

WEST MIDLANDS FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

SCRUTINY REPORT

15 FEBRUARY 2016

1. **UPDATE ON PROGRESS OF OUTCOMES FROM THE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW**

Report of the Chief Fire Officer.

RECOMMENDED

THAT members note the initial direction of travel in implementing the recommendations made following the review of partnerships.

2. **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

This report is submitted to update members on the actions to date to meet the outcomes of the Scrutiny Committee report on the review of partnerships. The full report was submitted to the Executive Committee on 14 December 2015.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The review made recommendations in 6 strategic areas:

- Leadership
- HQ Resources
- Mainstreaming Commissioning
- Governance
- Embed Commissioning
- Data Quality

3.2 The ACFO Service Delivery and the Strategic Enabler for Prevention have absorbed the findings of the review and established an understanding of possible improvements and a plan of action in meeting the strategic recommendations.

3.3 The main actions to date are as follows:

- Identified the key stakeholders

- Established an implementation team
- Engagement with key stakeholders
- Review of responsibilities and job description for HQ partnership officer in preparation for recruitment
- Engaged with Business Development Officer

- 3.4 In addressing the recommendations within the scrutiny report consideration should be given to the external and internal aspects of the risk reduction team and the partnership teams. The internal aspect will be the realignment of managerial positions, such as the Operations Commander for fire investigation, responsibilities and accountabilities for improved leadership and day to day direction. There will be a requirement to influence and respond to the external environment and relationships with Chief Fire Officers' Association (CFOA) and the wider health environment as we build our relationships and embed Fire as a health asset. The post of the Community Safety Manager will lead on this to provide greater leadership and influence.
- 3.5 In order to provide sufficient leadership each area will require a sustainable and efficient structure that will provide local support to aide delivery and ensure alignment to The Plan. The formalisation of a health advisor within the team, to report to the Community Safety Manager will enable the transition from national strategy through to local delivery. The current resourcing structure can support this approach and is anticipated to be achieved within 3 months.
- 3.6 Delivery of local service is key to maintaining and improving local partnerships and the absence of any framework that provides a governance structure has been identified within the review. This will require a restructure of the Partnership Officers that provides central coordination and support that can be flexible and adapt to new opportunities through commissioning. This will be achieved through the repositioning and rationalisation of Partnership Officer roles and provide a consistent approach to enhance local delivery. The anticipated timescales for completion is expected to be 5 months.
- 3.7 To provide continued support to local Operational Managers and the Business Development Team, the role of the Community Risk Reduction Officers will be redefined to

increase the effectiveness in local partnership arrangements and supported centrally to improve governance. The anticipated timescales for completion are expected to be 5 months.

- 3.8 The current partnership policy will be rescinded and replaced with a partnership framework that promotes local flexibility, ensuring value for money through a performance framework and central coordination. This is anticipated to be completed following the establishment of a central partnership support team.
- 3.9 In addressing the recommendations from the scrutiny report there will be a requirement to follow the employee engagement framework and engage with representative bodies through the recognised structures and all effected employees informed. It is anticipated that this will have commenced week commencing 8 February 2016.
- 3.10 Corporate Risk 4 has been amended to reflect the recognition of the scrutiny review and the delivery of the outcomes of the review in Appendix 1.
- 3.11 A summary of an action plan is included in Appendix 2 of this report.

4. **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

In preparing this report an initial Equality Impact Assessment is required and attached to the report as Appendix 3

5. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

In delivering the recommendations within the scrutiny report will improve corporate governance and monitoring of partnership agreements across Service Delivery.

The course of action recommended in this report does not raise issues which should be drawn to the attention of the Authority's Monitoring Officer.

6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Additional resources will not be required to implement the

recommendations as this will be achieved through existing structures. There will be a requirement to review and refresh job descriptions to reflect any change in the structures. There will be no increase in budget requirements but the restructure will seek to identify efficiencies in resources. Any resource capacity will be realigned and redirected to support the business development team.

7. **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no environmental impacts

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Executive Committee report 14th December – Review of Partnerships

The contact name for this report is Gary Taylor (Assistant Chief Fire Officer), telephone number 0121 380 6006.

PHIL LOACH
CHIEF FIRE OFFICER

Appendix 1 – Scrutiny Report

Corporate Risk:

Corporate Risk 4: The Fire Authority would be unable to ensure that proper controls are established whilst working in partnership with other agencies/groups, resulting in a significant impact upon the organisation's financial standing, reputation and ability to deliver key objectives.

Emerging Issues	The risk score associated with this risk was raised to $3 \times 2 = 6$ following the August 2015 interim findings of the Scrutiny Committee review of our partnership arrangements. The Scrutiny Working Group delivered its final report to Scrutiny Committee in December 2015, following which the Executive Committee formally approved the findings and proposals for change on 14 December 2015. The findings of the final report were as outlined in the interim report so the current risk rating remains unchanged.
Changes to control measures	The Scrutiny Review recognises that the control environment to enable for the effective management, monitoring and governance of partnerships requires improvement. An action plan for improvement to address the range of proposals set out in the Review of Partnerships report is currently being developed by the SE Prevention. As part of this approach the SE is currently consulting staff and key stakeholders (ops commanders for example) in respect of potential structure, processes and resources that will enable for the more effective control and governance of partnerships. Therefore there are no changes to control measures at this time. The SE Prevention is committed to implementing the proposals for change and will provide regular updates to Scrutiny Committee who will monitor performance in delivering the action plan.
Assurance updates	The Scrutiny Committee report provides for a level 3 independent assurance of the control environment and this is reflected on the assurance map.

Appendix 2 – Scrutiny Report

Action Plan Summary:

Outcome	Action	Lead Officer	Expected Timeframe
Increased Leadership and accountability	Realignment of posts to reflect and internal and external focus	Strategic Enabler for Prevention	April 2016
HQ Resourcing	Establish a health Advisor post	Head Of Community Safety	March 2016
HQ Resourcing	Role reviews of the partnership teams across each area and the central support. Redesign the central Community Safety Team (CST) to adopt a business partner approach for increased consistency	Operations Commander for Community Safety	June 2016
Increased Governance, future proof Commissioning and Shared best practice	Establish a central partnership support team to provide co-ordination of commissioning work, local governance and central guidance.	Head of Community Safety	June 2016

Appendix 3 – Scrutiny Report

FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Name of policy/activity/project

Implementation of the findings of a Scrutiny Committee review of partnerships.

Is this a new or an existing policy/activity/project?

This is a new review following a report sent to Executive Committee on the 14th December

Scope/timescales for project or activity (including review date)
--

In March 2015, Scrutiny Committee agreed to undertake a review of all aspects of partnerships activity. In enabling this, a Scrutiny Members working group, comprising Councillors, Tranter, Hogarth and Spence was established. The review process was facilitated by officers from the Strategic Hub.

In leading the review the Members working group has been engaged throughout and has:

- ☐ Met all Partnership Officers
- ☐ Met a cross section of Community Risk Reduction Officers
- ☐ Met regularly with the (then) Community Safety Manager
- ☐ Spoken to a limited number of station personnel
- ☐ Participated in a home safety check.

As is common with all reviews, a number of opportunities for improvement have been identified. However, whilst responding to such opportunities will be necessary to secure continuous improvement and value for money, it is perhaps more appropriate at this time to fundamentally re-think what the Service requires of its partnerships systems, structures and functionality. The scope of the review, quite rightly, looked at the 'as is' in terms of our accepted thinking regarding what Fire Service partnerships have traditionally delivered – generally working with a range of multi-agency partners to deliver improved outcomes and support the delivery of The Plan in 'making West Midlands safer'.

However, due to the changing political and funding landscape commissioning (bidding to supply services) has emerged as a viable means of contributing towards balancing our budget whilst improving the lives of the most vulnerable by providing services that have traditionally been provided by public health agencies. Therefore, the Service must re-consider its current approach to identifying and supporting partnerships and focus upon the

structure, processes and resources required to maximise and sustain a commissioning model. The need for sustainable organisational commissioning expertise will be of primary consideration in developing proposals for change as a result of this review.

The review has examined partnerships from a strategic perspective right through to the delivery of local partnership activity. As a consequence of this, proposals have been submitted to enable for:-

- ☐ consideration and confirmation of the Leadership Team in community safety and the role of this team in reinforcing and enabling the delivery of partnerships.
- ☐ the appropriate role and structure of the HQ Community Safety team to be developed in line with the organisation's commissioning ambitions.
- ☐ the establishment of effective governance arrangements both locally and centrally to enable for assurance to be provided that partnerships are provided in line with expectations.
- ☐ the role of command partnerships resources to be considered in supporting a commissioned based approach.
- ☐ Evaluation-quantifying and qualifying success methodologies to be developed.

It is expected that all aspects of the recommendations within the scrutiny report will have been delivered by June 2016 following consultation and engagement with all stakeholders. The achievement of recommendations will result in an internal restructure of roles and responsibilities to maximise the effective and efficient use of resources.

Department/Directorate

Service Delivery

Policy/project lead

Area Commander Simon Shilton (WMFS)

Author of EIA

Area Commander Simon Shilton

STAGE 1 – AIMS

What are the aims of the activity or policy?

The aim of this review was to improve the leadership, accountability and quality of the corporate risk control environment to effectively govern, monitor and manage partnership performance.

What are your outcomes (what is it that you hope to achieve)?

The outcome of the review is to implement the recommendations of the scrutiny board findings in areas such as leadership. Resources, mainstreaming commissioning, future proofing, governance and data quality.

How does this project or policy align with 'The Plan'

The proposal aligns with the plan in the following areas:

Priorities:

- Partnership working
- People
- Value for Money

Strategic Objectives:

- Protection
- Prevention
- Response

Outcomes

- 1- Improved governance for partnership arrangements for Prevention
- 2- Deliver value for money by making best use of our resources through effective team structures
- 3- Increased leadership and central support to deliver local priorities against the Plan

- 4- Create a consistent approach to prevention based initiatives
- 5- Respond to commissioning activities to support business development opportunities

STAGE 2 – DATA COLLECTION

For each of the protected characteristics listed below, provide data to evidence that you have researched the possible impact of your policy on WMFS staff and/or the community. (Please refer to guidance notes on sources of data). Your data collection must be **robust**. Further help and advice from the Equality and Diversity team is available:-

Note: Both options include the same workforce.

Note: Data collection for Agency personnel within FC and HSC is not available via HRMS.

Some characteristics are known and will be included in this instances this will includes 74 personnel – data set 1,

Where this is not known, this data set will include 62 personnel – data set 2.

Ethnicity (including race, national or ethnic identity)

Ethnicity	Number	Percentage
White British	13	76.5%
BME	4	23.5%
Total	17	100.0%

Gender (including transgender)

Gender	Number	Percentage
Female	12	70.6%
Male	5	29.4%
Total	17	100.0%

Disability

Disabled?	Number	Percentage
No	16	94.1%
Yes	1	5.9%
Total	17	100.0%

Religion and Belief

Religion	Number	Percentage
Christian	8	47.1%
Hindu	1	5.9%
None	4	23.5%
Prefer Not To Say	3	17.6%
Not stated	1	5.9%
Total	17	100.0%

Age

Age group	Number	Percentage
25 - 34	4	23.5%
45 - 54	9	52.9%
55 - 64	4	23.5%
Total	17	100.0%

Sexual Orientation

Sexual Orientation	Number	Percentage
Heterosexual	12	70.6%
Prefer Not To Say	3	17.6%
Not stated	2	11.8%
Total	17	100.0%

Maternity/Paternity

There are no members of staff that are on maternity or paternity

STAGE 3 – ASSESS AND ANALYSE IMPACT

Having gathered sufficient data you now need to analyse any potential or real impact.

Who benefits?

Local command areas would benefit from increased support and consistency to enable effective services to be delivered to our communities. The Business Development Team would be provided with greater support from initial concept to delivery. Partners would benefit from greater governance arrangements along with improved management of corporate risk and reputation.

Who doesn't benefit and why not?

Changes to structure may impact on individuals and a review of job roles and descriptions may require posts to be re-advertised. Local partnership resources will need to be reviewed to achieve organisational effectiveness.

What consultation have you carried out or plan to carry out? (Attach evidence)

Engagement is a key factor to the success of this review, demonstrating openness and transparency whilst building trust and it is also important that this review either maintains or improves on the Service Delivery model. To date the following engagements have been undertaken in the initial review

- Partnership Officers
- Cross section of Community Risk reduction Officers
- Regular meetings with the temporary community safety manager
- A selection of station based personnel
- Participation in a Home Safety Check

Further engagement with stakeholders is planned following the announcement of the intended outcomes at Joint Consultative Committee on the 4th February.

Is there any evidence of higher or lower participation by different groups?
(If this is a new function how are you going to gather data on this and when do you plan to review it?)

N/A.

If there is a greater impact on one group, is that appropriate and consistent with the policy's objectives?

As we have only 1 person who has declared a disability any options presented to staff for engagement could potentially put this person at risk of redundancy / redeployment.

As this workforce is predominantly women this proposal could be seen as having the greater impact on this group.

Could any part of the activity discriminate unlawfully?

No

Does the policy/activity meet the communities varied needs?
(If yes, detail how.)

Yes- Delivering prevention activities within our communities

Does the policy/activity support WMFS in fulfilling its general or specific duties under the Equality Act 2010? (Advance, Eliminate, Foster)

Yes- Greater effectiveness and governance in:

- Service Delivery
- Value for Money
- Safer communities.

STAGE 4 – ADDRESS ISSUES/REDUCE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Staff engagement sessions are planned and the possibility of a redirection of resources to other areas of the organisation in support of Business Development.

STAGE 5 – FINDINGS, COMMUNICATION REVIEW AND MONITORING

You should now be ready to make an **informed** judgement about the impact of your policy/activity. Please select and complete the **single** most appropriate section below:-

No major change needed

How does your analysis support this conclusion?

What are your monitoring/review arrangements?

Adjust the policy/activity

What is your evidence for the need to adjust the policy/activity?

.....
.....
.....

How are you planning to adjust the policy to reduce potential impact?
What are your timescales on this?

.....
.....
.....

What are your monitoring/review arrangements?

.....
.....
.....

Continue the policy/activity (despite potential or actual adverse impact)

What are your justifications for continuing policy/activity despite potential or actual adverse impacts?

From the analysis above, there appears to be no addition adverse impact on specific individuals or groups. The restructuring of resources and increased leadership will enhance our service to the community.

.....

What are your monitoring/review arrangements?

The monitoring arrangements will be continuous to ensure effective service delivery

.....

.....

.....

Stop and remove the policy/activity

What is your justification for this? What potentially unlawful discrimination has your analysis indicated?

.....

.....

.....

What is your next step? Is the policy/activity still needed? If still needed what is going to replace it and when?

.....

.....

.....

Equality and Diversity feedback

.....EIA agreed evaluation of potential impact is thorough as is potential benefits of different shift system. No indication of this stage of any equality impacts beyond what has been identified in the above report subject to the review at 6 months after implementation as detailed above. TDP 09.10.25.....