



Insight | Change | Management



Service Delivery Review
Programme:
Criteria Setting Workshop
(13 March 2025)

Report

April 2025

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Introduction.....	1
1.2	Session Structure and Participation.....	1
1.2.1	Session Structure.....	1
1.2.2	Participation.....	2
1.3	Report Structure	2
2	EVALUATION CRITERIA REVIEW	3
2.1	Introduction.....	3
2.2	Finalised Criteria	3
2.3	Consensus and Adjustments.....	4
3	WEIGHTING OF CRITERIA.....	5
3.1	Introduction.....	5
3.2	Final Weighting Results	5
4	CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS.....	6
4.1	Conclusions.....	6
4.2	Next Steps.....	6
	APPENDIX ONE: ATTENDANCE.....	7
	APPENDIX TWO: SCORING (MENTIMETER OUTPUT).....	8

1 INTRODUCTION

Background and Context

1.1 Introduction

This report summarises the outcomes of a criteria setting workshop held as part of the Service Delivery Review (SDR) the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) is conducting to assess its operational model and ensure resources are allocated efficiently.

The session, held on 13 March 2025, aimed to finalise evaluation criteria for assessing proposed changes and assign weighting to each criterion.

The event took place online via Microsoft Teams, facilitated by Nick Duffin (ASV). Opening remarks were provided by Assistant Chief Officer (ACO) David Farries, who set out the strategic priorities of the SDR programme:

- Temporary appliance withdrawals.
- SFRS estate issues (such as RAAC stations and capital backlog).
- Station upgrades for decontamination and dignified facilities.
- Matching operational resource to risk and demand.
- Long-term dormant stations.

The objectives of the session were to:

- Agree on evaluation criteria for assessing change options.
- Assign weighting to each criterion.
- Ensure a neutral and transparent process for assessing service delivery changes.

1.2 Session Structure and Participation

1.2.1 Session Structure

The session ran from 1:30 PM – 4:30 PM, following a structured agenda:

Agenda Highlights

Time	Activity
1:30 – 2:00	Welcome, Introduction, Progress Update, Overview of Criteria & Weighting
2:00 – 3:00	Discussion on Evaluation Criteria
3:10 – 4:10	Weighting Exercise (Mentimeter)
4:15 – 4:30	Plenary & Next Steps

1.2.2 Participation

The session included senior SFRS personnel, external stakeholders (Police Scotland, local councils, NHS representatives, third sector organisations and members of the public), and union representatives (FBU, FRSA, Unite, Unison).

There were 28 participants (SFRS staff, external stakeholders, and members of the public) who agreed and weighted the criteria.

The event was also attended by a facilitator, note takers and subject matter experts from SFRS. In total 34 people attended the session.

1.3 Report Structure

Following this introduction the remainder of the report is set out as follows:

- **Section Two:** Provides a narrative description of the discussions that took place around the proposed evaluation criteria.
- **Section Three:** Sets out the results of the weighting exercise.
- **Section Four:** Provides brief conclusions and sets out the next steps.
- **Appendix One:** Details those who attended the event.
- **Appendix Two:** Provides detailed results from the Mentimeter weighting exercise.

2 EVALUATION CRITERIA REVIEW

Discussion on Evaluative Criteria

2.1 Introduction

The participants were directed that following this session, the options developed in the preceding stages of the SDR process would be appraised against a set of criteria. The audience was presented with the following draft criteria to consider.

- Impact on Communities
- Impact on Workforce
- Sustainability
- Financial Viability
- Deliverability

Discussion focused on the following questions:

- Are there any other criteria you would like to consider?
- Are there any criteria you think should be removed
- What should be included under each heading?

2.2 Finalised Criteria

During the discussions amongst the participants these five proposed criteria for evaluating SDR options were reviewed and agreed upon as providing the full range of consideration to allow subsequent appraisal of options.

The main points discussed for each criterion are set out below:

1. Impact on Communities:

- Considers effects on fire safety, community resilience, social well-being, and equality.
- Emphasises early intervention, prevention, and public safety.
- A refined definition was agreed upon to include diverse communities.

2. Impact on Workforce:

- Assesses impact on firefighter safety, workload, morale, skills, and job security.
- Revised to highlight challenges of both Wholetime and On-Call firefighters.
- Language was adjusted to acknowledge potential negative impacts.

3. Sustainability:

- Includes long-term operational, environmental, and demographic factors.
- Clarification added to distinguish financial viability from broader sustainability.
- Consideration given to climate change and population shifts.

4. Financial Viability:

- Evaluates cost-effectiveness and affordability.
- Focus shifted from "reducing costs" to "reinvesting in priority areas".
- Minor amendment made to remove ambiguity.

5. Deliverability:

- Examines feasibility within operational and time constraints.
- No major discussion or changes required.

2.3 Consensus and Adjustments

A broad facilitated consensus was agreed in which:

- All five criterion were agreed upon without opposition.
- Clarifications were made to wording for inclusivity, clarity, and transparency.

The final wording agreed for each criterion is shown below:

- **Impact on Communities**

The option has potential positive impacts on the **diverse** communities we serve. By reflecting the concerns and priorities of the public, this option can contribute positively in terms of fire safety, **prevention**, wider community resilience, reassurance, quality of life, and wider community safety, **social equality**, and well-being.

- **Impact on Workforce**

The option will minimise any negative impact on **all** SFRS staff. Issues such as firefighter safety, workload, morale, skills required, **recruitment, retention and** job security, and overall well-being, have been considered.

- **Deliverability**

The option is deliverable within the timeframe and other restrictions SFRS is working to. It reflects the core operational objectives of keeping our communities and firefighters safe and also takes account of the strategic priorities of SFRS.

- **Financial Viability**

The option should be financially sustainable. It should be affordable to implement and should be cost effective – offering the potential for reducing overall costs for reinvesting in priority areas.

- **Sustainability**

The option should be sustainable over the long term – in terms of its impact on the Service, our ability to respond to emergencies, the impact on our communities or on the environment.

3 WEIGHTING OF CRITERIA

Determining Priority for each Criterion

3.1 Introduction

A presentation explaining the weighting, outlining an example of the weighting, and demonstrating the use of Mentimeter¹ was provided to participants.

The purpose of the weighting exercise was explained to participants. At the balanced room appraisal event, decision makers will score the options against each criterion out of a scale of 1-10. The weighting developed at this session will then be applied. This allows an understanding of the overall impact of each option in a balanced setting against an objectively agreed weighting.

To establish the weighting, participants were each allocated 100 points to distribute across the five criteria using Mentimeter.

3.2 Final Weighting Results

The final outcomes of the exercises are shown in tabular form below.

Criterion	Weighting (%)
Impact on Communities	31.25
Impact on Workforce	24.68
Deliverability	16.61
Financial Viability	14.82
Sustainability	12.64

- Impact on Communities received the highest weighting (31.25%), reflecting its priority.
- Impact on Workforce ranked second (24.68%), highlighting concern for firefighter welfare.
- Sustainability received the lowest weighting (12.64%), indicating it was less critical than deliverability or financial viability.

¹ **Mentimeter** is an interactive presentation tool that allows users to engage audiences with live polls, quizzes, and Q&A sessions.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Closing Discussion

4.1 Conclusions

The SDR Criteria Setting Session successfully achieved its objectives in that it:

- ✓ Agreed on five evaluation criteria.
- ✓ Established a weighted scoring system.
- ✓ Ensured a transparent and structured process for future assessments.

The next phase will focus on evaluating options using the agreed framework before proceeding to public consultation.

4.2 Next Steps

The agreed criteria and weightings will be used in the Balanced Room Event (29 April 2025) to score each change option.

Key Milestones in SDR Timeline

- 29 April 2025 – Balanced Room Event: Options scoring.
- 30 April 2025 – Final agreement on options for public consultation.
- June–Sep 2025 – 12-week public consultation.
- Dec 2025 – Final decision by SFRS Board.

APPENDIX ONE: ATTENDANCE

• Alasdair Ross	Aberdeenshire Voluntary Action (AVA)
• Alicia Mulvey	SFRS, Programme Officer (<i>Minutes</i>)
• Alison Fisher	South Perth Green Spaces
• Andrew Wright	SFRS, Local Senior Officer
• Angela Paul	Old Kilpatrick Foodbank
• Ann-Marie Bruce	Aberdeenshire HSCP
• Chelsea Lindsay	SFRS, Watch Commander Control
• Claire Owens	SFRS, Property Development Manager
• Clare Stewart	West Lothian Council
• Colin Brown	Fire Brigades Union (FBU)
• David Farries (DF)	SFRS, Assistant Chief Officer
• Derek Jackson	Unison
• Elizabeth Bradshaw	Perth Tenants and Residents Association
• Iain Templeton	Partners in Advocacy
• Jim Quinn	SFRS, Area Commander
• Jo-anne Sweeney	Clackmannanshire Council/ Forth Valley HSCP
• John McKenzie	Fire Brigades Union (FBU)
• Kenneth Barbour	SFRS, Deputy Assistant Chief Officer
• Kenny Freeburn	Scottish Ambulance Service
• Kirsty Greenhowe	Falkirk Food Train
• Laura Canning	Unite
• Lyndsey Gaja	SFRS, Interim Director of People
• Lyndsey Nicholson	Inspector, Police Scotland
• Lynne McGeough	SFRS, Head of Finance and Procurement
• Marc Pincombe	SFRS, Local Senior Officer
• Mark Loynd	SFRS, Area Commander (SSRP)
• Martin Ogilvie	Dumfries and Galloway Council
• Marysia Waters	SFRS, Head of Communications and Engagement
• Nick Duffin	ASV, Consultant
• Ross Robison	SFRS, Deputy Assistant Chief Officer
• Scott Arcari	SFRS, Watch Commander On Call Support
• Tim Kirk	Fire and Rescue Services Association (FRSA)
• Tony Hughes	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)
• William Kay	SFRS, Watch Commander
• OBSERVER	
• Jamie Murray	SFRS, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Adviser

APPENDIX TWO: SCORING (MENTIMETER OUTPUT)

There were 28 participants who scored using Mentimeter, they were each asked to divide 100 points between the 5 options. The summary scores for each criterion are shown in table 1. Table 2 shows the individual scores provided for each criterion.

Choices	Score
Impact on Communities	31.25
Impact on Workforce	24.67857143
Sustainability	12.64285714
Financial Viability	14.82142857
Deliverability	16.60714286

Table1: Summary Scores

Voter	Please divide 100 points between the 5 options				
	Impact on Communities	Deliverability	Financial Viability	Sustainability	Impact on Workforce
1	40	15	10	10	25
2	25	25	20	10	20
3	35	10	20	10	25
4	25	15	25	15	20
5	30	15	20	10	25
6	40	15	10	10	25
7	35	11	9	14	31
8	35	25	15	10	15
9	30	10	20	20	20
10	40	10	10	0	40
11	30	10	30	15	15
12	30	20	10	15	25
13	30	10	15	15	30
14	35	10	5	15	35
15	35	10	10	10	35
16	40	50	10	0	0
17	40	30	10	10	10
18	25	20	15	15	25
19	25	25	10	20	20
20	35	14	6	10	35
21	30	15	15	10	30
22	35	10	10	15	30
23	25	15	20	15	25
24	20	20	20	20	20
25	25	15	20	10	30
26	30	10	20	10	30
27	25	15	15	20	25
28	25	15	15	20	25

Table 2: Individual voter scores



Thank You

asv

Insight | Change | Management

| info@asv-online.co.uk |