*Notes (to be deleted as required):*

1. *See* [*How to carry out an FOI self-assessment*](http://www.itspublicknowledge.info/ScottishPublicAuthorities/Self-AssessmentToolkit/Self-AssessmentToolkitIntroduction.aspx) *for more information about gathering and recording evidence*
2. *Boxes will expand as you type*
3. *You are welcome to customise the table to your authority’s document style: colours, font and add a logo to the header*
4. ***NB this document is A3 but it should print as A4 if you send it to an A4 printer***

**Authority** [authority name]

**Lead Officer** [name]

**Date completed** [date evidence gathering completed]

|  | **Questions** | **Evidence gathered** | **Strengths identified** | **Weaknesses identified / Areas for improvement** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Leadership Commitment** |  |  |  |
|  | How clear is the strategic responsibility for ensuring compliance with requests for review? Does someone have oversight of reviews and take an active interest in them? |  |  |  |
|  | Are there enough nominated reviewers in the authority to meet demand?  |  |  |  |
|  | To what extent do leaders and managers recognise and control the risks associated with reviews e.g. that responses are issued on time or that reviews take a fresh look? |  |  |  |
|  | To what extent are leaders and managers made aware of the outcome of reviews and any important learning points? |  |  |  |
|  | **Clear but flexible review process** |  |  |  |
|  | How effective are the arrangements for making sure reviewers are independent of the handling of the original request? |  |  |  |
|  | To what extent do review procedures support reviews of different types of cases? |  |  |  |
|  | To what extent do reviewers have access to all the information and support they need to make a decision? How responsive is the authority to requests from reviewers for e.g. more information, searches or advice? |  |  |  |
|  | What’s the evidence that reviewers feel able to challenge original responses or substitute different decisions? |  |  |  |
|  | Are lessons learned from reviews shared within the authority? If so, do they result in changes in practice?  |  |  |  |
|  | How specific are the authority’s review procedures about the importance of maintaining a record of the reasons for the decision on each case? Does practice match the procedures? |  |  |  |
|  | How far can review records be relied on for responding to the Commissioner’s investigations of appeals?  |  |  |  |
|  | How robust is the process for keeping review procedures up to date?  |  |  |  |
|  | **Staff resources and training** |  |  |  |
|  | Should all staff of the authority recognise a request for review when they receive it? What’s the evidence - have reviews been missed or overlooked? |  |  |  |
|  | How effective is the allocation process in ensuring reviewers are sufficiently objective and independent of original requests?  |  |  |  |
|  | How resilient are review arrangements in response to sudden increases in volume, during holiday periods or other staff absence? |  |  |  |
|  | Do reviewers have access to sufficient training and support to help them conduct reviews and resolve complex issues?  |  |  |  |
|  | **Responsive and evolving authority** |  |  |  |
|  | What are the arrangements to make sure responses to requests for review are issued on time? How effective are they – are responses ever late? |  |  |  |
|  | What’s the evidence that learning from reviews results in changes to the way the authority works e.g. publishing particular types of information? |  |  |  |
|  | To what extent does the authority keep abreast of wider FOI learning e.g. from the experience of other authorities and the Commissioner’s decisions?  |  |  |  |

**Document control sheet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document Information** |  |
| Full name of current version: Class, Title, Version No and Status.  *E.g. C5 Key Documents Handbook v01 CURRENT ISSUE* | C2 TOOLKIT Module 5 Assessment Questions and Evidence Grid v01 CURRENT ISSUE |
| VC FileId | 108990 |
| Type | Briefing |
| Approver  | SIC |
| Responsible Manager  | HOPI |
| Date of next planned review  | October 2021 |
| **Approval & Publication** |
| Approval Date (major version) | 22 October 2018 |
| For publication *(Y/N)* | Y |
| Date published  |  |
| Name of document in website file library | Module\_5\_Assessment\_Questions\_and\_Evidence\_Grid |
| **Corrections / Unplanned or Ad hoc reviews (see Summary of changes below for details)** |
| Date of last update |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of changes to document** |  |
| **Date** | **Action by**  | **Version updated**  | **New version number**  | **Brief description**  |
|  | *(initials)* | *(e.g. v01.25-36****)*** | *(e.g. v01.27, or 02.03)* | (*e.g. updated paras 1-8, updated HOPI to HOOM, reviewed whole section on PI test, whole document updated, corrected typos, reformatted to new branding*) |
| 24/10/18 | KB | 01.00 | 01.01 | New document created following approval of draft |
| 24/10/18 | KB | 01.01 | 01.02 | DCS updated |
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