Commissioning Arrangements Self Assessment

Name of service area/client group: ……………………………………………………………………………………….

This self-assessment toolkit can be utilised to support your organisational arrangements to promote effective commissioning in a way that serves all of our diverse communities. We encourage you fill out this self-assessment with your colleagues in your commissioning team/service area. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the commissioning arrangements for your service area or client group – giving each statement a mark out of 5, where 5 = strongly agree with the statement and 0 = strongly disagree – and justify your mark in the right-hand column.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Statement** | **0 – 5** | **Illustrative examples, comments** |
| **Analyse** | | |
| 1. We routinely collect and analyse information to understand the current and future local population’s needs, including assigning ongoing responsibilities and resources to identify or generate relevant information and data on Black, Asian and Multi Ethnic communities, which contributes to the JSNA |  |  |
| 1. Needs analysis data is disaggregated by ethnic group rather than the collective BAME categorization |  |  |
| 1. We proactively seek and report on a diverse pool of research and best practice evidence which includes the perspectives of practitioners from Black, Asian and Multi Ethnic communities. This assists us in strong holistic decision making. |  |  |
| 1. We know what resources we have available for this service area/client group and we can confidently project our future financial commitments. |  |  |
| 1. In analysing our provider landscape we ensure that we work with a diverse range of providers who in turn are able to meet the needs of all sections of our communities that we serve. |  |  |
| 1. We are able to benchmark the costs and performance of services to understand how they compare to other local areas. |  |  |
| 1. We have systematic processes for meaningful engagement in the commissioning and purchasing of services with all of the diverse communities that we serve. |  |  |
| **Plan** | | |
| 1. We have a clear, written strategy or agreed outcomes for the service area/client group that signals our future commissioning intentions for the local area. |  |  |
| 1. We ensure that the development of specifications and contracts/service level agreements do not adversely impact Black Asian and Multi Ethnic run organizations and communities. |  |  |
| 1. We have a thorough understanding of our Public Sector Equality Duty and the implications of this. |  |  |
| 1. We conduct in depth equality impact assessments, obtaining external input to ensure our assessments are linked with actions which are reviewed regularly. |  |  |
| 1. We have recent and on-going dialogue with a wide range of diverse partners, including Black Asian and Multi Ethnic and women owned provider organisations, to build consensus on the implications of the commissioning strategy or plan. |  |  |
| 1. We develop business cases, and where appropriate options appraisals, when designing or reconfiguring services. |  |  |
| 1. We have developed a person-centred approach to commissioning, which enables individuals, and local communities, to maximise choice and control over the services they use. |  |  |
| 1. We have effective strategies for communicating commissioning issues with a range of stakeholders. |  |  |
| **Do** | | |
| 1. We have a good understanding of the diverse range of providers in our area, their strengths and weaknesses and future plans. |  |  |
| 1. We proactively ensure that Black, Asian and Multi Ethnic and VCS organisations have equal access to procurement and grant opportunities and undertake capacity building where appropriate. |  |  |
| 1. We are able to influence the market to develop services in line with our population needs, rather than the historical awarding of contracts. |  |  |
| 1. We have regular and productive dialogue with providers which encourages ‘consensus’ and partnership orientated relationships. |  |  |
| 1. Our service specifications are evidenced based, specific about what is required from the provider and outcome focused. |  |  |
| 1. We have an established and fair policies and procedures in place that ensure we treat all of our providers equally, whether internal or external. This has helped us establish a reputation as a fair, open and transparent purchaser. |  |  |
| **Review** | | |
| 1. Our procurement and contract monitoring activities are fair and proportionate to risk. |  |  |
| 1. We are able to bring together relevant data on activity, finance and outcomes for services, to judge whether they give value for money. |  |  |
| 1. Our contracts and specifications include appropriate levers to enable us to influence performance and explore efficiency savings. |  |  |
| 1. We decommission services where they fail to meet outcomes, provide value for money, and/or the requirement has changed. |  |  |
| 1. We continuously improve our commissioning arrangements, reviewing learning to inform all our commissioning activities. |  |  |
| **Organisational Context** | | |
| 1. Our Commissioning Arrangements sits within an enabling environment where there is strong senior leadership buy in, resource allocation and expectations with regards addressing inequalities. |  |  |
| 1. All of our Commissioning Team is culturally aware and competent. |  |  |
| 1. As a Commissioning team we are proactively embedded in our community and work closely with our front-line services and practitioners. |  |  |
| 1. Our commissioning teams reflect the diverse communities that we serve locally. |  |  |

From the above analysis, summarise the major strengths and area for development:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strengths |  |
| Areas for Development |  |