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. Information is routinely collected and analysed to understand the needs of the current and future local population, contributing to the population needs assessment (e.g., a JSNA). We consider the equality and diversity needs of our local population, including providing specific attention to people with protected characteristics such as (but not exclusively) race, gender, and disability. |  |  |
| 1. We proactively seek and report on a diverse pool of research and best practice evidence to inform our decision making. Our research ensures that we consider best practices for our whole population, including ethnically diverse groups and any other population group who may need different approaches to ensure fair and equal access to services and interventions. |  |  |
| 1. We know what resources we have available for our service area/client group and we can confidently project our future financial commitments. This includes assets or resources that may not be directly commissioned by our organisation. |  |  |
| 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 a systematic and diverse range of 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 affect groups that have protected characteristics or different types of providers (e.g., large providers vs. grassroot or community organisations). |  |  |
| 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, to build consensus on the implications of the commissioning strategy or plan. This could include internal and external professional stakeholders, providers of care (including the VCSE), and our local communities. |  |  |
| 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 including (but not limited to), private, independent providers, nation-wide providers, the voluntary and social enterprise sector (VCSE), community led groups and grass-root organisations. And we understand each of their strengths and weaknesses and future plans. |  |  |
| 1. We proactively ensure that VCSE and community based organisations that represent protected and diverse communities 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 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. We believe that people who use services are best placed to help design them, and have the time, resource and skill to effectively engage with local people to ensure they co-produce, or at the very least, inform commissioning decisions and activities. |  |  |
| 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. Our commissioning team are respectful of our local community’s cultural diversity, and will consider this when making commissioning decisions, enhancing inclusion wherever possible. |  |  |
| 1. As a Commissioning team we work closely with our front-line services and practitioners in order to better understand our local communities, and the potential implications of our commissioning decisions. |  |  |
| 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 |  |