

## Table of Feedback from Aged Care Sector Committee Members

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
<b>Dementia Australia</b>	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 1	KPI 1- Regulators do not unnecessarily impede the efficient operation of regulated entities  Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 1?</i>	<b>Not Sure</b> As commented in a previous assessment, under Measure 1.3 Continuous improvement, it would be beneficial to see evidence of how the Quality Agency has interacted with the Aged Care Complaints Commissioner to support systematic linkages between datasets and feed into continuous improvement processes of both bodies, especially in relation to common operating policies and procedures and complaints data trends being used to identify areas of the organisation for improvement.
			<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 1 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p2*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 2	KPI 2 - Communication with regulated entities is clear, targeted and effective  Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 2?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
			<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 2 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 3	KPI 3- Actions undertaken by regulators are proportionate to the regulatory risk being managed  Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 3?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
			<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 3 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p3*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 4	KPI 4 - Compliance and monitoring approaches are streamlined and coordinated  Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 4?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
			<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 4?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 5	KPI 5 - Regulators are open and transparent in their dealings with regulated entities  Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 5?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
			<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 5 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p4*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 6	<p>KPI 6 - Regulators actively contribute to the continuous improvement of regulatory frameworks</p> <p>Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Met</p>	<p><i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 6?</i></p>	<p><b>Disagree</b></p> <p>‘Substantially met’ may be more appropriate as a rating. Guidance materials on dementia on the new Standards website is thinner than it could be. There are multiple threads of research that could be highlighted to support implementation into practice (e.g. Cognitive Decline Partnership Centre projects), as well as other examples of sound dementia practice beyond the resources listed. Emphasis on engagement with consumers in continuous improvement activities could also have been articulated more clearly.</p>
			<p><i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 6 are appropriate and effective?</i></p>	<p><b>Not Sure</b></p>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p5*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
		All KPIs and results	<i>Do you agree that the ‘actions for performance improvement’ identified in the regulator’s self-assessment report correctly reflect the opportunities indicated by the evidence presented?</i>	<p><b>Agree</b></p> <p>Emphasis is on transparency and collaboration with the provider sector, but, as previously noted, it would be beneficial to highlight across the KPI criteria the ways in which the views of and information to consumers/service users are incorporated into the processes. Similarly, the ways in which the Agency provides transparent information to the public about the performance of services should be a stronger focus in future quality monitoring models.</p> <p>More evidence linking consumer feedback into the process would add depth to the metrics.</p>

## Table of Feedback from Aged Care Sector Committee Members

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
Catholic Health	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 1	KPI 1- Regulators do not unnecessarily impede the efficient operation of regulated entities  Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 1?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
			<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 1 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 2	KPI 2 - Communication with regulated entities is clear, targeted and effective  Quality Agency self-	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 2?</i>	<b>Agree</b>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p7*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
		assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 2 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 3	KPI 3- Actions undertaken by regulators are proportionate to the regulatory risk being managed	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 3?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
		Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 3 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p8*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 4	KPI 4 - Compliance and monitoring approaches are streamlined and co-ordinated	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 4?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
		Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 4?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 5	KPI 5 - Regulators are open and transparent in their dealings with regulated entities	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 5?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
		Quality Agency self-		



*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p9*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
		assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 5 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 6	KPI 6 - Regulators actively contribute to the continuous improvement of regulatory frameworks  Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 6?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
			<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 6 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p10*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
		All KPIs and results	<i>Do you agree that the 'actions for performance improvement' identified in the regulator's self-assessment report correctly reflect the opportunities indicated by the evidence presented?</i>	<b>Agree</b>

## Table of Feedback from Aged Care Sector Committee Members

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
<b>Leading Aged Services Australia (LASA)</b>	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 1	KPI 1- Regulators do not unnecessarily impede the efficient operation of regulated entities  Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 1?</i>	<p><b>Disagree</b>  <b>Demonstrate an understanding of the operating environment.</b>                      Evidence presented under this measure describes engagement with the sector rather than directly addressing the regulator’s knowledge and understanding of the operating environment.</p> <p>As noted in LASA’s feedback on the 2016-17 AACQA Regulator Performance Self-Assessment a fully independent and anonymous survey of providers is a better way to assess regulator performance against most KPIs.</p> <p>LASA congratulates the AACQA for working with provider peaks to undertake Aged Care Provider Survey in March-April 2018 and publishing the results online.</p> <p>LASA believes the answers to the below question from this survey more directly measures the AACQA’s understanding of the operating environment than the</p>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p12*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
				<p>metrics and evidence presented. This result indicates a relatively low level of dissatisfaction with an assessment team’s knowledge and understanding compared to other issues raised in the survey. However, to properly benchmark the AACQA’s performance the result needs to be compared with other regulators and over time.</p> <p>Anecdotally there is some concern from providers that assessors are not always appropriately trained or qualified so another useful metric in relation to this measure would be information on the qualifications, experience, training and ongoing professional development of staff.</p> <p><b>Minimise unintended negative affects</b></p> <p>The evidence on feedback from the post-assessment questionnaire is welcome, but there are a number of limitations in the evidence presented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted in feedback on the 2016-17 AACQA self-assessment,</li> </ul>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p13*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
				<p>many providers are unwilling to answer the post-assessment questionnaire because of concerns with lack of anonymity in responses. Providers understand the responses are compiled by an external company but they are not confident that the data is sufficiently anonymised when it is sent back to the AACQA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The feedback questionnaires relate to the assessment process, but they do not address action in response to non-compliance. While these occur relatively rarely they have a significant impact on providers (and residents) so it is important for a regulator to specifically report on how it minimises the unintended negative affects of these actions.</li> <li>• It may be useful to distinguish between different types of assessment contacts as it is plausible that certain types of contacts – such as unannounced visits – have larger impact on</li> </ul>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p14*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
				<p>provider operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question referenced in 1.2.1 about allowing care staff to continue their duties during an assessment does not address the broader costs and impacts of a site audit, a review audit or an assessment contact. Unfortunately, none of the questions in the Aged Care Provider Survey directly address this issue.</li> <li>• Evidence provided under 1.2.2 does not reference the proportion of negative feedback received under residential care. The evidence provided under home-care only references the proportion of free-text responses that are negative.</li> <li>• Evidence provided under 1.2.3 does not provide an indication of satisfaction with the complaints process. Responses to the Aged Care Provider Survey (below) indicate around a quarter of providers would be unlikely or extremely unlikely to make a</li> </ul>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p15*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
				<p>complaint, and less than half agree with statements that they are confident that the complaint would be dealt with fairly and that they can make a complaint without fear of retribution.</p>
	<p>All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 2</p>	<p>KPI 2 - Communication with regulated entities is clear, targeted and effective</p> <p>Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met</p>	<p><i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 1 are appropriate and effective?</i></p> <p><i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 2?</i></p>	<p><b>Disagree</b></p> <p><b>Guidance that is up to date, clear and accessible through appropriate media</b></p> <p>LASA believes that it would be better to directly survey providers about the usefulness of communication materials and the overall communication strategy rather than just providing descriptive information about the communications strategy.</p> <p>One option would be to expand the Aged Care Provider Survey to ask about communications more generally rather</p>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p16*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
				<p>than just about communications with assessment teams.</p> <p>There should also be opportunities for feedback on specific communications. For example digital communications could end with a ‘was this information useful’ questions.</p> <p>For example, LASA has received feedback that some staff in some residential facilities do not see the e-newsletter because they are on the floor rather than at a computer. While most facilities endeavour to print the newsletter for this staff, this does not always occur. As such, allowing facilities to request copies by post rather than email may aid in the distribution.</p> <p>LASA members have also raised significant concerns about the location and number of places available at briefings provided by the AACQA on the new quality standards.</p> <p>Members have also repeatedly asked, through LASA, for quarterly information</p>



Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p17

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
				<p>on enforcement priorities and numbers of compliance events, including the specific standards failed. This would allow providers to investigate and address deficiencies in their own services without waiting for assessment visits.</p> <p><b>Consider impact on regulated entities and engages with stakeholders</b></p> <p>LASA agrees that the AACQA engages regularly with stakeholders. However, it's not always clear that the feedback is taken into account or that there is a sufficiently rigorous approach for measuring the impact of changes in regulatory behaviour. Directly surveying providers in relation to this issue would be useful.</p> <p><b>Decisions and advice are provided in a timely manner, clearly articulating expectation and reasons</b></p> <p>The following questions from the Aged Care Provider Survey provide useful evidence for this indicator. As noted above, further benchmarking is needed</p>

Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p18

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
				<p>to understand the significance of these results.</p> <p><b>Our approach is consistent and supports continuous improvement</b></p> <p>Concerns with inconsistency are by far the most common problem identified by providers. This is reflected in anecdotal feedback received by LASA, but it is also supported by the results of the Aged Care Provider Survey (below), with high levels of dissatisfaction about consistency between teams and over time. Similarly, there is a concern among providers about the recent spike in compliance incidents, since practices have not changed substantially.</p>
			<p><i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 2 are appropriate and effective?</i></p>	<p><b>Disagree</b></p>
	<p>All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 3</p>	<p>KPI 3- Actions undertaken by regulators are proportionate to the regulatory risk being managed</p>	<p><i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating</i></p>	<p><b>Not Sure</b></p> <p><b>Risk based and proportionate approach to compliance</b></p> <p>The evidence provided shows the AACQA is taking an increasing targeted approach</p>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p19*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
		Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>of its performance against KPI 3?</i>	<p>to compliance activities. The AACQA also has a clear process for the escalation of the compliance incidents based on seriousness. However, as noted above, there is concern from providers about the consistency of compliance decisions.</p> <p>The Aged Care Provider Survey response below provides some indication of the degree to which providers believe compliances decisions are appropriate. More detailed questions of this nature and better benchmarking would provide better evidence on whether AACQA decisions are proportionate.</p> <p>Anecdotal feedback suggests that there is concern that adopting a more risk based approach has been code for assessors becoming more aggressive and punitive.</p> <p><b>Approach to risk regularly re-assessed</b> The evidence notes that the 2017-18 assessment program focused on the top five not-met outcomes. However, it is not clear how this was communicated to providers, or the formal process that the AACQA has in place for targeting its</p>

Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p20

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
				assessment program.  <b>Earned autonomy</b> LASA supports the ACQA’s use of earned autonomy.
			<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 3 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Not Sure</b>
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 4	KPI 4 - Compliance and monitoring approaches are streamlined and co-ordinated  Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 4?</i>	<b>Disagree</b> KPI 4 would be best measured with direct questions to providers in a fully anonymous format. The Aged Care Provider Survey provides some information on the organisation of the assessment team but does not explicitly address how streamlined requests for information have been.
			<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 4?</i>	<b>Disagree</b>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p21*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 5	<p>KPI 5 - Regulators are open and transparent in their dealings with regulated entities</p> <p>Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Substantially met</p>	<p><i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 5?</i></p>	<p><b>No response provided</b></p> <p>Rather than process based evidence, the best indicators in relation to KPI 5 are surveys of the regulated population. The Aged Care Provider Survey provides some evidence (below) on provider views regarding the openness and transparency of assessment teams. However, this is separate from broader transparency issues. For example, providers have asked the AACQA to explain the recent spikes in compliance events and improve communication on enforcement priorities and historical non-compliance information across the sector.</p> <p><b>Openness to requests about the operation of the regulatory framework</b></p> <p>As noted above, LASA has received significant concerns from providers about the location and availability of education sessions on the new quality standards.</p>
			<p><i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 5 are appropriate and effective?</i></p>	<p><b>Disagree</b></p>

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p22*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
	All evidence submitted by the Quality Agency under KPI 6	KPI 6 - Regulators actively contribute to the continuous improvement of regulatory frameworks	<i>Do you agree that the self-assessment process has provided sufficient, reliable and current evidence to support the Regulator’s rating of its performance against KPI 6?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
		Quality Agency self-assessment rating – Met	<i>Do you agree that the output/activity based evidence metrics used to assess the Regulator’s behaviour against KPI 6 are appropriate and effective?</i>	<b>Agree</b>
		All KPIs and results	<i>Do you agree that the ‘actions for performance improvement’ identified in the regulator’s self-assessment report correctly reflect the opportunities indicated by the evidence presented?</i>	<b>Disagree</b> As indicated in the responses to individual KPIs, LASA is concerned that the self-assessment is overly focused on process based evidence rather than outcome or survey based evidence. In some instances this may reflect problems with the availability of information. However, in many cases there is better evidence through the Aged Care Provider Survey. Where there is only limited process based evidence available, this limitation should be explicitly acknowledged and addressed in subsequent years.

*Australian Aged Care Quality Agency – Regulator Performance Self-Assessment 2017-2018 – Table of Feedback p23*

Committee member	Self-assessment evidence in the Quality Agency report to which the Committee member is providing feedback	Relevant Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and Quality Agency self-assessment result	Question asked of the Committee member for feedback purposes	Summary of feedback
				<p>LASA also notes that a number of concerns (particularly around consistency, the recent spike in compliance actions and lack of communication around enforcement priorities) that were raised by providers with the AACQA are not mentioned in this self-assessment. A useful self-assessment needs to include greater recognition of areas for improvement.</p> <p>No 'actions for performance improvement' appear to have been identified.</p>