

WEST MIDLANDS FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

10 DECEMBER 2012

1. REVIEW OF SAFESIDE

Report of the Clerk and Monitoring Officer.

RECOMMENDED

- 1.1 THAT the Committee considers and approves the attached scoping document for the proposed review of the Safeside facility at Fire Service Headquarters.
- 1.2 THAT the Committee establishes a working group to take forward the review of Safeside.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report has been prepared to outline to the Committee the detail of the proposed scrutiny review of the Safeside facility at Fire Service Headquarters. The attached scoping document outlines the rationale, aims and objectives and methodology of the proposed review and the support that will be provided to the working group and the Committee.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The role and terms of reference for the Scrutiny Committee were approved by the Authority at its meeting on 25 June 2012. The terms of reference outline that part of the role of the Scrutiny Committee is to carry out a minimum of two scrutiny reviews per annum selected by the Committee. Such reviews will be member-led and evidence based and will produce SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely) recommendations.

- 3.2 The Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 5 November 2012 agreed to consider the operation of Safeside as part of its work programme and asked for a report to be presented at the next meeting. Safeside is a state-of-the-art, scenario based experiential learning centre that inspires visitors to think and act safely.
- 3.2 In determining the appropriateness of this area for scrutiny, members applied the prioritisation tool that was introduced to them in their initial training provided by the Centre for Public Scrutiny on 7 November 2012 and determined that the scrutiny of the Safeside facility was a high priority and therefore should be included in the Committee's work programme.
- 3.3 In order to be effective, every Scrutiny Review must be properly managed to make sure that the review achieves its aims and has measurable outcomes. One of the most important ways to make sure that a review goes well is to ensure that it is well defined at the outset. This way the review is less likely to get sidetracked or be overambitious in what it hopes to tackle.
- 3.4 The scoping template attached has been developed based on researching a number of scoping documents used by other organisations. It has been designed to help members to focus on the purpose of the review, and exactly what is to be achieved.
- 3.5 The scoping document contains some suggestions on the objectives, approach methodology and outcomes for the review of Safeside that have been developed for the Scrutiny Committee by officers. This is presented as a discussion document for members to review and consider at the meeting arranged for 10 December 2012 where further input and views are sought.
- 3.6 It is recommended that the Committee establishes a working group to take forward and gather evidence for the review. The group will need to meet more frequently than the full committee and these dates are yet to be determined. The working group will then report its findings and suggested recommendations to the Committee for consideration. It may also be necessary to call additional meetings of the Committee.

- 3.7 The scrutiny function will have the full support of officers to make sure that reviews run smoothly and that relevant information held and witnesses that are required can be accessed during the review.

4. **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

In preparing this report an initial Equality Impact Assessment is not required and has not been carried out as there are no policy changes proposed.

5. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None

6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications. It is not anticipated that additional resources will be required to undertake this review.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Governance of the Authority 2012/13 Report, 25 June 2012
The Centre for Public Scrutiny Good Scrutiny Guide

NEERAJ SHARMA
CLERK AND MONITORING OFFICER

Contact Officer
Sally-Ann Chidwick
Head of Strategic Planning, Improvement & Risk Team
Tel: 0121 380 6405

DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENT (Terms of Reference)

Review Title <i>The working name that relates to the topic</i>	Scrutiny of the Safeside Education Centre	Review Reference Number: <i>reference for tracking purposes.</i> WMFRA/SC/1
Commission <i>Who commissioned the work</i>	Review commissioned by the Scrutiny Committee on behalf of the West Midlands Fire and Rescue Authority	
Task Group Members <i>Names of all those on the Task Group</i>	<p>➤ (Chair) Councillor Keith Chambers</p> <p>To be determined by the Scrutiny Committee.</p>	
Support <i>Scrutiny has officer support to make sure that reviews run smoothly</i>	<p>Scrutiny will require officer support to make sure that the review runs smoothly and this will be facilitated by the Strategic Planning Improvement and Risk Team (SPIRiT) within the Service working with the Democratic Services team at Sandwell MBC.</p> <p>Support will be provided to assist the chair with the arrangements for managing the review and with keeping to timetable. SPIRiT will facilitate requests for information or the attendance of officers at meetings.</p> <p>Democratic Services will support the working group and the Committee in evidence gathering and report writing, including the formulation of appropriate recommendations.</p>	
Rationale <i>Explain why the review is important to the Scrutiny Committee. A clear rationale will also help clarify the indicators of success</i>	<p>The education programmes delivered from the flagship Safeside facility and are key element of the overall prevention strategy that plays an important role in achieving the vision of "Making West Midlands Safer". As such, members are concerned that Safeside may not be being used to its full potential. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the children from some of the more disadvantaged communities are not visiting Safeside and therefore not receiving the benefits of the education and experience that this facility offers.</p> <p>In determining the appropriateness of this area for scrutiny members applied the prioritisation tool that was introduced to them in their initial training provided by the Centre for Public Scrutiny on 7 November 2012. Applying this tool along with the anecdotal evidence helped them to determine that the scrutiny of the Safeside facility was a high priority and therefore should be included in their work programme.</p> <p>Not all members are aware of what Safeside has to offer and are keen to raise their awareness in order to actively promote the Service and to encourage and support participation locally.</p>	
Review Aims Objectives <i>The main priorities and what the Review hopes to achieve</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To identify who visits Safeside and what areas they come from. ➤ To identify which schools are not visiting Safeside and why ➤ To identify the barriers that prevent groups from visiting Safeside (with an emphasis on children who live in the more disadvantage areas) ➤ To make recommendations to help remove barriers in order to increase the number of people attending from the disadvantaged areas. ➤ Establish what the costs and benefits are and how these are evaluated in order 	

	<p>to make an assessment regarding value for money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To make recommendations on how the facility can be promoted to ensure that appropriate groups are targeted and attendance in those groups is increased. ➤ To make recommendations on how elected members can help to increase attendance and promote the Safeside facility within their local areas.
<p>Link with Authority Priorities & Objectives</p> <p><i>How the review is linked to corporate aims and priorities</i></p>	<p>This review is linked to the vision of “Making West Midlands Safer”</p> <p>It supports the key priorities and outcomes outlined in The Plan - Communities Partnerships and Value for Money and the strategic objectives of vulnerable people, road safety, arson and anti social behaviour</p> <p>It also ensure that we continue to target our resources to risk, providing interventions that focus on vulnerable people such as children and young people from disadvantaged backgrounds</p>
<p>Success Criteria/ Outcomes</p> <p><i>Some key indicators which will be used to tell you if the review is achieving its purpose.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Increased take up of the education provided by Safeside by increasing the number of children visiting targeting children from the disadvantage areas. ➤ Identify opportunities to meet running costs from other means such as sponsorship to support an increase in revenue. ➤ Raised awareness of the facility to enable members to take a more active role in promoting the services and for engaging with communities to increase take up.
<p>Methodology/ Approaches</p> <p><i>e.g. Desk based review of papers visits/observations Comparisons with other authorities Process mapping/ Workshops/focus groups Seminars/public meetings Commissioned research Interviewing officers Calling witnesses/experts to give evidence</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Local Research – Members to find out what is happening in their area – do their local schools visit? If not can they find out why not and what would encourage them to do so? ➤ Desk based research – officers will provide background information that can be reviewed by Members including financial, activity and performance information ➤ Visit to Safeside. Members to book onto a school visit from a school in their area to gain an understanding of what Safeside offers from a service user perspective. ➤ Presentation from Officers managing/ working in Safeside to include Q&A ➤ Members will then develop further their key lines of enquiry and task off further work as identified in the previous stages. ➤ Identify any other potential funding streams. ➤ Talk to schools that have used the facility and finds out what their views are.
<p>Witnesses</p> <p><i>Officers who are required to attend to explain decisions and actions taken and their performance. Other people who may be invited to discuss issue of local concern and /or answer question</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Chair of the Authority & Chief Fire Officer/Deputy Chief Fire Officer ➤ Director of Operations/ Area Commander Community Safety ➤ Education Manager – Pete Wilson and selection of his staff ➤ Safeside volunteers ➤ Local Schools ➤
<p>Documentary Evidence</p> <p><i>e.g. Government legislation Best Value Performance Plan Relevant service</i></p>	<p>Background papers will be made available for Members on all information regarding the use of Safeside. This will also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Any reports produced for the Building upon Success Report which also identifies other educational facilities provided by the Service. ➤ Organisation charts ➤ Finances – including grant funding and sponsorship ➤ Visitor numbers – giving geographical breakdown

<i>plans for service groups</i> <i>Relevant Performance Indicators</i> <i>Budgetary data and activity</i> <i>Minutes of meetings</i> <i>Independent research and papers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Evaluation ➤ Feedback from schools and children ➤ Marketing and publicity materials 	
Publicity Requirements <i>how the results of the Review once it has been completed will be made public</i>	The report once agreed by the Executive Committee, will be published on the Service's internet and intranet sites	
Resources Requirements (Financial)	No additional funding has been identified as being required for this work.	
Timescales <i>Timescales for when various parts of project should be completed – what will be done, by when how and when</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Meeting to agree the scope to take place on 10 December 2012. ➤ The working group to establish a programme of meetings. The full Committee may also wish to call additional meetings if necessary ➤ Review to commence in early January and to conclude in early March in order to submit recommendations to the Executive Committee on 25 March 2013. 	
Evaluation <i>A review is assessed on its effectiveness by finding out what changes have been made as a result</i>	A review date of will be agreed by members to evaluate the outcome of the recommendations. It is proposed this review is completed 12 months after any findings are implemented.	
Scoping document Completed by: <i>(Name and Signature)</i>		Date:
Project Approved by: <i>(Name and Signature)</i>		Date: