Measuring Disablement in Society: Working Paper 3
Disabled People and the Citizen's Charter

Sue Arthur and Gerry Zarb, 1995

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine two key questions relating to the Citizen's Charter programme and disablement. First, how good is the Citizen's Charter as an approach to extending opportunities for, and empowering disabled people? Second, how useful is it as a tool for measuring the extent of exclusion or inclusion of disabled people in society? These two questions arise out of a research project currently being carried out at the Policy Studies Institute on *Measuring Disablement in Society* (MDS). The aim of this research is to investigate the various forms of disabled people's exclusion from key areas of social and economic activity and to demonstrate how the extent of their exclusion can actually be measured. This paper is one of several working papers being prepared for this project; the others cover transport, accessible environments, employment and the involvement of disabled people in local planning.

The Citizen's Charter is intended to be a major part of public life in the 1990s. Its primary aim is to raise the standard of public services and make them more responsive to the needs and wishes of people who use them. Two key ideas within the programme are the empowerment of citizens and enhancing local democracy. It is therefore potentially an important tool for disabled people who may be particularly likely to experience poor service provision because of inaccessibility and inflexibility. Evidence that disabled people face institutional discrimination has been well documented (eg Barnes, 1991), and is the basis for the MDS project. The government has recently introduced legislation to make discrimination against disabled people illegal but this will not, in itself, create equality. The Citizen's Charter programme is therefore an opportunity to improve public services to disabled people and to monitor service delivery and accessibility. However, it is important to note two key limitations of the Charter programme. First, that the introduction of the Charter programme did not carry any promises of extra resources to meet citizens' or customers' new expectations and 'rights', and, secondly, that the 'rights' espoused by the Charter are not actually legally enforceable.

It is also important to recognise that the Citizen's Charter is only one aspect of many recent policy and legislative developments in the public sector. Considerable

changes are taking place at a national and local level, some of which may be reinforcing the principles of the Charter and some of which may be more likely to work against its development. For example, there are requirements under the Community Care legislation for increased empowerment of individuals through consultation, as well as increased access to information and rights of redress which run parallel to the Charter programme. At the same time, there is evidence that, as an indirect effect of GPs becoming fundholders, GPs may be striking disabled people off their patients' lists because they are too expensive (see *Disability Now*, February 1994).

There is so far very little general research on the Citizen's Charter, and virtually nothing has been written about the disability provisions and standards within it. There are still therefore many unanswered questions about the extent to which individual service providers are acting under the Charter programme to monitor and improve disabled people's access to services. Some of these questions will be addressed through consultation and fieldwork for the MDS project.

Background to the Charter programme

The Citizen's Charter was introduced in 1991, with the stated aim of improving choice, quality, value and accountability in public services. It forms part of the Conservative government's policy agenda of public sector reform in the 1980s and 90s. This has involved an increased emphasis on competition, through privatisation and market testing, and performance evaluation. At the same time, the Government has espoused the principle of the right to information and openness of government, formalised in the 1985 Local Government (Access to Information) Act. The policy programme is based in the ideological principle of individualism and freedom of choice, ideals which can be seen in the Charter literature:

> *'the Citizen's Charter is about giving more power to the citizen. ... [it] is not a recipe for more state action; it is a testament of our belief in people's right to be informed and choose for themselves* (John Major, *The Citizen's Charter*, 1991).

The emphasis on choice through full information has meant that a key feature of the Charter programme has been the development and publication of performance standards and indicators. These measures are intended to provide the means whereby individuals can assess the quality and suitability of public services.

Since the launch of the Citizen's Charter, there has been a considerable amount of official activity in this field. Individual services are responsible for adapting the principles of the Charter to their own organisations, and official national charters have been produced in over 20 areas of public service, with parallel charters in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. There have also been numerous local charters produced by local authorities, district health authorities, GP practices, the police, and other service providers. These generally follow the national charters in content and principles.

New administrative structures have also been established under the Charter programme. A central Citizen's Charter Unit has been set up in the Cabinet Office with responsibility for reviewing individual charters, and information systems. Other units have been developed to co-ordinate provision of information on performance standards and on the charters themselves. In particular, the Audit Commission now has responsibility for developing and publishing performance indicators for local authority services (see below). A Complaints Task Force was established in 1993 to review and co-ordinate good practice in complaints procedures, which are an important part of the Charter guarantee.

The format and detailed content of the many charters varies, but they each follow the framework of the six principles of the Citizen's Charter as set out in the White Paper. These are:
X   setting, monitoring and publication of explicit **standards,**
X   **information** for and openness to the service user,
X   **choice** wherever practicable plus regular and systematic **consultation** with users,
X   **courtesy** and helpfulness,
X   well publicized and easy-to-use **complaints** procedures, and
X   **value** for money.

Each service is encouraged to determine how they will follow these principles. Some organisations may have been following many of these principles prior to the Citizen's Charter programme, but for others it will have provided an opportunity for review of their service delivery.
The Citizen's Charter Unit produced a Disability Checklist in summer 1994 to be used by service providers as a guide for checking that they take account of the needs of disabled people when working up their charter programme (see page 5).

The emphasis within each charter is on the first two of these principles: setting service standards and provision of information. Charters promise to provide better and more accessible information about the service in general and about its performance. Information on performance is particularly important from the point

of view of the MDS project because it provides measurements which may give an indication of the level of inclusion of disabled people. Performance measurement is also one of the key means of accountability under the Charter programme, and the extent to which this helps to empower the individual will depend on the quality and appropriateness of the measurement. This aspect of the Charter programme will therefore be the main focus of this paper.

Performance measurement

A major part of the charter programme is the statutory requirement for some service providers, including schools and local authorities, to publish details of their performance against national standards. These have been collated to produce national performance 'league tables'. The Audit Commission has statutory responsibility for developing and collating indicators on performance of local authority services, which were published for the first time in March 1995 (Audit Commission, 1995).

In addition to these prescribed indicators, individual agencies can and do set their own targets, at a national or local level, for meeting their selected service standards. The individual national charters vary in the type of standards they set, but local charters are expected to follow the same sorts of standards as have been set nationally.

Outside the work that the Audit Commission has done in developing local authority performance indicators, standard or target-setting has tended to be done in a fairly crude way. It is argued that the initial charter standards have been developed frequently without any consultation with the user, and that the standards chosen are ones which are easy to measure and easy to achieve (Deakin, 1994). Many of the service standards that are adopted are general statements of intent which are too vague to be measurable, or at least not easily. This is particularly true of the disability 'standards'. There has been a tendency for the standards that are fixed and measurable to focus on issues of quantity or processes rather than quality, for example targets for waiting times or punctuality. The performance tables themselves have also proved controversial. For example, critics argue that comparing figures across different areas has little value without an understanding of different local contexts and priorities (references to follow).

How performance is measured and which information is selected for public consumption are very important in the context of consumer empowerment. There is a risk that huge quantities of information can be produced on measures that are at best irrelevant for the consumer and at worst misleading. Performance can be measured in a variety of ways. For example, measures of processes or outcomes, quantity or quality. Quality and outcome measures may be more useful for the

consumer to make an assessment of a service. For example, a performance indicator might show that x per cent of disabled people in an authority receive some sort of help in their home, but without an indication of quality, we do not know the nature of the help, whether it is what the user required, or how flexible the service is. There has been considerable discussion around how well the Citizen's Charter has been able so far to address the issue of quality, and most critics agree that it is an area where much more development is needed (GLAD, 1992, Audit Commission, 1993a, Pollitt, 1994).

The presentation of information on some standards and not others can also be misleading as this provides only a partial picture. If service providers focus resources on meeting a priority target, an indirect effect may be that another element of performance worsens. For example, a hospital may record improved rates of discharging patients but without giving any figures on re-admissions, which would provide a more comprehensive picture of what is happening.

Unmet need and Consultation
As a result of the way the standards are currently set and measured, much of the information produced both at a local and a national level may not be the sort of information which is most important to citizens. One way whereby individual public services can try to improve the match between services and customer needs is through consultation, which is one of the six key Charter principles. Of all the principles, this is the one that is the least in evidence in the charters. Whether service providers are consulting with disabled users and whether they are amending service standards as a result will therefore be an important area to explore in the MDS research.

Some organisations are attempting to capture an element of feedback and quality measurement through customer satisfaction surveys. A problem with this approach is that it is never entirely clear who a 'customer' is. If services are to be genuinely responsive to users' needs they may need to take into account not only the views of current users but also of potential users. This would also require some way of assessing unmet need, and seeking the views of those who have a current need for a service, but are not using it (because, for example, it is inaccessible or inappropriate or even disempowering). Some organisations are trying to do this. However, customer surveys normally limit evaluation to a reactive response from users of the service. There is therefore little space within the process for the input of other 'interested citizens' who may be more likely to demand qualitative change - ie. a change in the nature or type of service, if it is not meeting their needs.

Who are citizens?
The original Citizen's Charter white paper included a **principle of non-discrimination**, which stated that:

> '*services should be available regardless of race or sex*'.

This principle is derived from the statutory requirements to provide services fairly under the race and sex discrimination legislation. There was, however, no mention of disability or disabled people. (However, the recent Disability Discrimination legislation does seem to carry an implicit expectation that this principle will/should be extended to disabled people, as service providers will - albeit within certain limitations - be required to provide access to services on an equal basis). Nevertheless, as the Charter stands, there is a fundamental question as to whether the understanding of 'citizen', as a general principle within the programme, extends to include disabled people. In response to a similar question in the House of Commons, the Prime Minister replied that:

> '*the principles underlying the Citizen's Charter apply to everyone including people with disabilities. Public services should consider the needs of all their customers, including those with special needs, when drawing up charters and planning service provision*' (20 May '94).

Throughout the Charter literature, however, there is a striking lack of clarity on the question of accountability to disabled people as citizens and/or service users.

Individual Charters and disability standards

The argument made above is primarily about the general limits of the Charter programme in relation to disabled people. Within the individual charters, there is normally some reference to special needs or special arrangements for disabled people. Service providers have the opportunity to go beyond the Charter framework and make better provision if they wish.

Unfortunately, there are many unanswered questions in all the Charters about how the general provisions apply in practice to disabled people. This is generally because the charters are fairly vague in their promises and intentions. In the way that the charters are currently written it is unclear whether, for example, there is an intention to include disabled people when a consultation process is promised, or whether a <u>general</u> right to provision of information includes fully accessible information. Although a few of the charters are now published in accessible formats, as is a small amount of the information arising from the charter

programme, this does not appear to have been an initial concern, nor is it comprehensively provided. People with sensory impairments who cannot access the charter process are clearly excluded from it.

An example of how the charters could be extended to include disabled people is seen in the *Claimants Charter* (the alternative *Benefits Agency Charter*), where standards include that the building should be physically accessible and that staff should be trained in Equal Opportunities and disability awareness. (Note: This Charter was produced by a group of welfare rights advisers, rather than the service providers).

The guidance issued by the Citizen's Charter Unit in the form of a Checklist encourages service providers to address this lack of clarity in their approach to disabled people. The checklist is intended to:

> *'help public service organisations check that they take account of the needs of people with disabilities when making decisions about services and how to make them available; when drawing up Charters and Charter standard statements, and when monitoring performance against Charter principles and standards.*

The Checklist was produced in conjunction with an 'Informability Guide' which provides advice on how to improve the communication of information, in particular to people with sensory impairments (COI, 1994).
The Checklist goes through each of the six Charter principles providing key questions for service providers to ask themselves. For example:

X   *Setting, monitoring and publication of explicit standards*: do you know how many of your customers are disabled and whether you are meeting their needs? Are standards of service for disabled people made as part of the normal decision making process? What public commitments do you make about your services for disabled people?

X   *Information for and openness to the service user*: do you provide information in a variety of formats and through various media? Is there someone who is accountable for making sure disabled people have access to all your information? Is it easy for disabled people to get into the public areas of your offices?

X   *Choice wherever practicable plus regular and systematic consultation with users*: how do you find out what disabled people want? Do you offer choices which reflect the views and needs of disabled people? Do you know how

satisfied disabled people are with your services?

X   *Courtesy and helpfulness*: are all your staff who come into contact with the public trained to communicate with and help disabled people? Does your organisation have targets for disability awareness training and training in communication skills?

X   *Well publicized and easy-to-use complaints procedures*: have you ensured that disabled people can use your complaints system? Does your complaints system identify and analyse separately complaints from disabled people? Does your complaints system allow disabled people to complain about issues of access?

X   *Value for money*: Do you plan to meet the special needs of disabled people from the outset within your overall budget? Do you know the most cost effective ways of providing facilities for disabled people?
(Citizen's Charter Unit, 1994).

The Citizen's Charter Unit itself recognises that this is not an exhaustive list. There is no obligation on organisations to follow these guidelines and there is no evidence as yet to suggest whether they are using them or not. However, the

Checklist does contain several useful questions, which can be explored further as part of developing measures for the MDS project. Measurement issues arising from the charters can be divided into those of performance standards and of involvement in the charter process. (Measuring involvement is covered in more depth in the MDS working paper number 5 on User Involvement.)

Specific disability provisions
Where disabled people are referred to in the individual charters, it is rarely as customers with equal rights to the service, but as an additional section, or clause, in other words, as a special case. An additional difficulty with the disability provisions is that they are rarely commitments or easily measurable targets. (See appendix for detailed list).

Several Charters include 'disability clauses' on the provision of information. For example, a good council *'will tell you how it looks after tenants who have special problems, like disabled and elderly people'* (*Council Tenants Charter*, p 19). Schools are also required by law to publish any 'special arrangements' for children with special educational needs in the school prospectus (*Parents Charter*). None of these guarantee that this information should be fully accessible, nor do they commit the service in question to making appropriate 'arrangements' for disabled people.

Other charters have a statement of good intent on disability provision, which are not sufficiently defined to be very useful. For example, the London Transport buses *'aim to provide ... services that meet the needs of elderly and disabled people in particular' (London Bus Charter)*.

A few charters make a greater commitment to provision. It is difficult to know how meaningful such commitments are and whether or not they are being assessed. One of the new Charter Standards in the *Patient's Charter* refers to the requirement for *'arrangements to ensure everyone, including people with special needs, can use services'* (p 13). British Rail's *Passenger Charter* states that BR are *'committed to making travel easier for passengers with disabilities, including wheelchair users. With 48 hours' notice, we will provide assistance at stations where there are platform staff'*. (However this is still a severe restriction on travel opportunities, as other 'citizens' are not required to give any notice if they wish to travel). London Underground has also introduced a *new right of unrestricted access for wheelchair users'*, although this still contains a substantial qualification in that *'the age of the system means that access will remain difficult for some'* (*London Underground 1994 Customer Charter*).

Possibly the strongest sounding commitments to disabled people are found in the *Parent's Charter* and the *Jobseeker's Charter*, but these are also based on a principle of separate (segregated) provision. For pupils with statements of Special Educational Need (SEN), there is a *'right to an education which meets those needs'*. However, the assessment a pupil receives sets out what 'special help' the pupil should have and names the school which he or she should go to. There seems to be an assumption here that this will be a special school, and it is certainly in direct contradiction with the *'right to a school of your choice'* which is stated earlier in the Charter, and which - at least in principle - is offered to other pupils without restriction.

The *Jobseeker's Charter* states that people looking for work can *'can expect us to deliver our services fairly and to the same high standards to all our clients, regardless of sex, race, disability and religion'*, and had a 1994 target that approximately 3 per cent of those placed in work should be disabled people. In fact, disabled people actually constitute about 13 per cent of the unemployed population (Labour Force Survey, 1994).

The Department of Health's draft *Community Care Framework*, to be used as a model for local community care charters, outlines principles in relation to social service provision. For example, there is an 'entitlement to expect' that in the assessment and care planning process, the views of both the user and the carer should be sought and listened to, and the user should have the opportunity to be

represented in this process where necessary. However, there is no entitlement to have these views taken into account, and the only obligation on the part of the assessor is to ensure that the user is fully informed of the outcome of the assessment and the types of service available. According to one source, 60 per cent of Social Service Departments already do this anyway (Jones, 1995).

As can be seen from this brief review of the key points in the relevant charters, provision for disabled people as service users is minimal and often appears to be added as a special arrangement rather than included by course in the general provisions. Mostly, the disability references are not set up as measurable standards and therefore remain fairly vague statements of good intent. This may have an important role in raising expectations about service provision, but it does not create any real accountability as there is no legal obligation to fulfil Charter standards. They are therefore too general to be very useful for disabled users either to assess the performance of a service provider, or to complain against a specific provision. Given that they are aimed at special provision, they also do not facilitate any further measurement in terms of the level of inclusion or exclusion of disabled people from public services.

The impact of the Charter

There has been little research so far which attempts to look at the effect of the Citizen's Charter and performance standards. The Charter programme covers a very wide remit, and it is therefore difficult to trace which policy developments or outcomes may be related to its introduction. The findings of one study suggest that many of the quality initiatives that were taking place within five selected service areas were occurring independently of the Charter programme (Pollitt and Beale, 1994). This might include, for example, new mechanisms for user-involvement, such as through community care consultation processes, planning groups or on inspectorates. More direct measures, such as standards of performance have only been publicly available for one or two years, which is too short a time to assess their improvement or otherwise. The most visible impact of the Charter has been a huge increase in information provision, both on performance standards and more generally.

There have been two Citizen Charter reports (1992 and 1994) which have highlighted some of the achievements of the programme. These refer either to newly adopted charter standards, measures of activity (such as conducting surveys), or improvements in simple measurables, for example, train punctuality and hospital waiting times. They also give local examples of action under the Charter programme (see below).

Given that one of the main objectives of the Citizen's Charter was to empower the individual, an important way of assessing its impact is to explore how well-informed

and proactive in their choice of service people have become. Government-commissioned research found that in 1993, 71 per cent of respondents had heard about the Charter. However, when it came to individuals' knowledge of the specific service charters or about standards in these charters, the proportions were much lower, between one and 40 per cent (ICM, 1993). This implies that service users are not yet very aware of what they can expect from service providers. Disabled people do not appear to have been included or separately identified in the sampling of respondents.

The most tangible source of accountability is through the complaints procedure. The Complaints Task Force has recently issued a report based on two years research looking at people's use of the complaints systems. It found that just over half of those surveyed were dissatisfied with the outcome of a complaint to public services and that for every complaint that is resolved another is not (The Independent, 1995).
As this is the only real redress under the Charter programme, it would suggest there is a long way to go before citizens feel that their voice is being heard.

Improvements in service standards for disabled people are occasionally reported in Charter documents, for example:

X   53,300 disabled people were helped back to work by the Job Centre out of a total of 1,640,000 unemployed people helped back to work.

X   London Transport's Unit for Disabled Passengers provides information for mobility impaired passengers.

X   Many new trains, now including all Intercity trains, have space for wheelchair users; specially designed toilets are fitted on new trains travelling long distances; stations at all major centres have a range of appropriate facilities. (BR Passenger's Charter).

X   The Inland Revenue and the Child Support Agency have produced leaflets in accessible formats, such as tape and Braille; the Benefits Agency has a Disability Benefits Enquiry Line where help can be provided over the phone, and which can send forms in Braille or large print.

X   In Brighton, disabled people have undertaken access audits on all Brighton Health Care's sites and an Access Action Group has been formed .

In addition, four charters (Jobseeker's, Parent's, Patients and Council Tenant's) are listed as being published in accessible formats, as are some of the additional guides.

There are few other mentions of achievements on disability measures in the national Charter literature. Given the enormous amount of other achievements that are listed, it makes a very insubstantial list and may reflect the marginal, or 'special' position which disabled people have in relation to the Charter.

However, that is not to say that these are the only disability initiatives taking place in the public services; many are just not reported as part of the Charter programme. (Again this may be because the Charter is not seen as including disabled people). For example, the Department of Transport has set targets for the accessibility of public transport.

Two of these are tangible commitments: i) all London taxis to be accessible by the year 2000 and ii) to subsidise and encourage the introduction of low-floor buses in London. While helpful, these targets are nothing like as comprehensive or as wide-reaching as disabled people would like to see (Heiser, 1995).

It is not clear that any of these developments are a direct result of the Charter, although some of this information is no doubt more readily available because of the Charter. However, there is no systematic way of assessing the contribution of the Charter to the improvement of services for disabled people; even where Charters do adopt disability standards or statements, they are either not measurable or information on them has not been published.

Performance Indicators

There has been a growing focus since the 1970s on performance measurement in public services, in part as a way of trying to control public expenditure and to ensure efficiency. This development has thrived under the Conservative government's public policy agenda during the 1980s and 1990s, and has become a natural partner to the Citizen's Charter. As well as the local publication of information relating to performance on individual charter standards, the Audit Commission is responsible for developing more substantial performance indicators for Local Authorities. A purpose of the indicators is to facilitate comparisons over time and between authorities.

The Audit Commission consulted with 'councils, consumer groups, government departments and others in order to develop the local authority indicators. Anna Coote however argues that there was '*no exchange of views with those who are at the receiving end of public services*' (Coote, 1992). The extent of consultation is clearly important in terms of how meaningful the indicators will be for individual users. In its consultation paper the Audit Commission explored the problem of

selecting appropriate measures, and recognised the difficulty of developing measurements of effectiveness or quality. The indicators have been selected mainly on the grounds that they are easy to measure, and often therefore ones for which data is already collected. This may mean that the data has been collected for quite different purposes and may be misleading when used out of its original context. In addition, the Audit Commission admits that, '*there are very few indicators that deal with services provided to particular minority groups*' (Audit Commission, 1992, p 6).

A recent article warned against too much reliance on performance indicators as a 'real' measure of comparison or value. Both the Audit Commission and Social Services managers agree that '*indicators do not tell the full story and that there may be very good reasons for some authorities placing more emphasis on some services than others*'. The president of the Association of Directors of Social Services argues that local authorities should not become weighed down with assessments and inspections; the most useful measures are those that '*say something about outcomes and consumer reaction*' (Community Care, 1995).

The first set of Performance Indicators, introduced in 1992 for use in the financial year 1993/94, have now been published locally, and collated and published as league tables (Audit Commission, 1992b and 1995). In subsequent years, some indicators have been removed and some new ones brought in, but they have largely remained the same to enable comparisons over time (Audit Commission, 1993 and 1994). There are about 150 of them, covering each area of Local Authorities' responsibility. Of these, there are very few that enable any measurement of LA performance in relation to disability standards. The following areas of interest are covered (see appendix for detailed list):

X   accessibility of authority buildings
X   authority dwellings adapted for elderly or disabled people
X   special educational need statements and special schools
X   disabled people receiving help to stay in their own home and those supported in residential care
X   the number of visits a week to those receiving help in their homes (most of these are elderly people)
X   the expenditure on social services on a) elderly and physically disabled and b) learning disabled people

In the initial consultation round, there was an indicator included on the accessibility of local authorities' information provision, both in terms of physical access to information points and the format of information outputs. This is a key indicator

for measuring to what extent the Citizen's Charter programme, with its focus on information provision, includes disabled people. However, it was not included in the final set: it will be important to investigate why as part of the MDS consultation process.

In addition to these indicators, performance against which was published in 1995, new indicators have been added for publication in 1996 and 1997. The relevant ones of these are:

X   does the council have a published policy to provide services fairly to all sections of the community?

X   how does the council monitor its performance in implementing this policy?

X   does the authority follow the Commission for Racial Equality and the Equal Opportunities Commission codes of practice on employment? (not until 1997)

X   access to public conveniences

X   attendance at day centres

X   privacy in residential care

X   the speed of providing items of equipment costing less than 1000

It is also worth noting in this context that four new indicators on Equal Opportunities were proposed in the 1994 consultation round (for 1997 publication) but were not adopted (again it will be important to find out why they were not included and how the decision was made to include the new indicators):

X   Has the authority surveyed the need for: a) translation services b) alternative media in its communication with the public?

X   Does the authority have a formal mechanism for consulting with community groups?

X   Does the authority participate in a local authority forum whose role includes monitoring racial incidents?

X   Does the authority: a) monitor social services clients by ethnic origin b) provide meals which meet specific cultural or religious and medical requirements?

The second of these was one which was put forward by GLAD in the original consultation process (GLAD, 1992). It is not known why these indicators were dropped; it may be through lack of support during the consultation process, or because the Audit Commission wanted to limit the numbers of indicators in this field.

Reliability and interpretation

It is important to assess how meaningful and reliable the data collected by the Audit Commission on Local Authority performance is for measurement and comparison purposes.

A general problem with the indicators is that they do not always appear to be clearly defined and there are suggestions that different authorities may therefore be using entirely different measurement criteria for the same indicator. In addition, in attempting to produce indicators which are simple and easy to understand and compare, there is a danger of presenting insufficient information to enable a meaningful interpretation of the data.

The way disabled access to public buildings is measured, for example, is supposed to comply with the Approved Document M of the Building Regulations Act 1991. There are some criticisms about whether Document M is a sufficiently detailed measure of full accessibility (see MDS working paper 2 on access) . It is not clear from the Audit Commission indicators how well individual local authorities were able to measure the degree of compliance, and whether all authorities applied an equal standard of accessibility. This is a measurement that will also be explored in the MDS fieldwork.

The measures from 1993/94 (Audit Commission, 1995) reveal some unexpected differences between authorities which may indicate a different measurement process. For example, out of a similar number of public buildings, about a quarter of Tower Hamlets' public buildings are recorded as accessible but less than 3 percent of Lambeth's and none of Lewisham's. Similarly, over half of Doncaster's buildings are accessible but none of Rotherham's. The explanation for these anomalies could lie in a real difference in accessibility, due to, for example, a larger number of, possibly smaller, modern buildings, but could also be a result of a different application of access criteria. In terms of comparison, the figures may be very misleading, particularly when the more aware an authority is of what is required for full access (and maybe therefore the more 'progressive' it is), the more likely they are not to record their buildings as accessible. In measuring access to buildings, the MDS method will involve audits by disabled people themselves, which we think can increase the validity of the measures, (provided that standardised access audits are used).

Some understanding of the difficulties with the use of this access measurement can be gained from a report which compiled London Borough performance indicators and added the Borough's comments where they had felt the indicator was problematic (London Research Centre, 1995). Out of 33 Boroughs, 25 chose to make a comment on this indicator.

The general comment was that Document M was very strict if properly applied and that given the age of council buildings, very few of them were able to comply with every aspect. 18 Boroughs commented that access to their council buildings was better than reflected by the performance indicator. However, London may not be typical in applying the standard strictly. Some councils accessibility ratings were very high and have been questioned by local access groups. It has been suggested that a better indicator would be one that graded accessibility, rather than produced complete passes or fails (Disability Now, 1995). It could be that many authorities have in fact been applying the measurement criteria in this way, which is more subjective because not standardised.

There is also potentially a problem in relying on the figures for numbers of disabled people known to the local authority, either for general reference or for calculating proportional rates of social service provision (the method used in the Audit Commission league tables). It will be important to investigate how authorities collect information on the numbers of disabled people in their area, as this may be done in a variety of ways. For example, it could be those from their register of disabled people, those who have had a needs' assessment or all those who have had some sort of contact with the social services department. Depending on the thoroughness of these recording systems, there may be large numbers of disabled people who the local authorities are unaware of.

Similarly, some of the authorities included in the London Research Centre's report commented that the figures relating to 'help in the home' under-represented their provision as the definition did not include day centres, specialist support teams, or occupational therapists. A related issue which is being examined as part of the MDS project is the validity and reliability of the indicators relating to community vs institutional forms of support for disabled people. For example, while the published performance indicators express the number of people in homes as a proportion of the total social services client list, it is possible to compile alternative figures based on the population as a whole. When combined with details on actual expenditure and the age profile of the local population (i.e. because age is known to determine the numbers in residential care) these alternative ratings may provide a more realistic indication both of local authorities' commitment to community based support, and of levels of unmet need.

These are also likely to be imperfect indicators however as they will still need to rely on existing data sources. The indicator on expenditure until 1995/96, for example, is not very helpful in terms of disability measurement as provision for elderly and physically disabled people is all recorded together. Therefore it is not possible to compare what is spent (per head of population) on disabled people alone. It also would require a great deal more information (i.e. on the total population in each area and the proportion in each group) in order to produce a completely accurate indicator for comparison between local authorities. Nevertheless, by providing an indicator to local authorities' commitment to supporting independent living in the community, this alternative approach to measurement should come closer to addressing one of the key issues which is known to be of interest to many disabled people. (Note: both the consultation process and detailed case studies in two local authorities will offer further opportunities to explore ways of developing appropriate indicators on this and similar issues relating to the provision of services to disabled people).

When the new indicators, detailed above, are published (Spring 1996 and 1997), there will clearly be more information available on disability measurements. In particular, the indicators on Equal Opportunities' policies and monitoring of implementation are to be welcomed, and that on the accessibility of public conveniences will add to knowledge about public access issues. This last indicator was one that disability groups had called for to be included in the Charter programme, but it is not clear why the Audit Commission has singled it out as a public access measure (Disability Now, 1992).

Gaps in measurement and research proposed

Together, the Citizen's Charter standards and the statutory Performance Indicators provide the beginnings of an information system for measuring service delivery to disabled people. However, because the Charter fails to allow disabled people equal rights as citizens, the standards and indicators that have been developed largely relate to areas of special treatment, and are far from being comprehensive across the programme. Key areas of public life where disabled people might be expected to have an equal entitlement include housing, transport, public buildings, education, training, health and social services. In particular, this would include an equal right to involvement in consultation and choice in public services.

Of these key areas, accessible housing and public buildings are included among the performance indicators, and although there is a need to monitor how measurement criteria are used, these nonetheless provide some useful initial information on

inclusion and exclusion of disabled people. In addition to physical access measurements, it has been suggested that policies of public organisations can be a key factor in restricting disabled people's participation and should be monitored (GLAD, 1992). Further indicators which would provide a more meaningful measure of housing provision could include: the level of provision of accessible housing or adaptations in relation to demand, and the extent to which such housing is provided in a choice of locations within a local authority. As part of the MDS project, it is intended to conduct access audits with disabled people in public sites in two case study areas and to carry out analysis of housing data (in some cases it will be necessary to use the same source of data as that used for the performance indicators) (see MDS working paper 2 on access). It has also been recommended that there should be local authority indicators on the key area of accessible public environments. This could include measurements of authorities' parking policies and on provision for pedestrians' needs (GLAD, 1992).

Indicators on access to public transport are limited to the service standards which transport companies decide to set. The ongoing programme of privatisation in this area means that measurement information on access will become very difficult to obtain, unless there is a statutory duty to provide it. At present, the only measurable here is British Rail's guarantee to provide help at staffed stations if given 48 hours' notice. A national survey of Transport Authorities is already underway as part of the research, which will include measurements of the extent of accessible transport within different regions (see MDS working paper 1 on transport for further discussion).

Performance indicators on economic life, employment, education and training, are barely covered in the Charter programme. Part of this may be because this area is not traditionally one of state or local authority involvement, and increasingly there is a diverse range of provision, particularly in the training field. The Employment Service's 1994 target of placing 56,000 disabled people in jobs could be a useful measure, when looking at disabled people's unemployment and economic inactivity rates compared to the non-disabled population. Education or training institutions are not currently required to provide information on the accessibility of their buildings or their educational material, nor the proportion of their students who are disabled and their qualification rates. All of these are important measures of exclusion/inclusion of disabled people.
(See also MDS working paper 4 on employment).

A key measure which is not used in the indicators on access and education is the number of fully accessible school/educational buildings. It is possible to calculate from the educational indicators what proportion of children with statements of special educational need are attending mainstream schools, rather than receiving

segregated schooling. However, this does not provide any information either on access to a good education within special schools or on mainstream schools' policies and facilities, which may be operating to exclude disabled children from the school or deny them a good education. This is a particularly important measure given the significance of schooling for later life and the fact that the official policy position has been to encourage greater integration for disabled pupils in mainstream schools. (Note: individual schools must publish their arrangements for children with special educational needs in the school prospectus, see above).

Within the provision of social services, it might be useful to include measures which try to capture the level of unmet need as well as those on existing levels of provision, which the current performance indicators show. Another important measure, from the perspective of the MDS project, might be the extent to which services provide choice and flexibility for disabled people. Consultation and advocacy are particularly important in this area; further measures could show the extent to which local authorities consult with disabled people and groups, not only at the delivery stage but also in their planning process (GLAD, 1992). A key measure will also be the outcome of the consultation (ie whether or not what is said makes any difference) (see MDS working paper 5 on user involvement for a discussion of these issues).

Data have been collected for the project on the levels of local authority social services expenditure, similar to those used in the performance indicators. However, alternative (more reliable) population figures will be used, and the differences in age profile in different geographical areas will be taken into account. It is also intended to conduct national surveys to explore the provision of social services to different groups of disabled people and the level of involvement of disabled people in local planning.

The role of the Citizen's Charter - issues for wider discussion

The Citizen's Charter establishes a principle whereby public services are answerable to the demands of the 'consumer', operating in the free market conditions of competition and full provision of information. However, the Charter framework appears to have no real understanding of structural inequalities, whereby as a result of the way that society is organised, each citizen does not enter the market place on an equal footing. It seems to operate on a principle of equal treatment, without recognising that some citizens are excluded in a fundamental

way from becoming service-users or active consumers. This is particularly true of disabled people. A striking example of this marginalisation can be seen in the case of public transport where targets which focus on, say, the punctuality of trains are meaningless for disabled people if they are unable to travel on public transport at all due to lack of access. It is also true of other groups, for example those whose restricted income means that they are unable to purchase certain services. This raises a central question of how well the Charter framework will ever be able to benefit disabled users and potential users at anything more than a fairly basic level.

Because the Charter is ostensibly about citizens, empowering individuals and developing accountability, the programme is frequently linked to the issue of civil rights. There is currently a degree of ambiguity about the extent to which the Charter creates rights. Many of the charters do contain 'rights'. Some are existing legal rights, repeated in the charters, but some are new 'rights', for example London Underground has introduced a 'right of unrestricted access for wheelchair users'. Several charters include a right to information about a service or about its performance, rather than a right to the service itself. Even if charters cannot create rights, they can create expectations which may be empowering in themselves. However, charters are not legally enforceable and there appears to be little in the way of legal redress for a right or a standard which is not met. Official redress under the Charter programme is through complaints' procedures, which are developed by individual agencies. It has been suggested that it is only a matter of time before individuals begin taking service providers to court for failing to meet a charter standard (Wilder, 1995).

It is important to note that disabled people have existing rights in the field of service provision. Legal rights exist under the Chronically Sick and Disabled Person's Act 1970 and the 1986 Disabled Person's Act (although the relevant sections in this have not been enacted by government). The Community Care Act introduced a right to an assessment of need.
Under the government's Disability Discrimination Act, it will be illegal to discriminate against disabled people in specified areas of public services. In the public sector, this includes transport and education, but only restricted aspects of these services are included. There was also a right of access to new public buildings created in 1987 under the Building Regulations.

The emphasis on information provision may not be the most effective way to empower the individual user. This will partly depend on what information is provided and how citizens are able to use it to ensure that the service better meets their own needs. It is likely that empowerment and accountability will be better achieved if there are flows of information both ways. It has been argued that, in selecting what information should be provided, '*there has been no exchange of*

views with those who are at the receiving end of public services. It was a top-down exercise in which citizens had no power to choose what information they would receive'. Empowerment may therefore be more meaningful if the citizen has rights to extract information from an authority (Coote, 1992).

Conclusions

Because of its aim of improving public services through the empowerment of service users, the Citizen's Charter is potentially a powerful tool for helping to redress the current exclusion of disabled people from full participation in society. In setting up information systems that attempt to monitor and evaluate performance, it is also an important tool for measuring the extent of that exclusion. However, the programme has been developed with no recognition of structural disadvantage or the need for positive action to begin to counter such discrimination. As a result, the references to rights for <u>all</u> customers in the Charters do not appear to include disabled people. The different needs of disabled people are not built into the Charter programme, but are left to individual service providers to pick up in their own Charters in an *ad hoc* way. This is often done through statements of good intent or a focus on special provision, and very rarely through comprehensive commitments or specific targets which could be monitored.

There are many ways in which Citizen's Charter standards could be made more meaningful to disabled people. These could include an obligation to provide information in accessible formats; standards which measure the extent of disabled people's use of the service and take into account unmet needs;

consultation and complaints procedures which guarantee to involve disabled people. The effect of this would be that disabled people would have equal rights in the Charter programme and not be the recipients of special provision as is currently the case.

The Local Authority Performance Indicators provide an opportunity to measure how well authorities are providing services to disabled people, compared against each other and over time. This is important not only to improve services for disabled people, but also as a way of encouraging authorities to review their output in this field and become more accountable to disabled people. The current set of indicators begin to show how performance can be evaluated but there are considerable doubts about their overall reliability and the types of questions that have been asked. Provision of information can only be empowering if it is meaningful to users and potential users, and can be used to help match service provision with needs more appropriately. The MDS project aims to fill in some of the gaps in our knowledge and understanding of measuring public services.

Issues for consultation

The following are suggested questions which begin to look at the level of inclusion of disabled people in the charter programme. They include general questions and questions raised by individual charters. Most of these, however, could be applied across several of the charters (eg. the issue of whether access needs are primarily defined in terms of wheelchair users or the majority of people with different types of impairments).

We hope to follow up the specific questions with the relevant organisations (ie British Rail, the Employment Service). General and broader issues can be raised for discussion with the Citizen's Charter Unit, disability groups, and anyone else who is interested. **We would like to receive comments on these questions and any additional ideas for measuring how well disabled people are involved in the charter programme.**

General questions:

1. What measured <u>improvements</u> for disabled people have been made under the charter programme? For example,
X information and charters in accessible formats
X improvements in physical access to services
X consultation with disabled people
X specific disability provisions and measurements on these.

2. What is disabled people's <u>knowledge or understanding</u> about the charters and the performance indicators? What is being done to make sure disabled people are informed?

3. Have disabled people been <u>consulted</u> as users of a particular service, or as potential users about unmet need?
X Is there any evidence that their views have been taken into account?
X How should service providers go about consulting disabled people?

4. What are disabled people's <u>views</u> about the charter standards, and how well they meet the needs of disabled people? For example,
X How useful are the standards that have been set?
X How useful is the information that is provided about performance?
X Does the published information help people to make sense of the charter standards?
X How could the charter standards and information be improved?

5. What are disabled people's <u>experiences</u> of using the charter? What are their experiences of using complaints procedures?

6. Who has the Audit Commission consulted with in order to develop the performance indicators? How have decisions been made to include or to exclude particular indicators?

Individual Charters

1. **London Bus Charter**
i) The charter claims that London Transport have been set 'tough targets', but what are they exactly? For example, have enquiry offices/termini been surveyed by London Transport to check accessibility? If not, what standards are they measuring against?

ii) The charter also talks about 'mileage covered'. What does this mean? In particular, will it mean that in the future it will be possible to say how much of the total bus network is accessible and/or how many miles are covered by accessible routes - which is similar to the method proposed for our own survey?

iii) What types of impairments are taken into account when defining access needs under the charter? (there seems to be an implicit focus on wheelchair users who are of course a minority).

2. **Customs and Excise Travellers' Charter**
i) What is meant in this charter by the guarantee of 'taking account of disabled people's needs'? What is this expected to cover? How will disabled people's needs be identified?

ii) More specific questions include: how many customs control posts are fully accessible? how many are staffed by sign language interpreters?

3. **British Rail Passengers' Charter**
i) The charter talks about 'special needs' (page 9). How does BR define 'special needs', and how have these been identified?

ii) Why is there a requirement for 48 hours notice - particularly on main lines; does this not severely restrict people's ability to travel freely when they want to?

iii) Although some trains might have space for wheelchairs, most travellers cannot

get on without assistance; is this, or will this be, taken into account when assessing how many routes are counted as accessible?

iv) What do BR mean by 'appropriate facilities'? Who did they consult? Are people with sensory impairments catered for and if so how? Are there any plans to publish specific monitoring targets on any of these 'appropriate facilities'?

4. **The Patients Charter**
i) The Charter introduces a new right to information on local health services - is there a requirement for this information to be published in accessible formats?

ii) Charter Standard 2 aims to ensure that everyone, including disabled people, can use services: does this access standard apply equally to people with different types of impairment, or just to wheelchair users?
iii) Are the communication needs of people with sensory impairments and people with learning difficulties addressed by the charter?

iv) Does access to services include access to appropriate specialist treatment for all those who want or need it?

v) What information is being published on achievement of this access standard (ii), and where is it published? (the charter states that information about performance against standards will be published annually by local health authorities).

vi) Should the standards be extended to include some measure of disability awareness among health service staff?

5. **The Charters for Higher Education and Further Education**
i) The charters state that clear and accurate information about universities and colleges and the courses they offer should be available - does this include providing information in accessible formats?

ii) Universities and colleges are expected to provide information on their policies and their arrangements for providing access to disabled students. Are these policies monitored - what proportion of institutions publish this information and what proportion actually provide full access?

iii) All 16-18 year olds are entitled to a full-time place in school or college. However, a suitable place may not be available for a disabled student, in which case the Funding Council may consider funding a place for you in an independent college if it is the best way to meet your needs. How is it determined what best meets a disabled student   s needs? What figures are kept on disabled students who

cannot find a suitable place in the public sector? Are they funded in a private college?

6. **Benefits Agency Charter**
i) The charter standards include fair treatment irrespective of disability and courteous staff. Local offices publish their performance against charter standards. How is performance against these general principles measured at a local/national level, ie the proportion of staff who have had Disability Awareness Training, are premises and information fully accessible to disabled people, what proportion of complaints are from disabled people?

ii) When national and local offices carry out surveys and consultation, do these include disabled people and disability organisations? What measures are taken to ensure that the views of disabled people are accurately represented?

7. **London Underground's Customer Charter**
London Underground surveys 2000 customers every month. Do these surveys provide information about access for disabled people, or the numbers of disabled people who use LU? Do they attempt to consult with Disability Transport groups about the needs of those who are currently unable to use the service or who use the service in very small numbers?

8. **The Council Tenant's Charter**
i) Do charter standards on the provision of information include data on the numbers of wheelchair and mobility standard housing? Councils are encouraged to set out in their reports their policy on disabled tenants: are these policies monitored by the government? Is the council report provided in accessible formats?

ii) The charter recommends that councils can consult through carrying out surveys, holding public meetings and consulting through representatives and experts: are there arrangements to ensure that disabled people and their representatives are part of this consultation process?

iii) Councils are expected to take responsibility for the environment inside and outside council housing. This has an important effect on levels of access: are council policies and action on this monitored by local authorities under the charter?

9. **The Parent's Charter**
i) The charter requires schools to produce a large amount of information, including examination performance, school prospectuses and reports: does this information

need to be provided in an accessible format? Schools must publish their policy for children with special educational needs, are these policies monitored? Do these policies ensure that disabled children's right to a good education and a broad and balanced curriculum are fulfilled?

ii) Parent's have a right to a place for their child in a school of their choice and to a good eduction. However, for some disabled children a statement of special educational needs will say which school they should go to. How is this decision taken, who is consulted, on what basis is the decision made, eg are decisions made on the basis of lack of physical access, support arrangements or learning material available in accessible formats?

iii) Are disabled parents able to participate equally in how the school is run? Is information accessible? Are public meetings fully accessible?

10. **The Jobseeker's Charter**
i) Are there arrangements to ensure that annual national customer surveys include disabled people and their representatives?

ii) How does the target of 3 per cent of people being helped back to work being disabled compare with the figures for all those who use the job centre? Are unemployed disabled people using the Job Centres as much as non-disabled people? Are Job Centres fully accessible, to people with sensory impairments as well? Are staff trained in Disability Awareness?

iii) Do Job Centres monitor how long it takes to find a job for a disabled person compared to a non-disabled person? Do disabled people have an equal chance to take part in schemes for the long-term unemployed?

11. **Draft Framework for Community Care Charters**
i) How have local authorities adapted the draft framework? Are there minimum standards and general principles which are replicated by all local charters? What standards have been selected and how is information being published against these standards?
ii) What information is available on how to obtain services and how to obtain an assessment? What information is available on the degree of choice over the nature and timing of services and who provides them? What information is available on how to make a complaint, comment or suggestion about services?

iii) What information is available on charges made for services? Do users receive a statement of charges for services and details of how these charges are arrived at

and how to challenge them? What information do users receive on how charges will be collected and alternative methods of payment?

iv) What arrangements have been made for information on ii) and iii) to be made accessible to people who have difficulty reading normal typescript, are unable to read at all and/or who have a first language other then English?

v) What arrangements are made for people to have a relative, friend or other person present at their assessment? What arrangements are made for people whose first language is not English and for people who face communication barriers (eg deaf or blind people)?
(Are interpreters routinely provided/provided on request/not available/available only for certain languages)?

vi) What guidelines/training exist for informing disabled people about the range of services available to them and the extent to which they can choose between them?

vii) Specific questions can be asked of selected services on timeliness, reliability, availability, choice, quality. For example, on home care, what arrangements are made for staff cover to ensure service is reliable? Are user offered a choice of times? How is quality of service assessed?

viii) What steps are being taken to involve disabled people and carers in local community care plans?

12. **Complaints Task Force**
i) Are complaints monitored to see how many are from disabled people, and analysed to see if there are any specific patterns? What are the outcomes of complaints from disabled people?

ii) Are complaints systems accessible and easy to understand: how is this monitored?

Performance Indicators

1. The performance indicator on access to public buildings uses Part M of the building regulations. How good is this as a measure of accessibility, particularly for older buildings which were designed before it was introduced? Is there a better way to measure access, ie not just a pass or fail?

2. What other measures of access could be developed as performance indicators, eg accessibility of local environments: number of steep dropped kerbs, pedestrian

crossings and tactile markers or bleepers at crossings, number of allocated parking spaces etc?

3. Are the figures that local authorities have on the numbers of adapted dwellings reliable and accurate? If not, should local authorities be encouraged to collect new figures for use as performance indicators?

4. What other measures of housing could be developed, eg the provision of accessible housing or adaptations in relation to demand, and whether such housing is provided in a choice of areas within a local authority?

5. What alternative measures of access to schooling could be developed, eg access levels to mainstream schools, availability of teaching support?

6. What additional measures could be developed on the provision of social services, for example, measuring how much influence disabled people feel they have in local planning?

REFERENCES

Audit Commission (1992a) *Citizen's Charter Performance Indicators*. Consultation Paper.

Audit Commission (1992b) *The Publication of Information (Standards of Performance) Direction 1992*

Audit Commission (1993a) *Putting Quality on the Map: measuring and appraising quality in the public service*. Occasional paper no. 18

Audit Commission (1993b and 1994a) *The Publication of Information (Standards of Performance) Direction 1993 and 1994*

Audit Commission (1994b) *Consultation on the Audit Commission's Proposals for 1995/96*

Audit Commission (1995) *Local Authority Performance Indicators. Vols 1-3 and appendices*. London. HMSO

Beale, V and Pollitt, C (1994) 'Charters at the Grass-Roots: A First Report' in *Local Government Studies*, Vol 20, no 2, pp 202-225

COI (1994) *The Informability Guide*. Central Office of Information, Informability Unit

Citizen's Charter Unit (1994) *The Citizen's Charter and people with disabilities: a checklist*

Community Care (1995a) 'Performance Indicators are only half the story in *Community Care*, 6-12 April, 1995, p.9

Community Care (1995b) 'Voices from the sharp end' in *Community Care,* 6-11 January, p 20

Coote, A (1992) 'Charter Blight' in *Social Work Today*, 12 November 1992

Deakin, N (1994) 'Accentuating the Apostrophe: the Citizen's Charter' in *Policy Studies*, Autumn 1994, vol 15, no 3, pp 48-58

Disability Now (1992) 'Fight for better toilets' in *Disability Now*, October 1992, p 32

Disability Now (1995) 'Councils 'cheat on access' in *Disability Now*, March 1995, p 1

GLAD (1992) *Response to the Audit Commission's consultation paper on performance indicators.* Greater London Association of Disabled People.

Heiser, B (1995) 'The nature and causes of transport disability in Britain and how to remove it   in Zarb, G (ed) *Removing Disabling Barriers.* Policy Studies Institute

ICM (1993) *Citizen's Charter Customer Survey*. Conducted for the Citizen's Charter Unit
Jones, R (1995) 'Disability, Discrimination and local authority social services: the social services context', in Zarb, G (ed) *Removing Disabling Barriers*. Policy Studies Institute.

Labour Force Survey figures, summer 1994, in *Employment Gazette*, March 1995, p 14

London Research Centre (1995) *Performance Indicators in London Boroughs*

Nursing Times (1993) 'Charting Progress' in *Nursing Times*, vol 89, no 14 (7 April), p 26

Pollitt, C (1994) 'The Citizen's Charter: A Preliminary Analysis' in *Public Money and Managemen*t, April-June 1994

Taylor (1989) 'Citizenship and Social Power' in *Critical Social Policy*, no 26, Autumn 1989

The Citizen's Charter: Raising the Standard (1991). Cm 1599. HMSO

The Citizen's Charter: First Progress Report: 1992. Cm 2101. HMSO

The Citizen's Charter. Second Report: 1994. Cm 2540. HMSO

The Guardian (1995) *'Crude' council wins right to scrap care*, 17 June 1995, p5
The Independent (1995) *Faith in power of complaint on the rise,* 23 July 1995, p 5

Wilder, G (1995) 'Unchartered Territory in *Health Service Journal*, 18 May 1995,

p. 13

Appendix: Disability provisions within Charters and Performance Indicators

Disability provisions within Charters

London Bus charter
"We aim to provide...services that meet the needs or elderly and disabled people in particular"

BR Passenger's Charter (March 92)
Page 9 - "we are committed to making travel easier for passengers with disabilities, including wheelchair users. With 48 hours' notice, we will provide assistance at stations where there are platform staff. Many new trains, now including all Intercity trains, have space for wheelchair users; specially designed toilets are fitted on new trains travelling long distances; stations at all major centres have a range or appropriate facilities."

London Underground 1994 Customer Charter:
London Underground 1993 Charter - new right of unrestricted access for wheelchair users, ie no restricted times of travel, no need for 24 hours notice. [booklet Access to the Underground published Sep 93.] However, "the age of the system means that access will remain difficult for some" (p 4)

The Patients Charter:
Charter standards (9): no 2, "arrangements to ensure everyone, including people with special needs, can use services", eg accessible buildings; **will publish information about these annually**
NHS rights (existing) (5): "to be referred to a consultant who is acceptable to you by your GP; to be given a clear explanation of any treatment proposed, including any risks and any alternatives, before you decide whether you will agree to the treatment"; "to choose whether you want to take part in medical research"

The Parents Charter 1994 (first published 1991)
Schools required to publish in prospectus details of "any special curricular and other arrangements made for particular categories of pupils, including those with statements of special educational needs", their policies for making SEN provision

SEN - a "right to an education which meets those needs". Statement can set out special help the child should have and names the school which he or she should go to

The Charter for Further Education:
right to expect clear and accurate information on "colleges policies and arrangements for students with learning difficulties or disabilities" including, any additional support available such as staff or equipment, arrangements for access to buildings (p 8), the courses available
 right to "have any learning difficulties or disabilities taken into account"

The Charter for Higher Education: as above re "right to expect" plus clear and accurate information on disability.
Jobseeker's Charter:
- "you can expect us to deliver our services fairly and to the same high standards to all our clients, regardless of sex, race, disability and religion"
Targets - to find 1,700,000 people work, 500,000 long-term unemployed. Target for disabled people is 56,100 (approx. 3% of total target).
- "we will not display a vacancy if we think the employer is trying to discriminate unlawfully on the grounds of race, sex, disability or religion."
- section on extra help for people with disabilities, but no commitments. Disability Employment Adviser will......"help you get priority in joining employment and training programmes", as well as other more standard things.

Council Tenants Charter
<u>Good</u> councils will tell you "how it looks after tenants who have special problems, like disabled and elderly people" (p 19)

HM Customs and Excise travellers charter - We will "try to take account of any special difficulties you might have - for example if you are disabled"

Complaints Task Force:
Checklist: 2.9 (p 5): "What arrangements are there for people with disabilities" in complaints systems and their publication and accessibility

Draft framework for Local Community Care Charter:
Information: "an entitlement to expect... accessible information... that is...available for people who have difficulty reading normal typescript"
Assessment and care planning: entitlement to expect ....

several points on involvement of assessees in the process, including allowing advocates and assistance for communication, and listening to assessee and to carer's views on what they want, informing people of types of services and outcome of assessment.

Benefits Agency Customer Charter
Promises "services will be fair, irrespective of your race, sex, religion or any disability".
- aim to give a decision on a claim within:
- attendance allowance - 35 days
- DLA - 30 days (10 days special circumstances only)
- DWA - 5 days
- ICA - 25 days
- SDA - 36 days
- IB - 10 days

Alternative **Claimants Charter**: "information should be accessible to all", plus building should be physically accessible; "staff should be trained to meet needs of customer", should include EO and disability awareness training

The Road User's Charter (Highways Agency): p 3 'we know that women and disabled drivers can face particular problems in the event of breakdown and we will work with the motoring organisations and the police to address their particular needs.'

The Courts Charter: p 5 'if we ask you to attend court, we will send you ... details of facilities such as ... special arrangements for people with disabilities. (We will also tell you if these facilities are not available.) ... the name and telephone number of a person at the court who ... will also help if you have special needs such as a disability'

Local Authority Performance Indicators

For financial year 1993/94:
X   the number of authority's public buildings which are accessible to disabled people

X   the percentage of authority dwellings which are adapted for elderly or disabled people

X   the number of children with statements of special educational need and the number of children placed by the authority in special schools

X   the percentages of physically and learning disabled people receiving help from the authority to stay in their own home

X   the percentages of physically and learning disabled people supported by the

authority in residential care

X   the percentage of adults who receive help in their homes from the authority on I) 2-5 visits and ii) 6 or more visits a week (most of these are elderly people)

X   the expenditure per head of population on social services on a)elderly and physically disabled and b)learning disabled people

New indicators for publication in 1996 and 1997:

X   does the council have a published policy to provide services fairly to all sections of the community?

X   how does the council monitor its performance in implementing this policy

X   does the authority follow the Commission for Racial Equality and the Equal Opportunities Commission codes of practice on employment? (not until 1997)

X   the percentage of public conveniences providing access for disabled people

X   the percentages of physically and learning disabled people attending a day centre

X   the percentage of adults going into residential care who were offered single rooms

X   the percentage of items of equipment costing less than '1000 provided within 3 weeks of assessment