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Preface

Social Welfare Department (SWD) and subvented Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) jointly established the Service Performance Monitoring System (SPMS) stage by stage from 1999 to 2002. The SPMS is a solid measure to ensure the accountability for public funds and the provision of quality social welfare services to the needy.

In April 2003, the service performance assessment methods under the SPMS were enhanced to encourage service operators to take greater accountability for the performance of their service units under corporate governance, to enable early detection and intervention of problem performance under risk management, and to reach cost-effectiveness in service performance monitoring through one-stop management.

To put forward the recommendation of the Lump Sum Grant Independent Review Committee (LSGIRC) on service performance assessment as laid down in its Review Report on the Lump Sum Grant Subvention System (the Review Report) published in December 2008, SWD has been conducting surprise visits as well as scheduled review visits to selected service units and collecting service users’ feedback systematically during the visits since 2009.

The service performance assessment methods include:

- annual reporting on self-assessment of Essential Service
Requirements (ESRs), Service Quality Standards (SQSs), Output Standards and Outcome Standards (OSs/OCs) by service operators on their service units’ performance with, if applicable, specific action plan on non-compliant area(s);

- self-reporting by service operators half-yearly on variance in the performance of OSs/OCs;

- review visits/surprise visits to selected service units for each service operator at least once in three years; and

- on-site assessment of new service units and other units with identified/suspected problem areas in service performance.

The “Service Performance Monitoring System Performance Assessment Manual” published in April 2003 contains all the features of the SPMS including an overall description of the service performance assessment methodology and related enhanced measures. This update edition aims at keeping all the stakeholders abreast of the development of the SPMS having regard to the recommendation made in the Review Report.

It is trusted that under the SPMS, SWD and NGOs carry on the provision of high quality social welfare services, which are efficient, accountable for public funds, user-focused and result-oriented.

Social Welfare Department
September 2012
Glossary

In the context of service performance monitoring, the following terms, in singular or plural forms, are defined as follows:

- **Service operator** is an entity that is funded by SWD to provide one or many social welfare services as stipulated in the written agreement(s). Nowadays, a service operator usually refers to the head of an NGO receiving subventions, and the District Social Welfare Officer or the chief officer of a service subject as designated in SWD.

- **Service unit** is the administrative structure set up by a service operator for the direct provision of the social welfare service(s) to the users in a manner as stipulated in the agreement(s) between the service operator and SWD.

- **Agency-based** or **on agency basis** is a description of the way of conducting service performance monitoring activity at the level of service operator.

- **Performance standard** is a collective term to denote different aspects of service performance expected from a service operator, including OSs/OCs, ESRs and SQSs.

- **Action plan** is the method to be executed in the service unit(s) by a service operator with a view to improving the service delivered in the unit(s) up to the basic requirement as stipulated in the agreement between the service operator and SWD.
Chapter 1: Features of Service Performance Monitoring

1.1 Purposes

Service performance monitoring is a shared accountability of both SWD, as a funder, and the service operators for the following purposes:

(a) to ensure service operators are responsible and accountable to their service users, SWD and the community for the proper and prudent use of public funds to deliver welfare services;

(b) to ensure service operators are providing quality social welfare services to service users; and

(c) to ensure service operators are pursuing service quality improvement in response to changing community needs.

1.2 Principles of Service Performance Monitoring

(a) The monitoring recognises the importance of Boards and Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) of service operators being accountable for the performance of their service units.

(b) The monitoring is constructive in the ways that:

- it encourages critical scrutiny and prompt management at
the earliest possible time of problem performance or less desirable situations probably leading to unsatisfactory performance; and

- it encourages identification of opportunities for improvement in a particular service or across the board rather than merely identifying areas where the service operator does not comply with the agreement terms.

(c) The monitoring is transparent by which service performance is assessed on the basis of the agreements drawn up between SWD and service operators.

(d) Results of service performance assessment are based on sufficiency of evidence.

(e) The monitoring is to be cost-effective, i.e. assessment activities to be scheduled and conducted in a streamlined way as far as practicable so that the monitoring purposes can be fully and efficiently attained while keeping minimum disruption to the service operation.

1.3 Monitoring Approaches

Service performance monitoring mechanism should encourage corporate governance of service operators, tackle quality issues effectively under risk management, and operate efficiently through one-stop approach.
(a) **Corporate Governance**

Providing services on public funds, service operators are facing an increasing public scrutiny and requirement of accountability from their service users as well as their staff, and from the public at large. Under corporate governance, the Boards and CEOs of service operators are required to take up accountability for the performance of their service units. The Boards and CEOs should report to SWD their assurance about the performance of their service units in accordance with the agreements. They should demonstrate a sound management of their organisations. They should ensure that public money is properly used for its designated purposes and pursue continuous service quality improvement.

(b) **Risk Management**

The crucial risk in service performance monitoring refers to unreliable governance of service operators, inadvertently or intentionally, that hampers mutual trust between the funder and service operators embodied in the monitoring mechanism. Unreliable governance of service operators may exhibit in fraudulent reporting, repeated occurrence of complaints against service delivery or agency administration, continued difficulties in making service quality improvement, etc. Under risk management, high priority would be accorded to the handling of problem performance or less desirable situations probably leading to unsatisfactory performance,
which requires critical scrutiny, focused intervention and prompt management.

(c) **One-stop Management**

Subvention allocation under Lump Sum Grant is agency-based while service performance monitoring takes into account corporate governance. For improving efficiency in service monitoring, one-stop approach is adopted. In other words, organisation of service performance assessment activities and analysis of service performance information is on agency basis. In daily operation, there will be an assessor in SWD to conduct service performance assessment and tackle quality-related issues for each service operator.

### 1.4 Handling of Poor Performance

Given the emphasis on service quality improvement and safeguarding the welfare of service users, if a service operator is assessed to be non-conforming with any of the agreement terms, it has to work out an action plan to improve the service within an agreed time frame. On the other hand, the Lump Sum Grant Independent Complaints Handling Committee, which was set up in pursuance of the LSGIRC’s recommendation with the Chairman, Vice-chairman and members being all independent persons, will handle complaints on the performance of service operators and their non-compliance with service requirements specified in the
agreement(s). In this connection, information generated from the complaints or the process of investigation would shed light on quality issues that service operators can bring about corrective action or enhancement in management and monitoring.

1.5 Withdrawal of Subvention

If a service operator of an NGO fails to make any improvement to achieve a reasonable standard of performance according to its agreement with SWD, the latter has the power to withhold or terminate the subvention to it.
Chapter 2: Performance Standards

2.1 Nature of Agreements

(a) *Agreements* between SWD and service operators refer to the Funding and Service Agreements (FSAs). In some service projects, the agreements also include the Service Specifications and the service operator’s proposal, giving more details about service policy, the basic set-up for service provision, the major service delivery process, the payment arrangement, etc. For services only provided by SWD, Service Documents (SDs) alike the framework of FSAs are used.

(b) Structurally, FSAs consist of two parts: the Generic Section and the Service-specific Section. The Generic Section is common to all FSAs. It defines the nature of FSA, the general obligations of SWD to service operators, and the role of SWD in overseeing the performance of the service operators through various monitoring methods. The content of the Service-specific Section varies from service to service. Notwithstanding, it spells out for different services the service definitions, the performance standards, the basis of subvention and if any, the specific obligations of SWD to service operators.

(c) Both FSAs and SDs are binding documents between SWD as a funder and the service operators. That is, SWD and service
operators are required to observe the terms of respective agreements for different services as mutually agreed and laid down in any of the documents mentioned at paragraph 2.1(a).

(d) Agreements will remain in force during the period in which SWD funds the service. At any time, it is open to the service operator or SWD to suggest a variation to the terms of the agreement, where appropriate and as confirmed by a written agreement between the two parties.

2.2 Types of Performance Standards

Among all the agreement terms, there are performance standards which spell out concretely the service performance expected from the service operators in any or all of the following aspects:

(a) **Output Standards (OSs)** are quantitative measures of the key activities related to the provision of a particular service. They are set according to the type of service provided. Examples of outputs include enrolment rates, number of registered members, achievement rate of individual care plans, hours of training per service user, average attendance per organised group, number of organised activities, etc.

(b) **Outcome Standards (OCs)** measure the effectiveness of the service. They are set according to the type of service provided and the data are collected through systematic use of specific measurement tools such as questionnaires or comparison
between pre-test and post-test performance. OCs may refer to the positive change of service users after receiving the services provided by the unit, e.g. enhanced parenting capability, improvement in support network, improved capability in managing family problem, etc.

(c) **Essential Service Requirements (ESRs)** specify some basic features of the infrastructure for the service provision and they are set according to the type of service provided. They may include staff qualification, availability of appropriate equipment, compliance with particular service manuals, opening hours, etc.

(d) **Service Quality Standards (SQSs)** define the level of which, in terms of management and service provision, service units are expected to attain. The SQSs are developed according to four principles which set out the core values of welfare services. These four principles are:

- to clearly define the purposes and objectives of the service and make its mode of delivery transparent to the public;

- to manage resources effectively with flexibility, innovation and continuous quality improvement;

- to identify and respond to specific service users’ needs; and

- to respect the rights of service users.
There are 16 SQSs, each of which is elaborated by a set of Criteria and Assessment Indicators. They are generic descriptions of the basic requirements so as to enable service operators to have appropriate methods tailor-made for a certain service type or a particular service unit in meeting the SQS requirements.

Remarks
Up-to-date details of these performance standards are available at the Homepage of SWD (www.info.gov.hk/swd) while service operators would be notified in writing any changes in the performance standards relevant to the services provided by them.

2.3 Value-added Items

For some service units, service operators may initiate value-added items in their proposals. These value-added items should be observable or measurable. They may be enhanced OSs/OCs, extra types of services, or innovative mode of service delivery. Service operators are required to materialize these value-added items and report the progress as directed by SWD.
Chapter 3:  Service Performance Monitoring Tools

For service performance monitoring, service operators are subject to any of the following tools appropriate to respective services:

3.1  **Basic Tools** (for all service units in normal circumstances)

(a)  **Self-Assessment**

Self-assessment requires service operators assessing their units as to whether the units meet the performance standards, including OSs/OCs, ESRs and SQSs as well as whether there are any areas of improvements they need to make in order to meet these said performance standards. All service operators are required to submit each year an overall report to SWD on the self-assessment conducted on their service units, indicating the compliance with the performance standards. If a service unit does not comply with any of the performance standards, the service operator must provide an action plan to show the step(s) it is taking to ensure the unit meets the requirement(s). For details, please refer to Chapter 4.

(b)  **Statistical Report**

Service operators should submit statistical reports periodically on their service units’ achievement at OSs/OCs and/or value-added items in a prescribed format as agreed with SWD.
SWD would analyse the data against the agreed levels set out in the agreements accordingly. Where the performance of a service unit falls below the agreed level within an agreed time frame, the service operator is required to provide an action plan to improve the performance. For details, please refer to Chapter 5.

(c) Review Visit/Surprise Visit

Review Visit (RV)/Surprise Visit (SV) is SWD’s regular service performance monitoring activity at a service unit against the terms of agreements between SWD and the service operator, including the implementation of 16 SQSs and ESRs. While pre-arrangement will be made with the service operator and service unit concerned for RVs, SVs are conducted on unannounced basis. Service operators have to receive either RV or SV at least once in three years. Under risk management approach, a number of service units would be selected for service operator to receive the visit. For details, please refer to Chapter 6.

3.2 Additional Tools (to be applied for a particular service/a service unit where appropriate)

(a) On-site Assessment

On-site assessment is a purposeful visit by SWD, at short notice or unannounced, to examine a quality-related issue
unique to a service operator or a service unit. On-site assessment will be conducted to new service units and other units with identified or suspected problem areas in service performance, etc. For details, please refer to Chapter 7.

(b) Users’ Satisfaction Survey/Collecting Users’ Feedback

Apart from collecting service users’ feedback directly during RVs/SVs as recommended by LSGIRC, SWD may conduct users’ satisfaction surveys for some services/service units. Both are systematic collection of service users’ views about the service delivery, based on which service operators would be advised to make, if appropriate, continuous service quality improvement.
Chapter 4: Self-assessment of Performance Standards

4.1 Purpose of Self-assessment

Self-assessment is a built-in mechanism in SPMS and by which a service operator is required to examine regularly its service unit(s)’ compliance with the performance standards as stipulated in the agreement(s). The service operator can then identify areas of improvements in order to meet the requirements.

4.2 Frequency and Approach

The self-assessment mechanism respects and honours the corporate governance of service operators. It is the responsibility of the service operators to ensure their service units’ compliance with the concerned requirements. Being an internal management process, service operators may choose to conduct self-assessment at any time point to evaluate their service units’ compliance and may adopt different approaches and processes of self-assessment. They can determine the frequency of self-assessment with regard to their operational needs. To seek continuous service quality improvement, speedy action must be taken to rectify any non-compliance identified during self-assessment.
4.3 **Self-assessment Tools**

The tools developed for use in the self-assessment process, which can be downloaded from the Homepage of SWD ([www.info.gov.hk/swd](http://www.info.gov.hk/swd)), are as follows:

(a) for SQSs – Implementation Handbook, Assessment Matrix and Self-assessment Checklist;

(b) for ESRs – Checklist and ESR Assessment Form; and

(c) for action plan – Report on Action Plan.

4.4 **Suggested Process**

The self-assessment process for service operators can involve:

(a) collect and read all policies, procedures and records that relate to each of the SQSs and ESRs;

(b) check on compliance against the Self-assessment Checklist on 16 SQSs and the Checklist for ESRs of respective agreements; and

(c) formulate and implement action plan for each of the non-compliant areas of any performance standards at the time of self-assessment.
4.5 **Report to SWD**

For reporting purpose, the service operator should submit to SWD the annual agency-based Self-assessment Report, using standard format provided by SWD, by the end of April each year. The Self-assessment Report should include all service units which have been operating for over one year at the submission time. It covers the achievement of OSs/OCs and implementation of 16 SQSs and ESR(s) in the service units concerned. For assurance of corporate governance, the Self-assessment Report should be endorsed by the Chairperson of the Board/Management Committee or CEO in the case of NGOs and by the District Social Welfare Officer/chief subject officer concerned in the case of SWD service units.

4.6 **Follow-up on Non-Compliance**

(a) When there is non-compliance at the time of Self-assessment Report submission, service operator has to submit the action plan(s) together with the agency-based Self-assessment Report. Within the timeline agreed with SWD, service operator has to implement the action plan(s) and report in writing to SWD on the action taken and the outcome achieved.

(b) SWD will take into consideration the service operator’s attitude in submitting its Self-assessment Report as well as carrying out the action plan(s), if required, as part of the track record of its overall performance. Identification of continuous non-compliance or any doubt on the accuracy of the
Self-assessment Report will be considered, among others, as risk factors for SWD to conduct on-site assessment at concerned service units.
Chapter 5: Assessment of Output and Outcome Standards

5.1 Statistical Data on Output Standards (OSs) and Outcome Standards (OCs)

For each service type, a set of OSs/OCs with agreed levels of achievement is specified in the respective agreement. Each service unit is required to submit data relating to its output and outcome performance on regular basis for the purpose of ongoing monitoring by SWD. This information forms the Statistical Information System (SIS). To serve this purpose, corresponding SIS Form for each service type is designed for service units to capture related statistical data and report to SWD.

5.2 Regular Reporting on OSs/OCs

Each service operator is responsible for a co-ordinated submission of the SIS Forms of all its units to SWD on regular basis as specified for each service type (mostly on quarterly basis and a few on monthly or half-yearly basis) following the announced submission mechanism. The service operators should also ensure the accuracy of the statistics and timely submission according to the timelines set for them.
5.3 Early Detection of Variance on Half-yearly Basis

Service operators are responsible to exercise close monitoring on their output and outcome performance so that they can make early detection and improvement of unsatisfactory performance. They are required to report variance, if any, to SWD on half-yearly basis against the agreed levels of the OSs/OCs of their service units, i.e. during the SIS submission in October for the period ending on 30th September using standard format provided by SWD. The service operators should pay special attention and take follow up action accordingly with a view to meeting the OSs/OCs at the end of the year. SWD will also follow up with service units with variance as appropriate.

5.4 Annual Assessment on OSs/OCs

At the end of each financial year, SWD will conduct annual assessment on output and outcome performance of service operators and then follow up on under-performance. To emphasize corporate governance and to speed up the implementation of improvement actions, upon the last submission of SIS in April for the financial year ending on 31st March, service operators are also required to submit at the same time action plans of any unmet OSs/OCs of their units using standard format provided by SWD together with their annual agency-based Self-assessment Report as mentioned in Chapter 4.
5.5 Follow-up on Under-performance

(a) Based on the result of the annual assessment, for each of the unmet OSs/OCs without justifiable reasons, SWD will closely monitor the service operators’ implementation of appropriate action plans and keep in view of the progress afterwards.

(b) Service operators are required to monitor closely their performance. If there is poor or suspected problem performance on OSs/OCs, SWD will consider to initiate on-site assessment on the concerned units for in-depth examination of the problem and taking more vigorous monitoring measures as appropriate.

5.6 The Annual Monitoring Cycle

The following table summarises the actions to be taken by service operators during the annual monitoring cycle by financial year for OSs/OCs:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Frequency</th>
<th>Reporting Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For <strong>monthly</strong> submission</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For <strong>half-yearly</strong> submission</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Quarter (Apr–Jun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency-based Submission of SIS Forms to SWD</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Half-yearly Review &amp; <strong>Report Variance</strong> to SWD in October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Measures to Eliminate Variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Annual Review, <strong>Report Unmet Output/Outcome Standards with Action Plans</strong> to SWD in April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Action Plans for Improvement in the coming year</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6: Review Visit/Surprise Visit

6.1 Nature of Review Visit (RV)/Surprise Visit (SV)

RV and SV are service monitoring activities at a service unit to assess the performance of the service(s) provided at that site in accordance with the terms of agreement(s) between SWD and the service operator. While RVs are conducted on pre-arranged basis, SVs are unannounced visits and the selected units will not be notified about the time, schedule and arrangement in advance. RVs and SVs also provide opportunities to identify good practices and issues on service performance so as to promote continuous service quality improvement.

6.2 Assessed Scope and Yardsticks

The scope of RV/SV covers the implementation of SQSs, ESRs and other aspects of performance of the service unit in the context of the terms of the prevalent agreements (nature of which is elaborated in Chapter 2, paragraph 2.1). While the visit may take an overview of the SQS implementation, it may examine specific areas of service operation, with reference to the latest development of the assessed service(s) as well as the track performance records of the service operator and the assessed unit. For SQS assessment, the judgement about the unit’s compliance with the assessed SQS or its Criteria is made on the basic requirements as in the original SPMS as spelt out at the Assessment Indicators in the SQS
Assessment Matrix, which are available at the Homepage of SWD (www.info.gov.hk/swd).

6.3 Unit Selection

All the existing service units, i.e. units with at least one-year operation, are subject to either RV or SV at any time. Given monitoring should be cost-effective, selection of service units for each service operator will be adopted under risk management approach. In a 3-year period, one unit will be sampled from every 10 units of the service operator for the visits.

6.4 Arrangement for RV/SV

(a) Scheduling

While SVs are conducted on unannounced basis, a 28-35 days notice will be given to the service operator for each RV with a copy to the unit head concerned. The RV has to be completed within the noticed period. That is, it may be scheduled at an earlier date having mutual agreement between the service operator and the SWD’s assessor. For logistic arrangement, the assessor will confirm the exact visit date in one week after the date of notice.

(b) Submission of Documents

Document review at the service unit will be conducted during
the visit as necessary. For RV, service operators would be required to submit documents relevant to service provision, including supporting documents for SQS implementation, at least one week before the visit to facilitate the assessment. Late submission of documents will not defer the visit date. However, it may lead to an extensive and detailed assessment at the service unit as the assessor has not been provided with necessary documents for his/her pre-visit preparation.

(c) Assessor

Normally, there will be one assessor for each visit. More than one assessor may be assigned for the visit as and when necessary.

(d) Length of Visit

Under normal circumstances, both RV and SV will be completed within one day.

6.5 Process of RV/SV

During the visit, the assessor will adopt any of the following activities as appropriate for the assessment:

(a) observe physical setting for service operation and practices in service delivery;
(b) review documents on SQSs as well as records pertinent to service operation;

(c) interview manager and frontline staff of the assessed unit, and/or other key personnel of service operator; and

(d) interview direct service users and/or family members of users.

6.6 Findings and Report

(a) Compliance with the Agreement

Findings of the RV/SV comprise the issues of compliance with the agreement terms covered in the assessed areas during the visit. For any non-compliance, the service unit manager will be given, during the visit, to know fully the reasons behind such finding. Within four weeks after the visit, the service operator is required to report to SWD the action plan for the service unit to rectify the non-compliant area in a reasonable timeframe. SWD will monitor the completion of the action plan for which the service operator should produce sufficient evidence as advised by the former.

(b) Good Practice and Opportunity for Further Progress

To promote continuous improvement, “good practices” and “opportunity for further progress” in SQS implementation, based on the information collected during the visit, will be
identified. Service operators should examine the area(s) for further progress and introduce appropriate improvement to the identified area(s) though they are not required to submit the action plan to SWD.

(c) RV/SV Report

The RV/SV Report will be issued to the service operators within six weeks after the visit.

6.7 Review of Findings

(a) Quality Review

Prior to the issue of the RV/SV Report, the supervising officer of the assessor will conduct quality review of the findings so as to ascertain the assessment result is objective and constructive.

(b) Disagreement and Appeal

In case the service operator holds a different view on the findings of the RV/SV Report, it may request the supervising officer of the assessor to have a second review of the findings. In the event that there is still disagreement about the assessment result after the second review, the service operator may lodge an appeal to the Director of Social Welfare (the Director) for a final review of the findings within three months.
from the second review. For the final review, the Director may consider setting up an independent panel, if appropriate, on ad hoc basis to conduct a hearing. Taking into account the nature of the issue in the appeal, the Director will form the panel with appropriate members from the social welfare and/or non-welfare sector.
Chapter 7:  On-Site Assessment

7.1 Nature of On-site Assessment

(a) Purposes

On-site assessment will be used as one of the ways to assess and monitor the service performance of service units of service operators. It is a focused and purposeful visit to collect information, assess and monitor the performance of the service units with a view to achieving the following purposes:

- to initiate early monitoring and intervention in the identified problems and formulate action plan as required; and

- to collect on-site information or evidence to facilitate assessment and monitoring of the service unit.

(b) Service Units for On-site Assessment

On-site assessment will be conducted to:

- service units with new mode of service delivery or service operators taking up services which are new to them;
- service units with suspected problem performance such as
  
i) problem manner in submission of Self-Assessment Report/statistical return;

  ii) continuous non-compliance of performance standard(s) and problem in drawing up or implementing action plan; and

  iii) special feedback in relation to service performance.

- service units having any emergency or disastrous or special event.

7.2 Activities of On-site Assessment

During on-site assessment, the assessor will conduct assessment of the service unit, which may include the following:

(a) reviewing documents on SQSs and other related records;

(b) observing the physical environment or practices;

(c) interviewing unit managers, staff or other personnel of the service operator;

(d) meeting with service users, including their family members and/or their representatives; and
(e) meeting with other stakeholders concerned.

7.3 **Follow-up Action and Use of Information**

Assessment findings collected through on-site assessment will be treated as track record of the service operator and thus form part of the assessment on the performance of its service unit concerned. For under-performance or non-compliance identified without justifiable reasons, the service operator will be required to follow up the action plan applied on its service unit for improvement, progress of which will be monitored by SWD.
Chapter 8: Service Quality Improvement

In addition to ensuring services provided by service operators are in compliance with the terms stipulated in the agreements, service performance monitoring strives for continuous service quality improvement in the welfare sector. Improvement, a concerted effort of service operators and SWD, will be attained through the following methods:

8.1 Self-improvement by Service Operators

SQS implementation emphasizes transparency of information on service delivery, regular reviews, as well as obtaining and responding to feedback from staff and service users. It drives service operators to self-improvement of the service provision through staff/users involvement and periodic self-assessment of the performance of service units.

8.2 Good Practices and Opportunities for Further Progress

(a) While good SQS practices observed by SWD during RVs/SVs recognise the endeavour of service operators, identification of the opportunities for further progress in SQS implementation is meant for on-going improvement of service quality. SWD would periodically conduct sharing of good practices in SQS implementation.
(b) SQS Benchmarking Study is a systematic collection of examples of general and good practices in SQS implementation of the welfare sector. It will be conducted to provide references for service operators in their decisions as to whether their service management benchmarks with basic SQS requirements, general practice or the good examples.

8.3 Review of Agreements

In parallel with the administration’s need assessment and policy requirements, periodic review of the achievement at the OSs/OCs in a particular service would facilitate any adjustment, if appropriate, in the FSAs/SDs to meet the changing needs of the community.

8.4 Overall Appraisal of Quality Issues

To support the service operators in the provision of high quality services, SWD conducts year-round analysis of findings in the visits so as to identify opportunities for improvement in a particular service or services across the board.