

July 30, 2008

To:

From: Elli Malki

C.C.:

Re: Report on "Socio-Market" audit in Hesed XXXX

This report summarizes the results of an audit that has taken place in Hesed XXXX during 27 June - 10 July. The purpose of the audit in the Hesed was to identify systematic problems in the delivery and quality of services provided by Hesed. The audit was based on a methodology that was developed in collaboration with Ernst & Young (E&Y). The analysis of the results is presented herein.

Summary of the results and recommendations:

We have not found evidence to systematic problems in the services provision. However, the names of the clients who reported non-receipt of the service as well as those clients, who did not answer the phone will be sent to the local auditor for additional check.

The report with the results of this check should be sent to Audit Coordinator until September 1, 2008.

We recommend to the JDC office and Hesed XXXX to consider the sufficiency of the Food Card program and the quality of the Canteen program.

We will be glad to provide you at your request with any additional information you may need for further examination.

1. The Methodology

Using data from the MIS, we have chosen a stratified random sample of Hesed's clients. The stratification was made by the districts of the city. These clients were personally interviewed, using a specifically designed questionnaire, and were asked about services they received from Hesed. The questionnaire's design was simple enough so that the respondents' answers could be easily interpreted and analyzed. The identity of the respondents in the sample was unknown to Hesed's personnel until the interviews were over. Then, the information for each respondent was compared to the Hesed's database in order to identify discrepancies.

2. The Results:

The random sample included 128 clients, and the respondents were asked about 3 services:

1. Canteen meals or (CM) received in May-08.
2. Homecare treatment (HC) received in May-08.
3. Food card (FC) received in May-08.

The table below presents the results of the interviews:

Problems in the provision of the services:

Program	Sample Size	Deviations	Deviations % (*)
HC	39	0	0.0%
CM	23	6	26.2%
FC	66	0	0.0%

The term “Deviation” refers to respondents who reported that they did not receive a certain service, while in Hesus database they appear to receive such service.

(*) The proportional deviation is a weighted average of the proportional deviation in each district.

Problems in the quality of the services:

Program	Sample Size	Deviations	Deviations % (*)
HC	39	0	0.0%
CM	23	12	52.4%

The term “Deviation” refers to respondents who reported that the quality of the service is bad.

(*) The proportional deviation is a weighted average of the proportional deviation in each district.

Problems in the appropriateness of the services:

Program	Sample Size	Deviations	Deviations % (*)
CM	23	1	4.3%

The term “Deviation” refers to respondents who reported that the service is not appropriate to their needs.

(*) The proportional deviation is a weighted average of the proportional deviation in each district.

Problems in the sufficiency of food:

Program	Sample Size	Deviations	Deviations % (*)
CM	23	4	17.1%
FC	66	20	30.4%

The term “Deviation” refers to respondents who reported that the food that they receive is not enough and they are hungry.

(*) The proportional deviation is a weighted average of the proportional deviation in each district.

3. Statistical Analysis:

A statistical analysis was performed to determine whether the results imply systematic problems in the delivery and the quality of the services. Description of the analysis and numerical results are presented in Appendix I.

Systematic problems:

Service	Provision	Quality	Appropriateness	Sufficiency
HC	No	No	-	-
CM	No	YES	No	No

complexity in such inference is that the normal approximation for the distribution of P holds only when conditions (5) are met.

We have determined the threshold $-\mathbb{P}$ – to be:

$$(6) \quad \mathbb{P} = 10/n$$

and checked the hypothesis:

$$(7) \quad H_0: p < \mathbb{P}$$

$$H_1: p \geq \mathbb{P}$$

Under the null hypothesis, as long as condition 5 holds, the normality approximation also holds and thus we can use equations (2), (3) and (4) to check it.

If the hypothesis (7) is rejected we conclude that there is no systematic problem in the population.

2) Results of the statistical analysis:

Name of City:	XXXX					
Homecare - Provision						
p_0 (Threshold)	25.6%	H0: $p <$	25.6%	Confidence Interval	0.0%	0.0%
n	39	H1: $p \geq$	25.6%		OK	
e	0					
P	0.0%					
P - p_0	-25.6%					
s	0.0%					
Z	0.00	1.65	OK			
Canteen - Provision						
p_0 (Threshold)	43.5%	H0: $p <$	43.5%	Confidence Interval	15.3%	37.0%
n	23	H1: $p \geq$	43.5%		OK	
e	6					
P	26.2%					
P - p_0	-17.3%					
s	5.5%					
Z	-3.12	1.65	OK			
Food Card - Provision						
p_0 (Threshold)	15.2%	H0: $p <$	15.2%	Confidence Interval	0.0%	0.0%
n	66	H1: $p \geq$	15.2%		OK	
e	0					
P	0.0%					
P - p_0	-15.2%					
s	0.0%					
Z	0.00	1.65	OK			

Name of City: XXXX

Homecare - Bad Quality

p_0 (Threshold)	25.6%	H0: $p <$	25.6%	Confidence Interval	0.0%	0.0%
n	39	H1: $p \geq$	25.6%		OK	
e	0					

P 0.0%

P - p_0 -25.6%

s 0.0%

Z 0.00 **1.65** OK

Canteen - Bad Quality

p_0 (Threshold)	43.5%	H0: $p <$	43.5%	Confidence Interval	42.0%	62.8%
n	23	H1: $p \geq$	43.5%		OK	
e	12					

P 52.4%

P - p_0 8.9%

s 5.3%

Z 1.68 **1.65** Problem

Name of City: XXXX

Homecare - Not Appropriate

p_0 (Threshold)	25.6%	H0: $p <$	25.6%	Confidence Interval	0.0%	0.0%
n	39	H1: $p \geq$	25.6%		OK	
e	0					

P 0.0%

P - p_0 -25.6%

s 0.0%

Z 0.00 **1.65** OK

Canteen - Not Appropriate

p_0 (Threshold)	43.5%	H0: $p <$	43.5%	Confidence Interval	-0.5%	9.0%
n	23	H1: $p \geq$	43.5%		OK	
e	1					

P 4.3%

P - p_0 -39.2%

s 2.4%

Z -16.21 **1.65** OK

Name of City: **XXXX**

Canteen - Hungry

p_0 (Threshold)	<u>43.5%</u>	H0: $p <$	<u>43.5%</u>	Confidence Interval	9.0%	25.3%
n	<u>23</u>	H1: $p \geq$	<u>43.5%</u>		<u>OK</u>	
e	<u>4</u>					

P 17.1%

$P - p_0$ -26.3%

s 4.2%

Z -6.33 **1.65** OK

Food Card - Hungry

p_0 (Threshold)	<u>15.2%</u>	H0: $p <$	<u>15.2%</u>	Confidence Interval	21.2%	39.5%
n	<u>66</u>	H1: $p \geq$	<u>15.2%</u>		<u>Problem</u>	
e	<u>20</u>					

P 30.4%

$P - p_0$ 15.2%

s 4.7%

Z 3.27 **1.65** Problem