

HMICFRS Judgment Criteria

We will assess each English fire and rescue service, giving graded judgments for the three principal areas in the inspection methodology of efficiency, effectiveness and people. Our categories of graded judgment are: outstanding; good; requires improvement; and inadequate.

The judgment criteria provide an indication of the expected levels of performance consistent with each grading. Judgment criteria allow HMICFRS inspectors to make consistent assessments across services and for services to see what they are being graded against. The criteria will also allow the public to see what performance they can expect from FRSs. The criteria are examples to help inspectors to determine appropriate judgments. They are not intended to prescribe specific standards, relate directly to the sub-diagnostics, or to be exhaustive lists of how we expect FRSs to perform at these levels. They are designed to be characteristic of these levels.

The judgment criteria take account of existing national operational guidance. We will have regard to existing standards and new standards as they are agreed and adopted when assessing fire and rescue services.

We will not provide an overall judgment for each fire and rescue service in the first full round of inspections. The three pillar level judgments will provide the public (and services) with a clear and succinct summary of our findings and will help services to promote improvements where necessary.

Question	Outstanding	Good	Requires Improvement	Inadequate
1.1 How well does the FRS understand the risk of fire and other emergencies?				
<p>1.1.1 How well does the FRS engage with the local community to build up a comprehensive risk profile?</p> <p>1.1.2 To what extent does the FRS use information from other sources (e.g. health and social care data, population and demographic data) to build the risk profile?</p> <p>1.1.3 How well does the FRS define the level of community risk, including those communities most at risk, harder-to-reach, hidden (e.g. unscrupulous landlords, overcrowded dwellings) or affecting the most vulnerable people?</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS is innovative in gathering and using information to increase the understanding of risk.</p> <p>The FRS is proactive in leading, developing and influencing cross-organisational activity to understand local risk.</p>	<p>The FRS routinely gathers a wide range of data (such as social, economic, and environmental) to produce an accurate and clear risk profile and integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS engages in dialogue with communities and interested parties to understand local risk.</p> <p>The FRS's integrated risk management plan has clear links to community risk registers.</p> <p>The FRS's strategic direction is clearly linked with its integrated risk management plan.</p>	<p>The FRS's use of data is limited; it does not use a sufficiently wide range of data (such as social, economic, and environmental) to produce an accurate and clear risk profile and integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS rarely, or in a limited way, engages in dialogue with communities or interested parties to understand local risk.</p> <p>The FRS's integrated risk management plan does not align with community risk registers, local emergency planning groups or FRS priorities.</p> <p>The FRS's strategic direction is not clearly linked with its integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS's risk assessment includes</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>The FRS's understanding of its local risks is not used, or is insufficient, to formulate an effective integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS fails to provide its core function of keeping the public safe and secure from the risk of fire.</p>

Question	Outstanding	Good	Requires Improvement	Inadequate
<p>1.1.4 To what extent does the FRS undertake regular liaison with relevant bodies to ensure a common understanding of risk, including fire standards and requirements?</p> <p>1.1.5 To what extent is risk information systematically and accurately gathered by staff?</p> <p>1.1.6 How well is information on risk communicated throughout the FRS?</p> <p>1.1.7 To what extent are the results of operational activity used to ensure a common understanding of risk?</p> <p>1.1.8 How well does the FRS identify and assess current, emerging or future changes in the risk of fire and other risks?</p>		<p>The FRS has an up-to-date risk assessment of reasonably foreseeable fire-related risks and other risks.</p> <p>The FRS uses information from operational activity to test its risk profile and challenge its integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS's integrated risk management plan identifies, and clearly articulates, current and future changes in risk. The plan clearly sets out how the FRS will manage risk to the public.</p>	<p>reasonably foreseeable fire-related risks and other risks but it is not current.</p> <p>The FRS does not consistently use information from operational activity to test its risk profile and challenge its integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS's integrated risk management plan does not identify current risk, or adequately consider or is not clear about, future changes in risk. The plan is not clear how the FRS will manage risk to the public.</p>	
1.2 How effective is the FRS at preventing fires and other risks?				
<p>1.2.1 To what extent is preventative activity, such as the home fire safety check programme, focused on those most at risk?</p> <p>1.2.2 How well does the FRS raise awareness and campaign to prevent fires and promote community safety?</p> <p>1.2.3 What progress has the FRS, with partner organisations, achieved in preventing fires and keeping people safe?</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>FRS's prevention activity is innovative and reduces the risk of fire and other risks.</p> <p>The FRS's prevention activities have had a significant impact on reducing fire and fire-related risk.</p> <p>The FRS is at the forefront of developing, sharing and influencing plans to prevent fire and other risks.</p> <p>The FRS has an established culture of continuous improvement with</p>	<p>The FRS has developed and implemented an ambitious prevention strategy which is informed by local risk and complies with statutory requirements.</p> <p>The FRS's prevention plan is clear about where the greatest risks lie within its area and sets out a clear rationale for the level of activity to prevent fires and other risks.</p> <p>The FRS works with other FRSs, a wide range of partner organisations and diverse sections of the community to</p>	<p>The FRS has a prevention strategy and plan informed by risk and statutory requirements but it is limited in scope or not current or unclear.</p> <p>The FRS prevention plan is not clear about where the greatest risks lie within its area or does not set out a clear rationale for the level of activity to prevent fires and other risks.</p> <p>The FRS works with some partner organisations and sections of the community to reduce the number of fires and other risks, but activity is</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>Prevention is not a sufficiently high priority for the FRS with insufficient resource allocated to prevention activity and only limited prevention activity with partner organisations.</p> <p>Prevention activity does not align with the risks identified in the integrated risk management plan.</p>

Question	Outstanding	Good	Requires Improvement	Inadequate
<p>1.2.4 To what extent does FRS identify vulnerability and safeguard vulnerable people during preventative activity?</p> <p>1.2.5 How well does the FRS work with partner organisations to promote road safety and reduce the numbers killed and seriously injured on the roads?</p> <p>1.2.6 How well does the FRS work with partner organisations to tackle fire setting behaviour and support the prosecution of arsonists?</p>	<p>outstanding examples of sustained service development and improvement that translate into better service for the public.</p>	<p>reduce the number of fires and other risks.</p> <p>The FRS targets its communications to provide information about fire prevention and to promote community safety. The FRS has a comprehensive understanding of the diverse needs of its communities and ensures that its engagement and communication is designed to be appropriate and accessible to meet those diverse needs.</p> <p>FRS staff are able to recognise the opportunity to prevent fires and other risks, and are able to take appropriate action.</p> <p>The FRS promotes road safety to reduce the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on the roads.</p> <p>The FRS evaluates the impact of its prevention activity and uses this evaluation to improve its own and partners' approaches.</p> <p>FRS prevention activity meets community expectations, and its core functions are sustained regardless of other discretionary priorities for the FRS.</p> <p>Staff understand how to identify vulnerability and take action to safeguard vulnerable people.</p>	<p>limited or inconsistent, or the FRS cannot evidence the impact of this work.</p> <p>The FRS communicates with the community, but activity is limited or not designed to be appropriate or accessible for diverse needs.</p> <p>FRS staff recognise some opportunities to prevent fires and other risks, but action taken is inconsistent.</p> <p>The FRS has undertaken limited action to promote road safety in order to reduce the numbers killed and seriously injured on the roads.</p> <p>Responsibility and accountability in the FRS for the evaluation of its prevention strategy is not clear.</p> <p>FRS prevention activity does not meet community expectations, or is secondary to the discretionary priorities of the FRS.</p> <p>Staff do not consistently identify vulnerability or opportunities to safeguard vulnerable people are missed.</p>	<p>The FRS fails to provide its core function of keeping the public safe and secure from the risk of fire.</p>

1.3 How effective is the FRS at protecting the public through the regulation of fire safety?				
<p>1.3.1 To what extent is enforcement and inspection based on risk?</p> <p>1.3.2 To what extent is a systematic, consistent and robust fire safety audit undertaken by staff?</p> <p>1.3.3 How well does the FRS take enforcement action against those who fail to comply with fire safety regulations?</p> <p>1.3.4 How well does the FRS work with other enforcement agencies to share information on risk and take joint enforcement action (e.g. local authority licensing, building control and trading standards officers)?</p> <p>1.3.5 To what extent is the FRS working in partnership to reduce the burden of unwanted fire signals?</p> <p>1.3.6 To what extent does the FRS engage with local businesses or large organisations to share information and expectations on compliance with fire safety regulations?</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS's regulatory activities has had a significant impact on keeping people safe and secure from the risk of fire and other risks.</p> <p>The FRS is at the forefront of developing, sharing and influencing regulatory activity to keep people safe and secure from fire and other risks.</p> <p>The FRS has established a culture of continuous improvement with outstanding examples of sustained service development and improvement that translate into better service for the public.</p>	<p>The FRS has developed and implemented a fire safety enforcement strategy and risk-based inspection programme which is informed by local risk and complies with statutory requirements.</p> <p>The FRS's enforcement plan prioritises the highest risks and includes a proportionate level of activity to reduce risk.</p> <p>The FRS carries out a programme of fire safety audits in line with its enforcement plan.</p> <p>The FRS systematically and routinely shares relevant information on fire safety risk with staff who use it to carry out fire safety audits.</p> <p>FRS staff work, and share information with, enforcement partners and take appropriate enforcement action in line with the FRS's plan.</p> <p>FRS staff engage with local businesses or large organisations and share information and expectations on compliance with fire safety regulations.</p>	<p>The FRS has a fire safety enforcement strategy and risk-based inspection programme informed by risk and statutory requirements but it is limited in scope and not up-to-date.</p> <p>The FRS enforcement plan is unclear and does not consistently target the highest risks or include a proportionate level of activity to reduce risk.</p> <p>The FRS enforcement plan does not clearly set out the level of activity the FRS takes. There is limited evaluation of enforcement activity to assess its contribution to fire safety.</p> <p>The FRS shares limited information on fire safety risk with staff and partner organisations.</p> <p>FRS staff work with some enforcement partners undertaking enforcement action, but activity is limited and is inconsistent. FRS staff carries out some fire safety audits but this activity is not part of a comprehensive programme targeting the greatest risks.</p> <p>Engagement with local businesses or large organisations and sharing information about compliance with fire safety regulations with local business or large organisations is limited.</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>Regulatory activity is not a sufficiently high priority for the FRS, with insufficient resource allocated to regulation, and only limited activity with partner organisations.</p> <p>Regulatory activity does not align with the risks identified in the integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS fails to provide its core function of keeping the public safe and secure from the risk of fire.</p>

1.4 How effective is the FRS at responding to fires and other emergencies?				
<p>1.4.1 To what extent does FRS operational policy reflect national operational guidance?</p> <p>1.4.2 To what extent does the FRS provide a proportionate response to incidents on the basis of risk?</p> <p>1.4.3 How well does the FRS use and communicate information about incident risk?</p> <p>1.4.4 How well does the FRS command fire service assets at incidents?</p> <p>1.4.5 How well does the FRS identify vulnerability and safeguard vulnerable people at incidents?</p> <p>1.4.6 How well does the FRS communicate information about incidents to the public?</p> <p>1.4.7 To what extent are consistent, rigorous and open systems in place to evaluate operational performance and make operational improvements?</p> <p>1.4.8 How well does the FRS exchange learning with other FRSs, including learning from national incidents?</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS is at the forefront of developing, sharing and influencing best practice in the response to fire and other emergencies.</p> <p>The FRS has established a culture of continuous improvement with outstanding examples of sustained service development and improvement that translate into better service for the public.</p>	<p>The FRS has developed a response strategy that is based on a thorough assessment of risk to the community. The FRS has an appropriate range of resources (people and equipment) available to respond to personal, property and environmental risk in line with its integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS understands and actively manages the resources and capabilities available for deployment.</p> <p>The FRS is able to handle calls in a timely manner to ensure public safety.</p> <p>The FRS can mobilise sufficient resources to respond to local, cross-border and national incidents.</p> <p>The FRS is able to manage fairly the deployment (and temporary redeployment) of resources to meet operational need.</p> <p>FRS staff are able to command fire service assets assertively, effectively and safely at incidents. FRS staff ensure the public are protected at incidents.</p> <p>Staff understand how to identify vulnerability and take action to safeguard vulnerable people.</p> <p>The FRS provides relevant information to the public about ongoing incidents to</p>	<p>The FRS has developed a response strategy that is based on a limited assessment of risk to the community. In some instances, the FRS has an inappropriate range of resources (people and equipment) available to respond to personal, property and environmental risk in line with its integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS has some understanding of the resources and capabilities available to it, but does not always actively manage their deployment.</p> <p>The FRS does not consistently handle calls from the public in a timely manner.</p> <p>The FRS can mobilise resources to respond to local, cross-border and national incidents, but this is not timely and/ or does not include the right mix.</p> <p>The FRS is not able to manage fairly the deployment (and temporary redeployment) of resources to meet operational need.</p> <p>FRS staff are able to command fire service assets at incidents, but do not consistently do so assertively, effectively or safely. Incident commanders take insufficient action to ensure the public are protected.</p> <p>FRS staff do not consistently identify vulnerability or safeguard vulnerable people at incidents.</p> <p>The FRS sometimes communicates with the public about ongoing incidents</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>The FRS has an inappropriate range of resources (people and equipment) available to respond to personal, property and environmental risk in line with its integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS is not consistently able to assertively, effectively or safely command incidents.</p> <p>The FRS has insufficient regard to national operational guidance for response.</p> <p>The FRS fails to provide its core function of keeping the public safe and secure from the risk of fire.</p>

		<p>help keep the public safe during and following incidents.</p> <p>FRS staff use learning to improve operational response and incident command.</p> <p>The FRS deals well with public complaints and feedback from the public about any aspect of its service provision and ways of working.</p> <p>The FRS understands what action it needs to take to adopt national operational guidance, including joint and national learning, and is actively implementing a plan to do so.</p>	<p>but this is not consistent or does not help keep the public safe during or following an incident.</p> <p>FRS staff do not consistently identify learning to improve future operational response or incident command.</p> <p>Public complaints and feedback from the public about any aspect of FRS service provision and ways of working are not dealt with well.</p> <p>The FRS is either unaware of industry good practice or takes insufficient action to improve services in line with national operational guidance.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

1.5 How effective is the FRS at responding to national risks?

<p>1.5.1 To what extent has the FRS established arrangements to be able to supplement resources in the event of extraordinary need, such as a flood, or a major incident?</p> <p>1.5.2 How well has the FRS established site-specific response plans for high-risk premises?</p> <p>1.5.3 To what extent has the FRS demonstrated it is intraoperable with other FRSs to ensure an effective and efficient cross-border response?</p> <p>1.5.4 To what extent does joint training and joint exercising help the FRS to plan for and test arrangements for dealing with major multi-agency incidents?</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS is fully intraoperable with other FRSs and is fully able to form part of a multi-agency response in line with Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles (JESIP).</p> <p>The FRS is at the forefront in using learning to inform national developments in the fire and rescue service.</p> <p>The FRS has established a culture of continuous improvement with outstanding examples of sustained service development and improvement that translate into better service for the public.</p>	<p>The FRS's local arrangements comply with, and support, the requirements within the National Co-ordination and Advisory Framework (NCAF).</p> <p>The FRS understands national and cross-border risks and is well prepared to meet such risks.</p> <p>The FRS has clear procedures (based on risk assessments) to develop site-specific plans, and is well prepared to respond to high-risk premises and national incidents.</p> <p>The FRS undertakes a joint exercise programme to test arrangements for cross-border incidents, using the learning to improve its capabilities and inform local and national developments.</p>	<p>The FRS's local arrangements mainly comply with the requirements and support the National Co-ordination and Advisory Framework (NCAF).</p> <p>The FRS has some limited understanding of national and cross-border risks or is insufficiently prepared to respond to such risks.</p> <p>The FRS has procedures based on risk assessment to develop site-specific plans and procedures, but these are not consistent; not sufficiently understood by staff; and some elements of the plans to respond to high-risk premises, or national incidents are limited.</p> <p>The FRS undertakes a joint exercise programme to test arrangements for cross-border incidents, but this is not frequent or is limited in scope, or does</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>Multi-agency activity undertaken by the FRS is limited and intraoperability with neighbouring services isn't tested or can't be demonstrated.</p> <p>The FRS is unable to form part of a multi-agency response in line with JESIP.</p> <p>The FRS fails to provide its core function of keeping the public safe and secure from the risk of fire.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

<p>1.5.5 How well prepared is the FRS to form part of a multi-agency response to a community risk identified by the local resilience forum, including a marauding terrorist attack?</p>		<p>FRS staff are able to work with neighbouring FRSs and form part of a multi-agency response in line with JESIP.</p>	<p>not sufficiently evaluate the exercise to improve its and its partners' capability. FRS staff are not consistently able to work with neighbouring FRSs or form part of a multi-agency response in line with JESIP.</p>	
<p>2.1 How well does the FRS use resources to manage risk?</p>				
<p>2.1.1 To what extent do FRS plans address the risks identified in the integrated risk management plan?</p> <p>2.1.2 To what extent are the FRS plans built on sound planning assumptions, subject to informed challenge and meet financial requirements?</p> <p>2.1.3 How well does the FRS allocate resources to preventative, protective and response activity?</p> <p>2.1.4 To what extent does the FRS have the capacity and capability it needs to achieve both change and operational performance?</p> <p>2.1.5 How well does the FRS ensure that the workforce's time is productive, making use of a flexible workforce and flexible working patterns?</p> <p>2.1.6 To what extent is the FRS actively exploring all opportunities for collaboration within and beyond the fire and rescue sector?</p> <p>2.1.7 How well does the FRS ensure there are mechanisms in</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS provides high-performing services to the public through innovative and flexible working patterns, which have led to demonstrable cost savings/service improvements.</p> <p>The FRS has had a significant impact in bringing about cross-service savings which can be reinvested in service provision.</p> <p>The FRS is at the forefront across services nationally, of improving productivity and making excellent use of its resources.</p>	<p>The FRS's budget and resource allocation supports the activity set out in the integrated risk management plan and strategic priorities.</p> <p>The FRS has allocated sufficient resources to prevention, protection and response activity, and there is a clear rationale for the levels of such activity linked to its integrated risk management plan. The FRS workforce model allows it to undertake its core functions effectively and efficiently.</p> <p>The FRS arrangements for managing performance ensure resource use are clearly linked to its integrated risk management plan and strategic priorities.</p> <p>The FRS has taken action to reduce non-operational costs where possible and any savings are reinvested into operational activity or realised as savings to achieve the aims of the integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS uses flexible workforce patterns to ensure provision of its services proportionate to risk and public safety. The FRS can demonstrate how this is cost effective.</p>	<p>The FRS's budget and resource allocation is not clearly linked to its integrated risk management plan and strategic priorities.</p> <p>The FRS has allocated resources to prevention, protection and response, but has not demonstrated a clear rationale for the levels of activity. Resources are not clearly linked to its plans.</p> <p>The FRS arrangements for managing performance are weak or do not ensure that resource use is in line with its integrated risk management plan or strategic priorities.</p> <p>The FRS has taken some action to reduce non-operational costs but this has been limited or savings are not used in a managed way. The FRS resource allocation allows it to provide services, but the link between service provision to the public and resource allocation is unclear.</p> <p>The FRS uses some flexible workforce patterns, but the link to risk or public safety is not clear. The FRS is unable to demonstrate how flexible working is cost effective.</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>The FRS budget decisions are not aligned to business need as outlined in the integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS has not reduced non-frontline operational costs or has not used savings in a managed way.</p> <p>Collaborative activity has an adverse impact on the provision of the FRS's core functions or workforce efficiencies.</p>

<p>place for the monitoring, evaluation and review of collaborations (including benefits realisation and outcomes)?</p> <p>2.1.8 To what extent are business continuity arrangements in place and how often are these tested?</p>		<p>The FRS proactively meets its statutory duty to consider emergency service collaboration. The FRS's collaborative activity fits with the priorities set out in its integrated risk management plan and improves the provision of core functions or achieves work force efficiencies.</p> <p>The FRS monitors, reviews and evaluates the benefits and outcomes of any collaboration.</p>	<p>The FRS has not appropriately discharged its statutory duty to collaborate. FRS's collaborative activity is not planned or does not fit with the priorities set out in its integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS monitors, reviews and evaluates the benefits and outcomes of any collaboration, but this is limited and is not used to learn or change decisions.</p>	
<p>2.2 How well is the FRS securing an affordable way of managing the risk of fire and other risks now and in the future?</p>				
<p>2.2.1 To what extent does the FRS understand and is taking action to mitigate the main/significant financial risks?</p> <p>2.2.2 To what extent does the FRS have a track record for achieving savings and avoiding any residual future budget gaps?</p> <p>2.2.3 To what extent can the FRS demonstrate sound financial management of principal non-pay costs (including fleet and equipment) through benchmarking, contract renegotiation, and joint procurement?</p> <p>2.2.4 How well do FRS plans make the best use of the opportunities, and respond to the risks, presented by changes in technology?</p> <p>2.2.5 To what extent does the FRS estate/fleet strategy, and changes to estate/fleet, support</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS can demonstrate that it is innovative in its approach to working with others to reduce costs appropriately across all functions.</p> <p>The FRS is at the forefront of developing, sharing and influencing best practice for new ways of working.</p>	<p>The FRS has an affordable workforce model which provides the right skills and capabilities mix, linked to its integrated risk management plan and priorities. The FRS financial plans help to secure sustainability of service to the public, continuous improvement and result in a balanced budget.</p> <p>The FRS understands the likely financial challenges (beyond the current spending review) based on relatively robust, realistic and prudent assumptions, which take account of the wider external environment and include some scenario planning for future spending reductions.</p> <p>The FRS has a plan for using reserves and is able to provide good evidence of using reserves in a sensible and sustainable way.</p> <p>The FRS actively considers how changes in technology and future innovation may have an impact on risk, and the FRS exploits opportunities</p>	<p>The FRS has a workforce model linked to its integrated risk management plan and priorities but the FRS financial plans secure a short-term or limited period of sustainability, and there is a risk that the future aims of the integrated risk management plan are unaffordable.</p> <p>The FRS understanding of the likely financial challenges (beyond the current spending review) is limited or not based on relatively robust, realistic and prudent assumptions, which take account of the wider external environment and include some scenario planning for future spending reductions.</p> <p>The FRS plan for the use of financial reserves is unclear or is not sensible or unsustainable.</p> <p>The FRS rarely considers how changes in technology and future innovation may have an impact on risk, or the FRS does not exploit</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>The FRS has not properly identified the future financial risks facing the organisation; FRS financial plans are short term and are not sustainable or affordable.</p> <p>The FRS does not have appropriate controls in place to either reduce the risks or ensure appropriate use of public money.</p>

<p>current and future service provision?</p> <p>2.2.6 To what extent is the FRS continuing to make savings to invest for future innovation?</p> <p>2.2.7 How well does the FRS use reserves to improve efficiency, to allow innovation and to promote new ways of working?</p> <p>2.2.8 To what extent is the FRS influencing how it can work with others in the future in order to improve efficiency?</p> <p>2.2.9 To what extent has the FRS considered and exploited external funding opportunities, or options for generating income?</p>		<p>presented by changes in technology to improve efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <p>The FRS identifies savings and investment opportunities that improve service to the public or generate further savings.</p> <p>The FRS secures funding to invest in improvements to the service provided to the public and is proactive in identifying additional funding sources.</p> <p>The FRS has financial controls and financial risk control mechanisms to reduce the risk of inappropriate use of public money.</p>	<p>opportunities presented by changes in technology to improve efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <p>The FRS identifies some savings and investment opportunities that improve service or generate further savings, but this is limited or not significant.</p> <p>The FRS has identified other funding sources but has not secured funding, or its ambition is limited.</p> <p>The FRS's financial controls and financial risk control mechanisms are weak or may fail to mitigate financial risk.</p>	
<p>3.1 How well does the FRS promote its values and culture?</p>				
<p>3.1.1 How well does the FRS understand the wellbeing needs of its workforce?</p> <p>3.1.2 How well does the FRS take early action to improve the wellbeing of the workforce?</p> <p>3.1.3 How well do leaders demonstrate they model and maintain the values the FRS expects of them?</p> <p>3.1.4 To what extent is a culture of promoting health, safety and wellbeing evident at all levels in the FRS?</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS senior leaders embody a clear vision for the wellbeing agenda. All staff understand that this is a service priority and wellbeing behaviours are firmly in place, accepted, demonstrated and understood across the whole organisation.</p>	<p>The FRS has a values and behaviours statement that is understood and demonstrated at all levels within the organisation.</p> <p>FRS senior managers act as role models and demonstrate commitment to service values through their behaviours.</p> <p>The FRS has well-understood and effective health, safety, wellbeing and dignity at work policies, and grievance procedures. These policies and procedures are available to, and help to afford protections to, staff.</p> <p>The FRS effectively promotes the mental and physical health and</p>	<p>The FRS has a values statement but awareness within the organisation is limited.</p> <p>Some examples are evident of behaviours that are not in line with the values and behaviours statement. Staff do not think that senior managers demonstrate the service values.</p> <p>The FRS has health, safety, wellbeing policies but these are not well understood and staff do not think that they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some practices to support mental and physical health exist, but these are</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>The FRS has a limited understanding of the wellbeing needs of the workforce.</p> <p>The FRS has not set out, or senior managers do not demonstrate, acceptable behaviours and values.</p> <p>Examples found of discrimination and inappropriate behaviours that have not been challenged.</p>

		<p>wellbeing of staff.</p> <p>FRS staff understand and have confidence in wellbeing support processes.</p>	<p>limited in scope and ambition.</p> <p>FRS staff have limited confidence in support processes.</p>	
3.2 How well trained and skilled are FRS staff?				
<p>3.2.1 How well does the FRS understand the skills and capabilities of its workforce (including the use of technology)?</p> <p>3.2.2 How well does the FRS ensure it has the right workforce mix of skills and capabilities?</p> <p>3.2.3 To what extent has the FRS established a culture of learning and improvement?</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS has a good understanding of current and future skills requirements, has a credible plan and has filled any current capability gaps with clear plans to address future requirements.</p> <p>The FRS has established a culture of continuous improvement with outstanding examples of sustained service development and improvement that translate into better service for the public.</p>	<p>The skills and capabilities of FRS personnel are aligned with the delivery of the integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS has a performance regime to monitor staff competence, performance and service provision to the public.</p> <p>The FRS regularly updates its understanding of the skills and risk-critical safety capabilities of the workforce to ensure that it meets current and future organisational needs.</p> <p>The FRS has systems in place to identify gaps in workforce capability and resilience issues. The FRS is tailoring its future workforce plans to meet longer-term changes in risk in a financially sustainable way.</p> <p>Staff are appropriately trained for their role. The FRS training plans are used to develop and maintain competence and capability. Risk-critical safety training is given sufficient priority.</p>	<p>The FRS workforce plan does not take full account of the requisite skills and capabilities the FRS needs to carry out the integrated risk management plan.</p> <p>The FRS has a limited performance management regime, which is not fully established or effective. There is an inconsistent link between performance management and the assessment of competence.</p> <p>The FRS does not undertake a regular assessment of staff skills and risk-critical safety capabilities; there is limited evidence that planning takes any account of workforce skills or gaps in risk-critical safety capabilities.</p> <p>The FRS has a system to review workforce capabilities but it is not used effectively to consider future needs. The FRS does not have a credible succession plan, for all levels of its business.</p> <p>FRS training plans are out of date and some staff do not update personal training plans. Insufficient priority is given to risk-critical safety training.</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>The FRS has a poor understanding of the workforce skills and capabilities and has no credible plan to rectify gaps.</p> <p>Staff lack the necessary skills and capabilities to enable the FRS to carry out its core functions.</p>

3.3 How well does the FRS ensure fairness and diversity?				
<p>3.3.1 How well do leaders seek feedback and challenge from all parts of the workforce?</p> <p>3.3.2 How well does the FRS identify and resolve workforce concerns?</p> <p>3.3.3 How well does the FRS identify and address potential disproportionality in recruitment, retention and progression for staff with protected characteristics?</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS can demonstrate that it has taken successful steps to identify and tackle barriers to equality of opportunity and that it has made progress in improving fairness and diversity at every level within the organisation. Equality is firmly established and understood throughout the policy and practice of the FRS.</p>	<p>The FRS regularly seeks feedback from staff at all levels to measure and monitor staff engagement.</p> <p>The FRS's feedback mechanisms carry credibility with staff and as such help to gather valuable information.</p> <p>FRS leaders can demonstrate that they act on and have made changes as a direct result of feedback from staff.</p> <p>The FRS engages with all representative bodies and staff associations.</p> <p>The FRS operates an open, fair and honest recruitment process for staff or those wishing to work for the FRS.</p> <p>The FRS is exploiting opportunities to ensure that its workforce reflects the community it represents and it promotes diversity at all levels within the organisation.</p> <p>The FRS promotes equality and diversity and engages with under-represented groups in the workforce to resolve staff concerns and ensure fair and open opportunities for all.</p> <p>The FRS has an effective system to understand and remove the risk of discrimination in recruitment and promotion processes and has firmly</p>	<p>Some means of gathering staff feedback exist, but these are inconsistent and not wide ranging. The FRS does not have a regular and effective system to measure and monitor staff engagement (across the whole service).</p> <p>Staff do not think that feedback mechanisms work or are effective.</p> <p>Evidence of making significant change as a result of staff feedback is limited.</p> <p>Some engagement takes place with representative bodies, but this is limited and does not include all.</p> <p>There is some evidence that FRS recruitment processes are not open or there is limited evidence that the FRS assesses or evaluates the fairness of the recruitment process.</p> <p>The FRS has a plan to increase the diversity of the workforce in line with its community, but it is not leading to change. FRS recruitment campaigns are not directed at, or are not accessible to, under-represented groups.</p> <p>The FRS has limited engagement across the workforce with under-represented groups or does not have a specific means of supporting staff from under-represented groups.</p> <p>The FRS does not evaluate recruitment processes and there is no evidence that the FRS assesses or evaluates the fairness of the</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>The mechanisms to engage and seek feedback from staff do not enable the FRS to understand the needs of staff.</p> <p>The FRS cannot demonstrate that it has taken successful steps to identify and tackle barriers to equality of opportunity or that it has made progress in improving fairness and diversity at every level within the organisation.</p>

		established equality throughout strategies, plans, training and practice.	recruitment process. Equality is not an integral part of policy and practice.	
3.4 How well does the FRS develop leadership and capability?				
<p>3.4.1 How well does the FRS manage and develop the individual performance of its staff?</p> <p>3.4.2 How fairly does the FRS identify high potential members of the workforce to become senior leaders?</p> <p>3.4.3 How fairly does the FRS select for leadership roles at all levels?</p>	<p>In addition to performing at levels described in Good:</p> <p>The FRS approach to leadership development and workforce performance is open and highly innovative.</p> <p>The FRS can demonstrate that its performance management arrangements are significantly increasing overall capability to serve the public.</p>	<p>The FRS has arrangements in place to assess and develop the individual performance of all staff.</p> <p>FRS staff have clear, personal and specific goals or objectives.</p> <p>The FRS has open and transparent selection processes and actively manages the career pathways of all staff, including those with specialist skills.</p> <p>The FRS has an open and fair process to identify, develop and support high potential staff and aspiring leaders.</p> <p>FRS staff think that the selection and promotion process is fair and this is reflected in the diversity of staff represented at all levels of the organisation.</p>	<p>The FRS arrangements for performance assessment are inconsistent. The link between performance assessment and staff development needs is limited.</p> <p>Some staff do not have personal objectives and have not received a meaningful performance assessment in the last year.</p> <p>The FRS does not have fully open or transparent selection processes. The FRS does not actively manage the career pathways of all staff, including those with specialist skills.</p> <p>The FRS processes to openly and transparently identify and select high potential staff are inconsistent.</p> <p>Staff do not think that selection processes are fair. Staff do not think that promotion processes are fair.</p>	<p>Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement:</p> <p>The FRS approach to leadership development and workforce performance does not enable the FRS to manage the performance of staff or enable the FRS to identify and select leaders.</p>