ASSURANCE OBSERVATIONS REPORT

West Midlands Combined Authority

ASSURANCE REPORT

Project/s: There are no component projects with specific focus or consideration that have formed part of this Health Check.	**Name:** Thrive into Work Programme, (Individual Placement & Support in Primary Care)
	Programme Code: N/A
	Programme Lead: Ethan Williams
	Development Stage/Route Agreed (if not Delivery): In Delivery

Title	**Programme Health Check** – Assessing the likelihood of successful delivery, effectiveness of the Grant Agreements with Delivery Partners, and changes to baseline for remaining Thrive into Work (TiW) Programme.
Programme Assurance Lead	Luke Cairney, Kate Bonney
Date(s) of Review	27 October 2023 – 6 December 2023.
Programme Representative/Point of Contact	Ethan Williams – Ethan.williams@wmca.org.uk; Lisa Hamilton – Lisa.hamilton@wmca.org.uk;

Version History

Version	Date	Reason for update	Issued by
0.1	06/12/2023	Draft report for peer review.	Luke Cairney; Kate Bonney
0.2	13/12/2023	Following peer review.	Luke Cairney
0.3	14/12/2023	Final Draft report issue to programme lead.	Luke Cairney; Kate Bonney
1.0	03/01/2024	Final report issued to Distribution List	Luke Cairney; Kate Bonney

Distribution List

Name	Role/Job Title
Clare Hatton	WMCA, Interim Director for Employment, Skills, Health, and Communities (EDSC) [Programme SRO]
Lisa Hamilton	WMCA, Senior Delivery Manager (Projects and Programmes) - EDSC
Mubasshir Ajaz	WMCA, Head of Health and Communities, Economy, Skills, Health, and Communities - EDSC
John Hall	WMCA, Senior Delivery Manager (Employment and Skills) - EDSC
Lisa Hughes	WMCA, Delivery Manager - Projects and Programmes (Employment and Skills) - EDSC
Ethan Williams	WMCA, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer - EDSC
Tatum Matharu	WMCA, Strategic Lead for Health Inequalities - EDSC
Julia Cove	WMCA, Programme Assurance Manager - Finance and Business Hub
Serena Dhanoa-Rasheed	WMCA, Programme Investment Appraisal Manager - Finance and Business Hub
Jaspal Seehra	WMCA, Performance Manager - Finance and Business Hub
Peter Estrella	WMCA, Risk Manager - Finance and Business Hub

Programme Overview

Lifecycle Stage reached:	Delivery
Previous Review(s) undertaken (including any external assurance):	No previous programme level Health Check activity has been undertaken. Activity on this programme commenced prior to the implementation of the Single Assurance Framework (SAF) and as such is not supported by any formal business case documentation. During the Health Check process, the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) carried out a separate informal review (through DWP regional lead). This was not recognised as an audit by DWP, but an opportunity to learn more about the service, Activity Delivery Partner (ADP) claims processes, invoices received to date, and ADP case management systems. There was no feedback or outturn available following DWP's engagement with the programme, and is therefore not reflected in this report.

West Midlands
Combined Authority

About this report

This report is an evidence-based assessment of the likelihood of successful delivery of the Thrive into Work Programme.

A Health Check Tool, incorporating the Association for Project Management (APM) and Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA) best practice has been used by the Assurance team to drive key lines of enquiry and inform report findings and recommendations.

The overall rating of the Health Check is based on the number of recommendations raised and the severity of those recommendations.

Any findings and/or recommendations raised are based on evidence presented as part of the Health Check process at that time.

It is acknowledged (and expected) that progress will be made by the Programme Team towards any recommendations made. Any observations made by the SRO/appropriate Portfolio Director will be considered as part of the Health Check process. There is an expectation that the Programme Team and SRO will respond and feedback within this report by 21 December 2023.

This assessment was arranged and managed by:

West Midlands Combined Authority
Finance and Business Hub
Programme Assurance & Appraisal Team
16 Summer Lane
Birmingham
B19 3SD

Email: programmeassuranceandappraisal@wmca.org.uk
Programme Assurance Lead: Luke.Cairney@wmca.org.uk; Katherine.Bonney@wmca.org.uk

---

1.   **Programme Maturity Assessment**

Maturity Assessment:	Green/Amber

a) Background

Programme activity commenced prior to the implementation of the SAF and as such is not supported by any formal business case documentation. This Health Check was therefore welcomed by the Directorate as an opportunity to seek out-of-Directorate scrutiny and support with any opportunities for improvement.

Phase 1

The current programme has evolved from a TiW randomised control trial (RCT), which took place between June 2018 and October 2020. This was funded by Government, through a joint unit between DWP and NHS England. Following the trial, a further award to fund a Post Trial Service (PTS) was provided, effectively extending the trial related activities from November 2020 up to March 2023.

Both the RCT and PTS were delivered by Shaw Trust and the Black Country Healthcare NHS Foundation. These two ADPs were procured and contracted through a third party, using NHS procurement frameworks, and were underpinned by Service Level Agreements (SLAs). These SLAs were held by the Black Country Integrated Care Board (ICB) [previously known as CCG] and funding was paid from DWP to the ICB, for onward award to the WMCA on a quarterly basis. Memorandums of Understanding and the SLAs between the ICB and ADPs both included provisions for the WMCA to manage delivery and performance directly.

Pre-phase 2, further grant funding was secured from DWP following a bid from WMCA, in order to continue programme activity following the PTS.

The ICB also stood down from Programme Governance responsibilities, at which time the WMCA renewed its approach to management and governance, and opted to align its approach with other programmes within the Directorate. Notably, this meant the development of Grant Agreements (over SLAs) with the existing ADPs. In April 2023, Heads of Agreement were signed between the WMCA and ADPs, as a practical 'bridging' measure until more robust Grant Agreements were signed in October and November 2023.

West Midlands
Combined Authority

Phase 2

The programme began its final phase (2) of delivery from April 2023, and is now underpinned by signed Grant Agreements with the two ADPs retained. The programme is due to complete at the end of the 2024/25 financial year, or when all DWP derived funding is defrayed, whichever occurs first.

b) Health Check Approach

This Health Check forms part of an annual Health Check Plan conducted by the Programme Assurance & Appraisal Team (Specifically, Programme Assurance Specialists) which was agreed by the Executive Committee in March 2023.

The aims of this Health Check are to:
- Assess the likelihood of successful delivery of the Thrive into Work Programme, in the context of changes to baseline since the programme's initial trial period, up to current delivery phase;
- Review the robustness and likely effectiveness of, and suitable transfer of conditions into, the newly formed Grant Agreements Vs. Previous Service Level Agreements (SLAs);
- Review programme management processes and controls in the absence of a business case and test collective understanding of team roles, responsibilities, and resource planning;
- Understand the performance monitoring and reporting arrangements and the synergy of those arrangements with other projects/programmes within the directorate such as Multiply, SPF and AEB;
- Review the interim Governance arrangements.

A series of meetings and desk-based research have informed this Health Check (which are detailed in Annexes A and B) and recommendations raised have been agreed with the SRO/Programme Lead.

The steps below represent a high-level overview of the Health Check approach, which are consistent with the agreed Terms of Reference (ToR):

- Agreeing a ToR document with the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, who was nominated as the Programme Lead for the Health Check, and has assumed key Programme Management responsibilities whilst key posts are recruited to.
- Using a Health Check Tool (as described in 'About this Report') to form the basis of Health Check key lines of enquiry around eleven categories (leading to an objective, evidence-based assessment.
- Engagement meetings (9) undertaken with programme SMEs and are set out in Annex A below. These align with those potential 'stakeholders' to be engaged, identified within the Terms of Reference v1.0. The Programme Senior Responsible Officer – Clare Hatton, was not interviewed as part of the process.
- Carrying out desk-based reviews of relevant programme documentation, with access to dedicated area of the Programme Team's SharePoint.
- Development of a draft Assurance Observations Report detailing findings and recommendations.
- Agreement and distribution of a final Assurance Observations (Health Check) Report.

c) Summary of Findings & Recommendations

Programme Challenges:
- There are two key dedicated programme posts – Programme Delivery Manager and Project Manager, yet to be recruited to. Currently the programme activities are carried out on an interim basis by others within the Directorate.
- The programme has a preferred approach to its own Governance, through a proposed Steering Group. The Steering Group will act as the main decision-making body for the TiW programme and consider any area of escalation and/or major programme issues. However, this Steering Group has yet to be convened.

Positive Observations:
- The approach to reporting back to DWP and Monitoring and Evaluation processes and returns (including documentation) have been identified as 'Best Practice' by DWP and subsequently rolled out, as the chosen approach to other TiW programmes nationally.
- The Programme is performing above its targets set out and agreed with DWP.
- The Scope of the programme is mutually well understood by all stakeholders.
- The Funding Agreements entered into between ADPs and WMCA are robust and have potential to satisfy a basis for similar programmes of delivery.
- The collective understanding of the programme position (financially, legally, and from a performance perspective) was sound, in spite of the programme needing to recruit to key permanent roles at the time of the Health Check.

Key areas for improvement: *Key areas for improvement are summarised below; however, detailed findings and recommendations are contained within Section 3 of this report:*

- There are a number of key logs such as Assumptions, Constraints, Dependencies and Lessons Learned, which should be developed, regularly reviewed, and managed for a programme of this size and budget.
- There are further opportunities to more regularly, and to a finer degree of detail, scrutinise the risk exposure to the programme, using the themes and methods set out within the WMCA Risk Management Framework.
- Understanding of Benefits Realisation.
- Planning activity for the eventuality of handover/s - as the Programme Team transitions from its interim state, further new team member/s orientation, and understanding the impacts of Single Points of Dependency should all have a clear and documented process.

It is acknowledged within several of the recommendations in Section 3 of this report, that the 'Operational Plan' should be revised to capture key information around programme process and controls. The programme does not benefit from an approved business case therefore the Operational Plan has been viewed as the most suitable and centrally available information resource for the programme environment. Given the remaining programme lifecycle, the Programme Team's close work with DWP, and the detail within the Operational Plan and Funding Agreements, it was deemed unnecessary to recommend the creation of a retrospective business case.

d) Overall assessment

The Health Check has rated the programme as 'Green/Amber' which is defined as "Successful delivery appears probable. However, constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery".

There were 8 recommendations raised as part of the Health Check which have been outlined in Section 3 of the report

Health Check Category	Recommendations Raised & Priority		
	H	M	L
Client & Scope	0	0	1
Risk Management	1	0	0
Planning & Scheduling	0	0	1
Organisation Capability & Culture	0	1	1
Supply Chain	0	0	0
Solution	0	0	0
Finance	0	0	1
Health & Safety, Social Responsibility & Sustainability	0	0	0
Performance	0	1	0
Governance	0	0	0
Stakeholder Communication & Engagement	0	0	1
TOTAL No. of Recommendations	1	2	5
Overall RAG Rating:	**Green/Amber**		

e) Next Steps

It is acknowledged (and expected) that progress will be made by the Programme Team towards the recommendations made. Any observations made by the SRO/appropriate Portfolio Director will be considered as part of the Health Check process.

Details of the next proposed Assurance Review are included in section 5.

2. RAG Status Definitions

RAG	Criteria Description
Green	Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost and benefits realisation appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery.
Green/Amber	Successful delivery appears probable. However, constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery.
Amber	Successful delivery appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and, if addressed promptly, any cost/schedule overrun could be resolved.
Amber/Red	Successful delivery of the programme/project is in doubt with major risks or issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to ensure these are addressed and establish whether resolution is feasible.
Red	Successful delivery of the programme/project appears to be unachievable. There are major issues which, at this stage, do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The programme/project may need re-baselining and/or overall viability re-assessed.

Recommendation priority	Expected completion date
High	**High** – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should prioritise these recommendations.
Medium	**Medium** – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome, the programme/project should ensure these recommendations are actioned.
Low	**Low** – The programme/project would benefit from the uptake of this recommendation.

3. Programme Maturity Assessment

Ref.	Health Check Ref.	Finding/observation Impact of Finding/observation	Recommendation	Agreed Y/N	H/M/L	Completion Date
1.	Client Scope	It is acknowledged that Assumptions, Constraints, and Dependencies are discussed in an ad hoc manner across the programme team; however, there are no dedicated (or documented) logging activities for capturing constraints and dependencies in particular. The negative impact of this is somewhat mitigated through the current programme team support from both employment and health related leads within the ESC directorate; However, once a Delivery Manager and Project Manager posts are recruited, a more robust process for ensuring these programme elements are actively managed will be required.	Now that the funding agreement between both ADPs and the programme baseline has been agreed by all parties, the programme team should carry out an exercise to effectively log Assumptions, Constraints and Dependencies. These logs should then be regularly reviewed as part of the future Steering Group activity to ensure they are being effectively managed. Responsibility for creating and maintaining these logs should be detailed within the programme Operational Manual, in lieu of an approved business case for the programme.	Y	L	31/01/24
2.	Risks	The programme Risk Register has been produced on a bespoke ESC headed document, rather than the WMCA standard template available. There is also a lack of version history demonstrated within the programme Risk Register, with the latest risk item entered onto the register in August 2023. At the time of this Health Check there were 3 open risks on the register. Given the lack of version history combined and no formal minutes of programme team meetings available, reviewers cannot be satisfied that programme risks are being managed as effectively as possible. Without an adequate level of risk detail, there is also potential that any Programme Management controls are not being effectively deployed. Without a more considered and documented view of the TiW risk profile, programme decision makers do not have the suitable level of information to manage programme risks continuously and proactively, which will in turn decrease the chances of successful delivery.	Work with the WMCA Risk Manager to complete a review of the programme Risk Register and Risk Management process, to include but not limited to: • Review the risk ratings of items and carry out an exercise to ensure all risks related to the programme, and mitigating action are captured • Themes detailed within the WMCA Risk Management Framework should be used during this review to ensure appropriate risk types are fully considered. • Transition the programme Risk Register to the WMCA standard, to ensure all necessary risk fields and requirements are captured. • Include a key risk around Single Points of Dependency and the impact of those. This is reflective of previous resourcing arrangement for the programme team, as described in engagement meetings. • Consider after the risk identification exercise whether any risks should be escalated to the corporate Risk Register. • Consider ADP risks and implement a process for ensuring these are routinely reviewed by the programme	Y	H	Ongoing

				Y	L	29/03/24
		As per the Operational Plan, ADPs are responsible for creating and holding individual Risk Registers, which the WMCA retain the right to request. The programme team do not hold copies of these registers, but would be prepared to use as a mechanism in order to assist in performance management approach of ADPs, where that may become necessary. This is a missed opportunity, not just to gain insight of both ADPs perspective of programme risk, but also enabling ADP risk escalation where appropriate. The programme team was in receipt of both signed Funding Agreements at the time of the Health Check. However, no risk items were included within the register which identified the intrinsic risk of those Funding Agreements not being returned. Although this would now be seen as a closed risk, its absence suggests the risk management process is not as robust as it could be for this programme.	• Ensure there is a dedicated forum/agenda item, both on an interim basis (current) and following the implementation of the Steering Group, for the consideration and management of programme level risks. • Detail when and where risks will be regularly discussed, reviewed, and escalated for both scenarios. For internal benefit provide those details within the Operational Plan.			
3.	Planning & Scheduling	Processes for the delivery of programme outputs are working effectively, including Monitoring and Evaluation, reporting, claims and payment cycles. Furthermore, the Programme Schedule is mutually understood between WMCA and ADPs. However, there is no coherent exit strategy for the ADPs, which will be vital for the WMCA to effectively close the programme and monitor the achievement of benefits. The Operational Plan outlines the responsibility for the creation of exit strategy falling to the ADPs; however, these must still be assessed by the WMCA for appropriateness. There is a lack of documented handover planning across the programme. Currently the programme is operating under a form of 'continuity plan', whilst key programme team roles are still vacant. The programme is performing well, however there is a potential risk of ineffective knowledge transfer and retention during this period. There is a need to safeguard programme intelligence.	Develop Exit Strategy plans/documents with ADPs, and the process of formal review for their appropriateness. Given that the programme's current phase will end with the 2024/25 fiscal year at the latest, preparatory work should begin in earnest. Develop a more robust process for programme handover activity. This will need to effectively consider all key programme posts and will protect the WMCA in a scenario where personnel were to leave the programme environment. Linked to Risk Recommendation (2) [bullet point 4] of this report, where mitigation activity dictates, include plans for management of SPODs. This should be included within the Operational Plan. Whilst considering the wider Planning and Scheduling theme for programme activity, attention should also be given to the scenario where the programme were to continue past the current end date. The programme team may wish to invite the retender of ADPs, dependent on overall performance. In the context of further devolution arrangements, it is possible that additional funding could be redeployed to the TiW programme and/or the preservation of key programme activities beyond 2024/25, which may warrant a revised procurement approach for ADP selection.	Y	L	29/03/24

4.	Organisation Capability & Culture	Although there are provisions in place for escalation and key programme decisions to be taken, the implementation of a dedicated Steering Group to make and report key programme decisions, is planned for the programme. The Steering Group is not yet formed and no definitive timeline for this action could be provided at the time of the Health Check. No Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Steering Group were available for review, although it is acknowledged that efforts to move the Steering Group formation forward had been impacted by external factors, such as wider planned changes to governance and decision-making processes across the directorate.	Develop and agree ToR for the programme's Steering Group, to facilitate convening regular, formal programme meetings, so that dedicated decision-making arrangements are clear and documented. Work with the Programme Assurance and Appraisal Team (specifically Serena Dhanoa-Rashid the Programme Appraisal Manager) to include detail within the ToR of how the Steering Group will manage Change Requests and how this aligns to the WMCA Change Control process and defined accountability and responsibility. This is especially important where the DWP may wish to revise its expectations around programme delivery, which it retains the right to do so. Define within the ToR the alignment of the Programme Steering Group and the following: • Proposed Health Equity Advisory Council to be chaired by the mayor. • ESC Designated Sign Off (DSO) meeting. • Programme Board (being implemented by the WMCA Governance team).	Y	M	31/01/24
5.	Organisation Capability & Culture	It is clear when considering various phases of the programme to date, that there are key lessons and insights of value to be collated. Examples of this nature include: • the creation and application of back-to-back funding agreements; • ADPs proceeding into delivery on behalf of the WMCA without fully robust agreements; and • the management of that delivery for example. Insights from the delivery of prior TiW phases, will likely have a wider application on other ESC programmes of delivery, including the TiW's approach taken to monitoring, evaluation and reporting process. The WMCA approach to these elements has been identified as 'Best Practice' by DWP and subsequently rolled out, as the chosen approach to other TiW programmes nationally.	Create a dedicated Lessons Leaned Log for the Programme. Allocate and agree an appropriate forum to populate, review and take responsibility for this Lessons Learned log. This would likely be the proposed Steering Group. Include any pertinent detail into the newly development log, following the DWPs local review of the Programme, which took place in late November into early December 2023.	Y	L	31/01/04

6.	Finance	The programme team are in the process of developing a formal Change Request to be progressed through the SAF. This was delayed until the return of both Funding Agreements, which contain output profiles. A draft version of the Change Request report was reviewed during the Health Check which appeared to highlight a financial discrepancy between the total funding available to the programme, when compared with other programme documentation.	Work with Finance colleagues to clarify the programme surplus of circa £59k over the two remaining fiscal years, when reconciling the maximum ADP payment allocations within both the agreed Funding Agreements and WMCA programme management top slice figure.	Y	L	15/04/24
7.	Perfomance	Although it is acknowledged that ADPs are contributing to a programme which is essentially performing above target (to date) in terms of outputs, the TiW programme understanding of Outcomes and Benefits is not well documented. Currently, Outputs are being achieved, to the satisfaction of DWP who designed the scope of the programme, and which follows tried and tested methods to engage with those out of work; however, the Benefits are not being captured.	Work with the WMCA Business Improvement Team (specifically, Jaspal Seehra - Performance Manager) to create a dedicated Benefits Realisation Plan for the Programme. This will need to consider the programme Logic Model (TiW – theory of change), and Case Data within the Programme Dashboard around the TiW users longer term.	Y	M	Ongoing
8.	Stakeholder Comms Engagement	No evidence was found of any WMCA led engagement with target groups or users of the TiW service. There was some limited user information contained within the live dashboard. User experiences and qualitative feedback would provide beneficial information for lessons learnt (linked to recommendation 5 above) and future strategic propositions.	Consider opportunities to gather more qualitative data directly from service users and target groups. This could be fed into the live dashboard, as necessary.	Y	L	29/02/24

SRO response:

1. **Client Scope**

These key logs will be developed to be used on an ongoing basis throughout the remainder of the programme. In the absence of an original Business Case, from which some of the key programme level assumptions would have been drawn, the logs will reflect high level themes. Once developed, their ongoing review can be included in the future IPSPC accountable body or steering group's agenda. Development of these logs will begin by end of January 2024.

2. **Risks**

The risk register format currently used by IPSPC is the ESC template which has been signed off. Work has also commenced across ESHC Directorate regarding improved risk management. The Project Manager responsible for this workstream will be arranging update and development training with Peter Estrella for all programme leads to ensure parity of risk identification, assessment, scoring and management.

The newly formed ESHC Performance Panel made up of Exec Director ESHC, Senior ESHC Officers and Corporate M&E representation will review red rated programme risks at the quarterly panel sessions. Programme level risks are also included within the Directorate DSO which meets monthly and has attendance from Legal & Finance present.

Moving forward, there is an opportunity to request submissions of ADP Risk Registers as referred to in the Operational Plan. These will be submitted on a quarterly basis alongside ADP's quarterly funding claims. These will take the same format as is included within other programme's quarterly submissions. ADPs will be notified of this in January 2024, with the first formal submission taking place for Q4 (15th of April2024).

3. **Planning & Scheduling**

The development of an Exit Strategy and associated plans and documents with ADPs will form the first part of the Delivery Manager's workstreams once they are recruited. Raising this with ADPs at this stage may instigate queries regarding future funding availability, which we are not in a position to confirm at this stage. As the work on single settlement develops a clearer picture can be provided. In the interim the newly appointed Delivery Manager can support commencement of this work with ADP's around contingencies, participant management and any changes to communication with external stakeholders.

4. **Organisation Capability & Culture**

A draft TOR for the steering group has been developed, however work is now underway to adapt this to better align to other steering groups currently under development across the WMCA. There is an opportunity to merge existing concepts for an IPSPC steering group and a 'labour market participation and into work support' thematic panel to avoid duplication and enable synergy across the WMCA. The provisional working title for this group will be 'Health and Labour Market Participation Panel' and members will primarily focus on its eponymous themes. Once this is further developed, work can get underway with the programme assurance team to ensure relevant detail regarding change requests is included in the ToR.

5. **Organisation Capability & Culture**

Please refer to point 1.

6. **Finance**

The surplus of circa £59k has been identified to WMCA finance and has primarily arisen from a slight difference between the internal IPSPC budget for 2 years and the original high level budget profile submitted by WMCA to DWP as part of the bidding process. There is an opportunity for this £59k to be reprofiled into the IPSPC budget to ensure all available funding is invested into the programme. An approach for managing this surplus will be agreed by the time of the Q4 WMCA Spend Claim submission to DWP.

7. **Performance**

Work has already commenced across ESHC Directorate on benefits realisation across programmes, headed up by Lisa Hamilton, Senior Delivery Manager Projects & Programmes, Wil Tonkiss, Insight and Performance Manager and Miguel Silva, Senior Delivery Manager Adult Education, in line with moving towards the single settlement. This work for Thrive into Work IPSPC will form part of the wider scope and therefore an update will be provided to the Assurance team at the next follow up point.

8. **Stakeholder Comms Engagement**

Some qualitative data is collected across the programme through the form of case study submissions by ADPs monthly. There is an opportunity to work more closely with the communications team to fully utilise these case studies, as well as build insights from them into ongoing reporting. An evaluation of the IPSPC programme will also get underway in year 2 of delivery and will include a focus on collection of qualitive data through interviews, workshops, and other methods. A strategy for utilising qualitive data will get underway in the new year, commencing by 29th February 2024.

4. **Acknowledgements**

The Assurance Team would like to thank everyone who participated in this Health Check for their support and openness, which contributed to their understanding of the Thrive into Work Programme, and their review of the findings/recommendations presented to them.

The Assurance team would like to specially mention Ethan Williams for providing all required documentation for the review, being the main point of contact, and for the timely responses to queries from the Assurance team throughout the process. During the engagement meetings, all programme stakeholders provided positive feedback and high praise of Ethan and it was recognised by the Assurance team that Ethan is a valuable and dedicated Thrive into Work programme lead.

5. **Next assurance review**

It is recommended that a follow-up review to be held with both the Programme Delivery Manager and Project Manager (once in post), in order to assess progress with agreed recommendations, and agree any subsequent action.

Where these are key programme posts are not recruited to, or the planned approach to the management of programme activity has changed, a suitable substitute/s from within the Economic Delivery, Skills, and Communities (EDSC) Directorate, will be agreed between the Programme Assurance Team and Lisa Hamilton (Senior Delivery Manager, Projects, and Programmes).

The follow-up review will take place on Wednesday 17 April 2024

ANNEX A - List of programme stakeholders and SMEs who had an input into the assessment

The following stakeholders were consulted during the Health Check:

Name	Organisation and role
Ethan Williams	WMCA, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
Mani Dogra	WMCA, Management Accountant
Phil Cole	WMCA, Finance Business Partner
Lisa Hughes	WMCA, Delivery Manager – Projects & Programmes, Employment and Skills
Sarah George	Shaw Trust, Regional Manager *[Delivery Partner – LOTs 2,3,4]*
Will Pemberton	WMCA, Procurement Lead Officer
Tatum Matharu	WMCA, Strategic Lead for Health Inequalities
Peter Geach	WMCA, Interim Business Partner Solicitor
John Hall	WMCA, Senior Delivery Manager – Employment and Skill

ANNEX B - List of evidence reviewed

The following pieces of evidence were reviewed during the Health Check:

Evidence reviewed	Date Evidence received
2023.10.19 Thrive into Work IPSPC Grant Funding Agreement - Black Country Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
23.25 KPI Dashboard 091123 (LIVE) [MS EXCEL via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
BCWB HC 125 Shaw Trust TIW full-length-standard-contract-22-23-particulars. v0.2 (002) [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
BCWB HC 324 BCHFT TIW full-length-standard-contract-22-23-particulars. v0.2 (00B) [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
Black Country Healthcare Data Sharing Agreement v1 [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
DWP IPSPC MI & Spend Return Template [MS EXCEL via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
IPSPC Delivery Guidebook_V2.0_18.04.2023 (3) [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
IPSPC Grant Funding Agreement - West Midlands Combined Authority [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
Schedule 2 Operational Plan [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
Shaw Trust Data Sharing Agreement v1 [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
Thrive into Work - Theory of Change [PDF via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
Thrive into Work IPSPC Governance Structure [MS POWERPOINT via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
Thrive into Work IPSPC, WMCA Roles and Responsibilities v2[MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
TiW IPSPC Funding Agreement - Shaw Trust [PDF via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
TiW IPSPC Stakeholder Register [MS EXCEL via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
WMCA IPSPC Monthly MI Template [MS EXCEL via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
WMCA IPSPC Quarterly Claim Template [MS EXCEL via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
WMCA TiW IPSPC 23.25 Demographic Data Report - Q1 [PDF via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
WMCA TiW IPSPC 23.25 KPI Dashboard Report - Aug23 [PDF via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
WMCA TiW IPSPC 23.25 KPI Dashboard Report - July 2023 [PDF via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
WMCA TiW IPSPC 23.25 KPI Dashboard Report - Sept23 [PDF via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
WMCA TiW IPSPC 23.25 New KPI Dashboard Report - Headlines April23 [PDF via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
WMCA TiW IPSPC 23.25 New KPI Dashboard Report - June 2023 [PDF via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
WMCA TIW KPI DASHBOARD - May 2023 [PDF via SHAREPOINT]	13/11/23
TiW IPSPC ICB Underspend EW 241023 [MS EXCEL via SHAREPOINT]	14/11/23
Appendix A. TiW (2018-2023) Previous Programme Outline [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	14/11/23
Project *[Programme]* level Risk Register - Thrive Into Work [MS EXCEL via SHAREPOINT]	14/11/23
TiW IPSPC - SAF Change Form EW 040823 [MS WORD via SHAREPOINT]	14/11/23

It is important to note that documentation shown as accessed 'via SHAREPOINT', is subject to change from when previously accessed by reviewers during the Health Check process.