



## HMIC Inspection Report

### Cleveland Police

October 2007



*Cleveland Police – HMIC Inspection Report*

*October 2007*

**ISBN: 978-1-84726-449-7**

**CROWN COPYRIGHT**

**FIRST PUBLISHED 2007**

## **Contents**

### **Introduction to HMIC Inspections**

Programmed frameworks  
Risk-based frameworks  
The grading process  
Developing practice  
Future HMIC inspection activity

### **Force Overview and Context**

Geographical description of force area  
Demographic profile of force area  
Strategic priorities  
Force developments since 2006

## **Findings**

### **National summary of judgements**

### **Force summary of judgements**

### **Neighbourhood Policing**

### **Performance Management**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Overview**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Domestic Violence**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Public Protection**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons**

## **Recommendations**

## **Appendix: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations**

## Introduction to HMIC Inspections

For a century and a half, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) has been charged with examining and improving the efficiency of the police service in England and Wales, with the first HM Inspectors (HMIs) being appointed under the provisions of the County and Borough Police Act 1856. In 1962, the Royal Commission on the Police formally acknowledged HMIC's contribution to policing.

HMIs are appointed by the Crown on the recommendation of the Home Secretary and report to HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary, who is the Home Secretary's principal professional policing adviser and is independent both of the Home Office and of the police service. HMIC's principal statutory duties are set out in the Police Act 1996. For more information, please visit HMIC's website at <http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/>.

In 2006, HMIC conducted a broad assessment of all 43 Home Office police forces in England and Wales, examining 23 areas of activity. This baseline assessment had followed a similar process in 2005 and has thus created a rich evidence base of strengths and weaknesses across the country. However, it is now necessary for HMIC to focus its inspection effort on those areas of policing that are not data-rich and where qualitative assessment is the only feasible way of judging both current performance and the prospects for improvement. This, together with the critical factor that HMIC should concentrate its scrutiny on high-risk areas of policing – in terms of risk both to the public and to the service's reputation – pointed inexorably to a focus on what are known collectively as 'protective services'. In addition, there is a need to apply professional judgement to some key aspects of leadership and governance, where some quantitative measures exist but a more rounded assessment is appropriate.

Having reached this view internally, HMIC then consulted key stakeholders, including the Home Office, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and the Association of Police Authorities (APA). A consensus emerged that HMIC could add greater value by undertaking fewer but more probing inspections. Stakeholders concurred with the emphasis on protective services but requested that Neighbourhood Policing remain a priority for inspection until there is evidence that it has been embedded in everyday police work.

HMIC uses a rigorous and transparent methodology to conduct its inspections and reach conclusions and judgements. All evidence will be gathered, verified and then assessed against an agreed set of national standards, in the form of specific grading criteria (SGC). However, the main purpose of inspection is not to make judgements but to drive improvements in policing. Both professional and lay readers are urged, therefore, to focus not on the headline grades but on the opportunities for improvement identified within the text of this report.

### Programmed frameworks

This report contains assessments of the first three key areas of policing to be inspected under HMIC's new programme of work:

1. Neighbourhood Policing;
2. performance management; and
3. protecting vulnerable people.

Neighbourhood Policing has been inspected not only because it is a key government priority but also, and more importantly, because it addresses a fundamental need for a style of policing that is rooted in and responds to local concerns. The police service must, of course, offer protection from high-level threats such as terrorism and organised criminality, but it

also has a key role in tackling the unacceptable behaviour of the minority of people who threaten the quality of life of law-abiding citizens.

Performance management is an activity largely hidden from public view, although members of the public are directly affected by poor performance on the part of their local force. This inspection has focused on the need for forces to maximise the opportunities for performance improvement. It also posed questions as to whether forces have an accurate picture of how they are doing and a capability to respond to changing priorities. This area was selected for inspection because it is a key factor in delivering good performance across the board.

Protecting vulnerable people covers four related areas – child abuse, domestic violence, public protection and missing persons – that address the critically important role of the police in protecting the public from potentially serious harm. In the 2006 baseline assessment this was the worst performing area and raised the most serious concerns for HMIC and others. As a result, this area was prioritised for scrutiny in 2007.

### **Risk-based frameworks**

In addition to its programmed inspection work, HMIC continues to monitor performance across a range of policing activity, notably those areas listed in the table below.

<b>HMIC risk-based frameworks</b>
Fairness and equality in service delivery
Volume crime reduction
Volume crime investigation
Improving forensic performance
Criminal justice processes
Reducing anti-social behaviour
Contact management
Training, development and organisational learning

While these activities will not be subject to routine inspection, evidence of a significant decline in performance would prompt consideration of inspection. For 150 years, HMIC has maintained an ongoing relationship with every force. This allows it to identify and support forces when specific issues of concern arise. On a more formal basis, HMIC participates in the Home Office Police Performance Steering Group and Joint Performance Review Group, which have a role in monitoring and supporting police performance in crime reduction, crime investigation and public confidence.

HMIC conducts inspections of basic command units (BCUs), also on a risk-assessed basis, using the Going Local 3 methodology. Combining these various strands of inspection evidence allows HMIC to form a comprehensive picture of both individual force performance and the wider national picture.

## The grading process

Grades awarded by HMIC are a reflection of the performance delivered by the force over the assessment period April 2006 to July 2007. One of four grades can be awarded, according to performance assessed against the SGC (for the full list of SGC, see <http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/methodologies/baseline-introduction/ba-methodology-06/?version=1>).

### *Excellent*

This grade describes the highest level of performance in service delivery and achieving full compliance with codes of practice or national guidance. It is expected that few forces will achieve this very high standard for a given activity. To achieve Excellent, forces are expected to meet **all** of the criteria set out in the Fair SGC and the vast majority of those set out in Good. In addition, two other factors will attract consideration of an Excellent grade:

- The force should be recognised, or be able to act, as a ‘beacon’ to others, and be accepted within the service as a source of leading-edge practice. Evidence that other forces have successfully imported practices would demonstrate this.
- HMIC is committed to supporting innovation and we would expect Excellent forces to have introduced and evaluated new ways of delivering or improving performance.

### *Good*

Good is defined in the Collins English Dictionary as ‘of a high quality or level’ and denotes performance above the minimum standard. To reach this level, forces have to meet in full the criteria set out in Fair and most of the criteria set out in Good.

### *Fair*

Fair is the delivery of an acceptable level of service, which meets national threshold standards where these exist. To achieve a Fair grading, forces must meet all of the significant criteria set out in the Fair SGC. HMIC would expect that, across most activities, the largest number of grades will be awarded at this level.

### *Poor*

A Poor grade represents an unacceptably low level of service. To attract this very critical grade, a force will have fallen well short of a significant number of criteria set out in the SGC for Fair. In some cases, failure to achieve a single critical criterion may alone warrant a Poor grade. Such dominant criteria will always be flagged in the SGC but may also reflect a degree of professional judgement on the level of risk being carried by the force.

## Developing practice

In addition to assessing force performance, one of HMIC’s key roles is to identify and share good practice across the police service. Much good practice is identified as HMIC conducts its assessments and is reflected as a strength in the body of the report. In addition, each force is given the opportunity to submit examples of its good practice. HMIC has selected three or more of these examples to publish in this report. The key criteria for each example are that the work has been evaluated by the force and the good practice is easily transferable to other forces (each force has provided a contact name and telephone number or email address, should further information be required). HMIC has not conducted any independent evaluation of the examples of good practice provided.

October 2007

### **Future HMIC inspection activity**

Although HMIC will continue to maintain a watching brief on all performance areas, its future inspection activity (see provisional timescales below) will be determined by a risk assessment process. Protective services will be at the core of inspection programmes, tailored to capacity, capability and the likelihood of exposure to threats from organised criminality, terrorism and so on. Until its full implementation in April 2008, Neighbourhood Policing will also demand attention. Conversely, those areas (such as volume crime) where performance is captured by statutory performance indicators (SPIs), iQuanta and other objective evidence will receive scrutiny only where performance is deteriorating, as described above.

The Government has announced that, in real terms, there will be little or no growth in police authority/force budgets over the next three years. Forces will therefore have to maintain, and in some areas improve, performance without additional central support or funding. This in itself creates a risk to police delivery and HMIC has therefore included a strategic resource management assessment for all forces in its future inspection programme.

<b>Planned Inspection areas</b>
Serious and organised crime
Major crime
Neighbourhood Policing
Strategic resource management
Customer service and accessibility
Critical incident management
Professional standards
Public order
Civil contingencies
Information management
Strategic roads policing
Leadership

## Force Overview and Context

### Geographical description of force area

The Cleveland Police area covers approximately 595 square kilometres and has a population of more than 554,600. The force area is divided into four policing BCUs, known locally as policing districts. There are four unitary local authorities (Hartlepool, Redcar and Cleveland, Stockton and Middlesbrough) within the force area and their boundaries are coterminous with the BCUs.

The force is responsible for policing a predominantly urban, densely populated area, closely resembling metropolitan authorities in socioeconomic characteristics and policing needs. Cleveland Police is considered to be most similar to the geographic areas currently policed by Merseyside, South Yorkshire, West Yorkshire, West Midlands and Northumbria. This comparison highlights the urban and distinct nature of the Cleveland area.

There are two prisons within the force area, HMP Kirkclevington and HMP Holme House. The former prepares long-term detainees for release back into the community, while the latter, built to Category A standard, acts as a local holding establishment for more than 800 inmates.

The Cleveland area is a major production centre for the chemical industry which results in the large-scale transportation by road, rail and sea of hazardous substances. The chemical industry remains a key economic factor and presents the force, other emergency services and partners with a significant major incident risk. In addition, there is a nuclear power station at Hartlepool, while Teesport remains one of the busiest commercial ports in the British Isles (in terms of tonnage).

The force's rural fringes border the North Yorkshire Moors, offering great beauty and scope for leisure activities. The industrial heart of the area has a strong infrastructure that is well served by the transport network, including an international airport. The area supports many leisure facilities including premier league and first division football. Each of the four districts hosts town centres that offer quality shopping by day and a lively night-time economy. The coastline includes the highest sea cliffs in England and part of the Captain Cook heritage trail.

### Demographic profile of force area

The Cleveland Police area accommodates a population of more than 554,600. The area is considered to be one of the most densely populated locations in the country, with 9.3 people per hectare compared with a national average of 3.5 people per hectare. In Middlesbrough, this figure rises to 25.6 people per hectare. In terms of the social and cultural diversity, the 2001 census results showed that the resident black and minority ethnic (BME) population was estimated to be 1.9%, the majority of which live in Middlesbrough. This compares with 2.8% and 2.4% for the Tees Valley sub region and the north east region.

In addition to being urban in nature, parts of the area are considered to be highly deprived. All four territorial districts have large areas of socioeconomic deprivation; 34 of the 88 wards in the force area are in the top 10% of the most socially deprived wards in the country (2005 data). The unemployment rate is 3.5% compared with a Tees Valley average of 3.4% and a north east regional average of 2.9%.

On 22 February 2007, the force employed 1,706 police officers, 707 police staff, 118 police community support officers (PCSOs) and there were 172 special constables (SCs). The force is committed to maintaining police officer numbers. Police officers will be redeployed,

October 2007

where appropriate, to front-line duties, and the police family will be broadened to include more PCSOs and SCs as well as community safety accreditation schemes.

The new district headquarters in Redcar and Cleveland and Middlesbrough and new police offices in South Bank and Redcar are open. These facilities have increased cell capacity and improved working practices, providing better access for the public and promoting community policing.

The annual revenue budget for the force (2007/08) is set at £119.38 million. Financial management and budgets within Cleveland Police are devolved to the most appropriate level.

### **Strategic priorities**

The vision for Cleveland Police is 'Putting People First' which is about delivering the best service possible to the people of Cleveland, while the aim of the Cleveland Police Authority is to see Cleveland Police become one of the top performing police forces in the country by 2010.

The combined corporate policing strategy 2007–10 and local policing plan (LPP) 2007/08 identify Cleveland's strategic policing objectives, namely:

- to provide a safer Cleveland police area;
- to ensure fewer people are affected by anti-social behaviour (ASB) and alcohol-related disorder;
- to provide a citizen-focused service; and
- to combat terrorism, serious and organised crime.

The local policing priorities for 2007/08 are:

- to tackle violent crime;
- to tackle ASB and alcohol-related disorder;
- to develop Neighbourhood Policing; and
- to tackle drugs.

### **Force developments since 2006**

The management structure of the force remains unchanged since the last inspection; however, strategic portfolios have been realigned between the deputy chief constable (DCC) and assistant chief constables (ACCs) to improve their insight into the whole force and for personal development.

The force has been working closely with Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) to improve the one area identified as 'Poor' in the last inspection (baseline 2006), namely training. This remains an area of concern, especially given the long-term implications of unsatisfactory training provision. At the time of this inspection the force had not yet achieved the necessary standard in this area of business. The force continues to work closely with specialist staff officers from HMIC in order to address the identified issues. Other highlighted 'areas for improvement' in the 2006 inspection have been included in monitored action plans in order to achieve continuous improvement, and the force has made satisfactory progress in these areas.

Force performance has improved when comparing the fiscal period 2006/07 with 2005/06 with an overall reduction of 4.9% in total crime, a reduction of 19% in robbery, 15% in burglary, 12% in vehicle crime, 3.7% in violent crime and an overall sanction detection rate

of 29.3%. The force is well placed in comparison with its most similar forces (MSF). Co-ordinated high-profile operations to tackle drug distribution, such as Sabre, have been carried out successfully.

The quality of service commitment (QoSC) was introduced in November 2006 and a series of workshops has been held to promote and develop the vision 'Putting People First'.

Financial difficulties encountered by the force in recent years have been overcome and proposals have been agreed which will see the force achieving the highest number of police officers in their history during 2007/08. The force continues to work with partners to significantly increase the number of PCSOs.

Neighbourhood Policing has been rolled out across the whole force with every community benefiting from a dedicated, accessible and visible policing team.

## Findings

### National summary of judgements

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
<b>Neighbourhood Policing</b>				
Neighbourhood Policing	6	14	21	2
<b>Performance management</b>				
Performance management	6	29	8	0
<b>Protecting vulnerable people</b>				
Child abuse	3	17	21	2
Domestic violence	1	13	27	2
Public protection	2	16	23	2
Missing persons	1	21	21	0

### Force summary of judgements

<b>Neighbourhood Policing</b>	<b>Grade</b>
Neighbourhood Policing	<b>Fair</b>
<b>Performance management</b>	<b>Grade</b>
Performance management	<b>Good</b>
<b>Protecting vulnerable people</b>	<b>Grade</b>
Child abuse	<b>Fair</b>
Domestic violence	<b>Fair</b>
Public protection	<b>Good</b>
Missing persons	<b>Good</b>

October 2007

## Neighbourhood Policing

GRADE	FAIR
-------	------

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6	14	21	2

### National contextual factors

The national Neighbourhood Policing programme was launched by ACPO in April 2005 to support the Government's vision of a policing service which is both accessible and responsive to the needs of local people. It was anticipated that, by April 2007, every area across England and Wales would have a Neighbourhood Policing presence appropriate to local needs, with all Neighbourhood Policing teams in place by April 2008. For local communities this means:

- increased numbers of PCSOs patrolling their streets, addressing ASB and building relationships with local people;
- access both to information about policing in their local area and to a point of contact in their Neighbourhood Policing team; and
- having the opportunity to tell the police about the issues that are causing them concern and helping to shape the response to those issues (Home Office, May 2006).

By focusing on the key areas of resources, familiarity/accessibility, problem identification and joint problem solving, this inspection has identified the extent to which Neighbourhood Policing is being implemented. It has also examined forces' capability and commitment to sustain implementation beyond April 2008.

### Contextual factors

Cleveland Police is committed to the development of Neighbourhood Policing. It has taken a phased approach to the introduction, adopting a first pilot site in Hartlepool police district which started in April 2006. The chief officer group (COG) was keen to fully assess the results from Hartlepool and identify best practice prior to expanding the model force-wide.

In Cleveland the Neighbourhood Policing model has four main principles, namely:

**Access** – to have dedicated officers patrolling areas or neighbourhoods. Officers will be available to any member of the public who wants to speak to them.

**Influence** – the public will be in a position where they can genuinely say that the police are driven by their local concerns and not just the concerns of central and local government.

**Interventions** – the public will see joint action and closer links with the police and partner agencies. The neighbourhood strategy will expect and demand that police and agencies work closer together.

October 2007

**Answers** – the public will know the results of police–partnership activity. If officers receive a call for assistance, people should receive feedback as to what has happened.

The Hartlepool pilot or ‘pathfinder site’ has the full support of the local authority and has proved a success with partners, communities and officers alike. Many of the initial misgivings and apprehension have given way to a high level of support from all sides. The commitment of the senior management team to the concept of Neighbourhood Policing is palpable and this has spread throughout the district, instilling in staff at all levels a confidence that this style of policing will work in Hartlepool. Independent evaluation and a recent MORI poll identified two significant findings:

1. The percentage of residents who have a great deal/fair amount of trust in the local police had risen from 57% in 2002 to 70% in January 2007.
2. The percentage of residents satisfied/very satisfied with the quality of service from the police had risen from 47% in 2002 to 66% in January 2007.

These are impressive results and serve as evidence of the success of Neighbourhood Policing in the pathfinder site.

Middlesbrough district was the next to go live in September 2006, while Redcar & Cleveland district and Stockton were the last in April 2007 – albeit Stockton already had an advanced form of community policing which dovetailed neatly with the neighbourhood model. As a result it is too early to assess if the move to Neighbourhood Policing will be as effective as it currently appears in Hartlepool. The early signs, however, are encouraging.

PCSOs, who are supervised by neighbourhood sergeants, are an integral part of the Neighbourhood Policing model in Cleveland. Financial difficulties in the past (which have now been overcome, although significant pressure remains given HM Treasury’s tight fiscal settlement in the medium term) and a significant reduction in the number of PCSOs funded by the Home Office has delayed recruitment, but it is anticipated that 166 will be in place by September 2007, with the remaining 31 recruited by January 2008 to bring the force up to the full complement of 197. They have a wide range of powers but the Chief Constable has yet to authorise a power of detention.

The Neighbourhood Policing model, which has developed across the force area having evolved from the pathfinder site experience in Hartlepool, is for each local authority ward (of which there are 88 within the 4 council areas) to be designated as a neighbourhood for policing purposes. A minimum of one police officer is allocated to each ward apart from a very limited number of exceptions where due to their small physical size two wards are conjoined for efficiency and effectiveness. It is proposed that when recruitment of PCSOs is complete there will be a minimum of one staff member allocated to each ward. Some neighbourhoods in the larger conurbations have more officers and PCSOs posted to each ward, but this is assessed rationally and resources are allocated according to workload, socio-demographics and deprivation. Neighbourhoods are often grouped in to larger units for supervisory purposes; this is common in many forces.

There is still an absence of national guidance in relation to qualitative performance measures for Neighbourhood Policing. As a result, forces are starting to develop their own suite of indicators. This national issue should be addressed as soon as possible.

As part of the inspection process a small, random telephone survey of 100 households was undertaken in Hartlepool, to provide a snapshot of how Neighbourhood Policing is

October 2007

embedded in the BCU. All forces in England and Wales were surveyed and the same methodology was used with the test site being the pathfinder BCU or a BCU nominated by the force. The table below shows the results for Hartlepool when compared with the national average across a number of questions. Green shading indicates that the results obtained were statistically significant and outside the expected range.

Question	% positive answers	National average range
<b>Q.1.</b> All police forces have put in place local teams, consisting of police community support officers and others to deal with problems of most concern to the public. Are you aware of a neighbourhood team, neighbourhood police officer or police community support officer in your area?	70.2	49.3 – 52.2
<b>Q.2.</b> Do you know how to make contact with any of the police team who work in your local area?	59.8	54.9 – 56.3
<b>Q.3.</b> From what you know, are the local police speaking to local people about tackling problems in your area?	68.9	53.1 – 54.8
<b>Q.4.</b> How much effort do the police in your local area put into finding out what people think? Would you say they put in (a lot/some/none)?	82.6	64.1 – 67.2
<b>Q.5.</b> How much say do you think local people have over what the police do to tackle problems in your local area? Would you say they have (a lot/some/none)?	74.2	66.3 – 69.2
<b>Q.6.</b> How much opportunity do you think there is for local people to work with the police to help tackle problems in your local area? Would you say there is (a lot/some/none)?	88.8	75.8 – 78.4

This is a very positive result for Hartlepool and mirrors the excellent results from the other independent survey undertaken by MORI. Her Majesty’s Inspector (HMI) is very pleased to note the results and wishes to congratulate all the staff in Hartlepool for their work in delivering Neighbourhood Policing in their district. As this style of policing is extended to the rest of Cleveland it is hoped the results can be replicated in the other three districts.

Overall HMI is pleased with the way Neighbourhood Policing is developing in Cleveland and with the enthusiasm and commitment displayed by the local authorities. The roll-out is slower than in some other forces, but HMI is convinced that the force is developing this style of policing effectively and looks forward to future assessments when it is hoped the whole force will be as developed as Hartlepool.

## Strengths

- Both the corporate policing strategy 2007–10 and the LPP 2007/08 confirm the force's commitment to embed the concept of Neighbourhood Policing.
- The ACC corporate development (CD) is the nominated ACPO lead for the implementation of Neighbourhood Policing, although operational responsibility for the four districts rests with the ACC territorial (T). The COG as a whole is committed to Neighbourhood Policing; as a result, the split in responsibility has not presented any difficulties. Neighbourhood Policing is the operational delivery mechanism for the Chief Constable's vision of 'Putting People First' and is central to both the force strategy and annual policing plan. All staff interviewed were committed to the philosophy of Neighbourhood Policing and determined to see it succeed in Cleveland.
- Corporate governance for the project is provided through a force-level project board chaired by the ACC (CD). This is supplemented by district project boards in each of the force's operational BCUs, chaired by the relevant district commander. The project as a whole is run in accordance with Projects in Controlled Environments 2 (PRINCE2) methodology, with a former chief superintendent engaged as project manager.
- The force project board contains a range of participants from all service units (headquarters departments) and districts, with a number of workstreams being led by the relevant service unit manager (SUM), eg crime and operations, information technology and training. Chief inspectors, who have responsibility for the implementation of Neighbourhood Policing in each district, also sit on the force project board, representing the district commanders.
- There is a timetable in place which will deliver full roll-out and staffing of both police officers and PCSOs by September 2007. As part of its role, the board actively seeks to identify and spread learning derived both 'in house' and from elsewhere to enhance the provision and roll-out of Neighbourhood Policing across the force area. There are no plans to disband the project team at this stage; indeed it is being maintained to ensure that effective evaluation is undertaken and any problems, corporate or local, are resolved effectively.
- The police authority (PA) is represented on the project board and plays an active role in developing Neighbourhood Policing. It is content with the pace of development and accepts that there will be variations to the model across the force area but given the differing political landscape this is seen as inevitable. It is an active participant in the governance process; among other initiatives, it is seeking to develop the concept of using volunteers within Neighbourhood Policing context. This would be a forcewide initiative building on the work currently being undertaken within the Redcar and Cleveland district where volunteers have been utilised for front-office duties for some time.
- As well as chairing the force project and driving the implementation, the ACC (CD) gauges the mood of the organisation through regular informal meetings with staff. Particularly well received has been the regular informal meeting with representatives of PCSOs posted to neighbourhoods to obtain a better understanding of their role and identify and address any areas of concern.

October 2007

- There is evidence across the organisation that Neighbourhood Policing is becoming pivotal in underpinning the delivery of policing services. The excellent qualitative results in Hartlepool found both by MORI and by the results of a small telephone survey undertaken for this inspection when considered alongside iQuanta data across a range of quantitative data are very encouraging. The same commitment to Neighbourhood Policing is in evidence elsewhere and this bodes well for the future.
- There is an effective external approach to communication, with evidence of consultation and feedback being provided. The strategy has four defined strands, ie access, influence, intervention and answers, and in the pilot BCU all households were leafleted explaining the strategy and identifying the nominated officers/PCSO within the ward and providing contact telephone numbers. Internally, staff from the pathfinder district are assisting to communicate the Neighbourhood Policing philosophy and pass on lessons learnt to the other districts in relation to effective communication. The force project board is assessing what worked well in the pathfinder and promulgating best practice.
- Local telephone numbers have been publicised for people wishing to contact their neighbourhood officers or PCSOs. In order to maintain command and control (C&C) and identify if these calls require an immediate response, all calls are routed to call takers instead of being directed straight to the relevant officer. The call takers can identify the geographical origin of the call and respond accordingly. A decision is then made regarding the priority of the call and if the officer or PCSO is on duty, the call can be directed to them immediately via the airwave radio system. This ensures an accurate record is kept of the call or potential incident and gives a better understanding of the workload of neighbourhood staff.
- While the vision of the Chief Constable is that there will be one named constable allocated to and responsible for each local authority ward across the force area, those wards where deprivation indices confirm the need for additional resource have been allocated further officers on a pro rata basis. The allocation of PCSOs will follow a similar model.
- The force is contributing regular monthly data to the ACPO tracking process that is monitoring the development of Neighbourhood Policing. As at 1 May 2007, the percentage of all staff allocated to Neighbourhood Policing was 15.56%. This will rise incrementally to almost 18% in two stages, with the additional 25 PCSOs being recruited by September 2007 and the final tranche of 21 being in place by January 2008.
- There is a strong abstraction policy in place that covers both spontaneous and pre-planned events, clearly driven from chief officer level, which seeks to minimise the withdrawal of Neighbourhood Policing staff from their wards. Confirmation was received from various levels that the policy is strictly applied with an exception report being mandatory where Neighbourhood Policing staff are subject to abstraction. Such instances are very infrequent, which is appreciated by neighbourhood staff and partners alike. Abstraction is to be monitored as part of a suite of performance indicators (PIs) currently being developed.
- Neighbourhood Policing staff are expected to investigate only those crimes appropriate to their role which occur within their neighbourhood, eg criminal damage. These are not routinely allocated but there was evidence of staff volunteering to take relevant crime reports and unallocated incidents. Evidence is emerging that

October 2007

response officers in particular are starting to appreciate and understand the role of Neighbourhood Policing colleagues.

- The force monthly performance review (MPR) process is sophisticated and embedded at individual and team level. This ensures effective accountability and monitoring of objectives. Confirmation was received from various levels that this had been introduced without great cultural resistance and was being applied consistently. Staff workloads are monitored by supervision via the MPR process.
- The neighbourhood structure was determined following consultation with partners and the local authorities, and there was agreement that the existing ward boundaries were the most pragmatic solution to dovetail in with other local authority structures. Aligning to residents' associations was considered in the pilot site but this was impractical for two reasons, namely the lack of complete coverage and the number of groups (55), which would not have been practical to service. Once established and working effectively in the pathfinder site the three other districts came to similar arrangements with their own local authorities.
- Despite the absence of an overarching corporate community engagement strategy, local priorities are successfully being identified within neighbourhoods in consultation with partners, residents' associations and community groups. Innovative approaches are being adopted such as visual audits and street surveys. In some districts, regular meetings with community groups every six weeks are being used as opportunities to provide feedback. In Hartlepool community consultation and feedback has been deemed so important that an officer has been allocated with this specific remit. This has been seen as a positive innovation and does not detract from the need for other staff to provide feedback. The role is one of co-ordinating feedback across the district and ensuring it has been provided.
- There is very strong support for the Neighbourhood Policing philosophy from partners and other strategic groups from across the force area. There is an obvious willingness on the part of key agencies to be involved in the delivery of Neighbourhood Policing and become involved in initiatives such as joint action groups (JAGs). These have been established and are working in each district. (In Redcar and Cleveland there is also an area environmental committee, in addition to the JAG, which focuses on the local authority's 'cleaner greener' agenda.) Even where there has been historical resistance to fully embrace partnership working such as with the health service in certain areas, recent changes in management have brought about a new desire to embrace joint working. In many neighbourhoods and districts the good working relations are exemplified by the commitment to joint tasking and problem solving.
- Neighbourhood profiles have been developed and are being utilised across the force area. They are 'live documents', constantly refreshed and are used as part of the National Intelligence Model (NIM) and problem-solving processes. They are further developed in the pathfinder site but that is to be expected given the timetable for embedding Neighbourhood Policing.
- Districts have undertaken self-assessments using HMIC's *Going Local 3* template as a means of self-improvement. Independent surveys have been undertaken such as the MORI poll in Hartlepool, and the advice of the national Neighbourhood Policing team has been sought in an effort to identify best practice nationally and to

implement appropriate initiatives within Cleveland.

### Work in progress

- The full complement of 197 PCSOs has not yet been achieved. However, the recruitment process is well under way and HMI is satisfied that the force will achieve 100% coverage of PCSOs by September 2007. As at 2 April 2007 there was 100% coverage of police officers across all wards and neighbourhoods.
- There is an absence of an internal communication strategy that will help bring about cultural change throughout the organisation; however this has been acknowledged by the force and is currently being developed utilising both good practice from the pathfinder site and staff from that district to help in the communication process. The force accepts that a communication strategy alone will not bring about cultural change, but it can be the cornerstone for more developmental work.
- There is a total of 31 PCSOs currently funded by partner agencies and concerns have been raised about the permanent funding of 'partner-subsidised' PCSOs. The force is actively working with the relevant agencies and the PA to assess the means by which such posts can be mainstreamed.
- The head of personnel sits on the force project board, and while it is apparent that staff allocated to Neighbourhood Policing are aware of their role definitions and expectations, the actual job descriptions for all staff are currently under review in the light of lessons learnt from the pathfinder site. This is part of an ongoing updating and review process undertaken by the project board to build on the findings of the pathfinder site to develop a corporate model.
- Priority identification is being established on the back of existing consultation structures, and the level of sophistication varies throughout the force. All neighbourhoods have either identified or are in the process of identifying their key individual networks (KINs) and mapping their key communities and cultural groups. When a major incident or high-profile operation or event takes place, confirmation was received that the established independent advisory group (IAG) networks would be consulted to assess the impact on the community. (Also see areas for improvement (AFIs)). Those community members consulted indicated that they felt they could influence Neighbourhood Policing, especially in Hartlepool, although work in Middlesbrough through the Safer Together in East Middlesbrough (STEM) project was also a good example of working with the community and partners to establish priorities and deliver programmed action.
- An independent academic evaluation has been undertaken at the pilot site in Hartlepool by Professor Jim Greaves of Hull University. There is evidence that lessons learnt within the pilot site have been assimilated within the three other operational districts. The ACC (CD) has indicated his intention to replicate the evaluation in the remaining BCUs.
- Guidance around appropriate and effective national qualitative PIs for Neighbourhood Policing has yet to be published. In the interim period the force is developing a suite of qualitative indicators designed to balance the quantitative data more readily available. There is an acknowledgement that Neighbourhood Policing has to have this balance to emphasise the key message that Neighbourhood Policing has a 'hard edge' with enforcement at its core. While Neighbourhood

October 2007

Policing staff are being held to account for their performance through the MPR and performance development review (PDR) processes, the force acknowledges that the indicators being used are largely quantitative until such time as they can develop an acceptable suite of qualitative indicators. **This lack of effective indicators for Neighbourhood Policing remains a national issue which needs to be addressed as soon as possible.**

- There is evidence of joint strategic assessments being prepared across the four operational districts, in conjunction with their respective crime and disorder reduction partnerships (CDRPs), ahead of the publication of national guidance in autumn 2007.
- Joint problem solving and tasking with partners is taking place in over 50% of ward areas. It is an approach that finds resonance with the local authority which is willing, with other agencies, to be a part of the process. Priorities are identified and multiple sources of data utilised in those wards where it is embedded. Communication between neighbourhood inspectors and local authority neighbourhood managers is proving effective in those local authorities adopting this approach. This will become fully embedded as Neighbourhood Policing becomes more established.
- The introduction of Neighbourhood Policing has brought with it an increase in intelligence flows from the community. The project board has undertaken some development work to assess how this can best be used. The force is, however, conscious that the increased flows of community intelligence have the potential to 'swamp' its systems. It needs to build on the developmental work already undertaken to ensure that significant community intelligence is not only captured but developed to its full extent. Inevitably, this will require some adjustments to its intelligence/analytical research processes to support Neighbourhood Policing – these are currently being assessed.
- There is strong evidence to show that the concept of Neighbourhood Policing is fully embedded and being delivered within the Hartlepool and Stockton districts, but this is not as apparent in Redcar and Cleveland where roll-out only commenced on 2 April 2007. Developments in Middlesbrough are on track, with implementation starting there in September 2006. Strong messages were received that there is total commitment to implement Neighbourhood Policing within the whole of Cleveland within the project plan timescales, and HMI is confident that given the current determination from all concerned this is achievable.
- Members of the Special Constabulary are not yet embedded into Neighbourhood Policing. The force is aware of this issue and endeavouring to rectify the situation by encouragement and the implementation an 80/20 policy whereby 80% of SCs' duty time is allocated to Neighbourhood Policing and 20% to response. The COG is in active negotiation with senior officers from the Special Constabulary in this respect. Progress has been made in an effort to bring a degree of corporacy to current arrangements.
- The introduction of a specific post to co-ordinate consultation and feedback to the community in Hartlepool (see strengths) has been watched with interest by the other districts, and the ACC (CD) has confirmed his intention to replicate this role in the other districts during the forthcoming year.

October 2007

## Areas for improvement

- Corporate training provision is not meeting the needs of Neighbourhood Policing partly due to problems within the training arena as a whole within Cleveland, and the frequency in the turnover of staff in the force training manager's post. A training course for Neighbourhood Policing staff which complies with Centrex outcomes has been developed, but this is being delivered at a local level. The Centrex package is not being used due to its perceived inadequacies regarding content and ease of use. The localised delivery is evidence of a lack of capacity within the force training department. Funds have been set aside by chief officers to engage an outside provider to develop and deliver a corporate Neighbourhood Policing training package for both police officers and police staff; however, this will be the subject of a tendering process and the start date is uncertain. It is imperative that the good work in Hartlepool is built on, and that effective training is put in place for all staff engaged in Neighbourhood Policing. Chief officers should ensure that any outside provider who is engaged is fully conversant with, and takes note of, good practice elsewhere in the country, and that effective evaluation is put in place to ensure that what is delivered is what is required by front-line staff and local command teams.
- Concerns were expressed from a number of sources that the quality, duration and content of PCSO training was not adequate. The force, as a matter of priority, should review and reassess the training being delivered to PCSOs, taking cognisance of good practice elsewhere in the country. (This is linked with the previous AFI but is not specifically focused on Neighbourhood Policing per se.)

## RECOMMENDATION 1

HMI recommends, as a matter of priority, that the force should review and reassess the training being delivered to PCSOs, taking cognisance of good practice elsewhere in the country.

- At a strategic level there is an absence of a corporate community engagement strategy, although engagement is taking place with the community at varying levels in diverse locations. There is no overarching framework to define the corporate philosophy, tactics or approach, and this needs to be rectified as soon as possible as it is one of the cornerstones for successful Neighbourhood Policing. This could include innovative approaches such as 'roll call' or street meetings which have been utilised in some neighbourhoods in the Metropolitan Police. Any strategy should encourage innovation, as evidence indicates that very often it is the staff themselves who can develop innovative ideas suitable to their working environment. Working more closely with minority and hard-to-reach groups should be a key element of any corporate community engagement strategy.
- Succession planning and staff continuity within the pilot site was evidenced but this was not as apparent within the other districts. A common understanding is developing that neighbourhood staff should commit to a minimum of two years in post, although this has yet to be set in policy or practice direction. The importance of continuity of staff in neighbourhood posts should not be underestimated, lack of continuity being the most common complaint from partners and members of the public. The force should debate how best to ensure staff continuity in the absence of a firm commitment to a minimum tenure in post.

October 2007

- While the standard of accommodation and equipment for the delivery of Neighbourhood Policing is fit for purpose, there is concern regarding the provision of information technology (IT) terminals in certain parts of the force area, eg Hartlepool and Middlesbrough. The force should review the provision of IT support within these locations.
- While there is evidence within the pilot site at Hartlepool that there have been improvements in residents' satisfaction with the quality of service received from the police (47% of residents satisfied or very satisfied in 2002 rising to 66% in January 2007), and there are the appropriate corporate policies in place, the commitment to this area of policing is not as apparent elsewhere in force. As Neighbourhood Policing becomes embedded the force needs to ensure that the quality of service ethic is promoted to all staff. It should not be viewed as the sole preserve of neighbourhood staff.
- Comprehensive information-sharing protocols are in place with key agencies and partners. The application of these protocols is not corporate and is resulting in a divergence of approach across the four districts. They are viewed as restricting the development of partnership working and their application needs to be reviewed as a matter of priority.
- Local authority staff are engaged by the force in certain key roles but there is a lack of consistency regarding the application of policy which limits their access to force systems. The use of established discipline codes within their parent organisations and security measures to limit access could be utilised to prevent misuse of police data or systems. The force needs to review which local authority staff member can have access to which force system and grant the appropriate authority, with appropriate safeguards, in order to enhance partnership working.
- While corporate policies are in place to address the victim's code and quality of service issues, the evidence collected during the inspection suggests that the force response to repeat victims remains patchy. The force need to ensure that its approach within this important area is corporate and consistent.
- Upon completion of the initial phase of their training, student officers are allocated to their operational district. At present, the approach of the force is to align them to response teams where it is considered they will be exposed to a wide range of police duties and responsibilities early in their service. They are not currently being allocated to Neighbourhood Policing teams during their probationary period, to learn and appreciate the importance of, and difference between, Neighbourhood Policing and response policing. HMI considers this to be a missed opportunity if the overall aim is to address the culture of the organisation and make Neighbourhood Policing the overarching policing philosophy of the force. The force should reconsider this approach and allocate student officers to Neighbourhood Policing teams, on a short-term, structured basis, during their probationary period.
- Confirmation was received from front-line Neighbourhood Policing staff in some parts of the force that they understood the principles of community impact assessments (CIAs) and would be able to provide data if asked, but they did not associate the terminology with their daily business. There was little evidence that staff understood the importance of CIAs or their role in the development of such assessments. CIAs are referred to in problem-solving documentation, but the force needs to reinforce with staff that CIAs are a core part of the Neighbourhood Policing

role and function. Neighbourhood Policing staff and analysts need to be trained in terms of their key role of obtaining and developing community intelligence. This is particularly important with regard to aspects of domestic extremism and counter-terrorism. The force needs to identify and build upon good practice which is taking place in other forces and build it in as an intrinsic part of the corporate Neighbourhood Policing training that is to be delivered in the future.

## Performance Management

GRADE	GOOD
-------	------

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6	29	8	0

### National contextual factors

There is no single accepted model of performance management across the police service but any such model or framework must be fit for purpose. Ideally, forces should demonstrate that individuals at every level of the organisation understand their contribution to converting resources into agreed delivery, and know how they will be held to account. On a daily basis, first-line supervisors monitor, support and quality assure the performance of their teams. At the other end of the spectrum, chief officer-led performance meetings – often based loosely on the American Compstat model – are a vehicle for accountability and improvement. Robust leadership, a commitment to improvement and reliable, real-time information systems are all critical factors in effective performance management.

There is no mechanistic link between overall force performance and the grade awarded in this framework. The grade is based on the quality of the force’s processes that enable it to identify and react to changes in performance.

### Contextual factors

The performance management framework in Cleveland has been developed after extensive consultation both internally and externally with key stakeholders and the Home Office. The analysis utilises national products such as iQuanta and MSF data as well as internally collected data and survey results. The results are delivered electronically on the seventh working day of the month to a standardised format and are available across the force. Accountability runs as a thread through the process, with a monthly corporate meeting structure addressing district and departmental performance supported by an individual assessment of performance through the MPR process. Individual accountability is in evidence at all levels in the organisation and this has undoubtedly contributed to the performance improvement witnessed in recent years.

All operational units are covered by the system and plans exist to roll it out across the remaining service units. The force constantly seeks improvement to the process and technology and faces a significant challenge in developing indicators and data that can effectively monitor performance in neighbourhoods.

The cornerstone of the framework is the team performance accountability mechanism (TPAM) that is an electronic, real-time, data-gathering and analysis system that can drill down to team and individual performance. The performance management framework in Cleveland has been reviewed by the Home Office which intends to use it to influence national guidance. The Police and Crime Standards Directorate (PCSD) and Audit Commission have highlighted it as good practice.

The cultural challenges that the force has overcome in introducing MPRs should not be underestimated, but the reviews are now embedded in operational units and feedback from staff is positive. HMI praises the force for this initiative.

## Strengths

- The corporate governance is effective, with the PA fully engaged in the development of the performance management process and the monitoring of performance at both force and BCU levels. Nominated members from the PA attend the monthly strategic performance group (SPG) as full participants, while other members hold bimonthly meetings with district commanders to monitor district performance.
- The full PA is provided with a quarterly report covering the major aspects of performance at force level and is actively involved annually in the target setting and priority identification processes that inform the annual policing plan. At quarterly minuted meetings chief officers are held to account for force performance.
- The PA is fully engaged in developing the priorities, targets and strategic objectives for the force and is presented with a range of options from which to select its desired outcomes. Competing national and local priorities can often create tensions, but the process undertaken by the force and PA provides a clear rationale for decisions made and priorities selected. It utilises an innovative electronic voting system to ensure anonymity and full involvement of all members. The PA representatives interviewed were completely satisfied with the openness of the force, their willingness to engage the PA and the involvement of the PA in the performance management process.
- Accountability lines for performance are clear, with all staff from the executive through to front-line staff being part of the MPR and held to account by line managers. There are regular monthly performance meetings within each district where teams and individuals are held to account by district commanders.
- The SPG is a monthly performance meeting chaired by chief officers and attended by district commanders and SUMs who lead the major departments in force. The agenda covers all aspects of performance and effectively holds all unit heads to account. It effectively links NIM and performance through the one meeting. In addition there is further active involvement from chief officers in the form of quarterly performance reviews where individual districts and departments are questioned on their performance and plans covering a wide range of issues by all the chief officers sitting as a panel.
- Strategic planning, performance management and NIM processes are linked in a multi-dimensional way at all levels through the performance management framework, which is far more than a performance management tool, as it links all the key business processes. This allows the development of force priorities, targets and key initiatives such as citizen focus to be linked in a holistic approach and to take full cognisance of all the relevant issues and not be treated in isolation.
- Ownership of different work streams highlighted in the force strategy 2007–10 and the annual policing plan are apparent. The head of corporate planning and performance liaises closely with the head of information and communications technology (HICT), finance and human resources (HR) to ensure a corporate approach to planning and strategy development.
- The operational performance team (OPT) undertakes the central audit and inspection process within the force. The OPT works with corporate performance and planning (CPP), which owns the performance management process and the TPAM system that provides all the force data and analysis. A culture of improvement is

October 2007

apparent, with a drive from chief officers not only to improve in relation to quantitative data but also to improve qualitative service delivery.

- MPR is fundamental to the performance management approach adopted in Cleveland. All staff in the organisation are subjected to regular monthly assessment of performance and progress against objectives and targets that are recorded electronically. This provides an effective system to highlight good or poor performance on a regular basis and is more responsive and provides more evidence than an annual system (see developing practice). The system has been accepted by staff, many of whom appreciate the regular opportunity for recognition of their work. The cultural change needed to bring this about should not be underestimated.
- In addition to appreciation shown via the MPR process the force also holds regular awards and commendation ceremonies that provide a more formal acknowledgement of exceptional performance or individual acts of bravery.
- The MPR process also provides early warning of potential unsatisfactory performance. This presents the opportunity for early rectification of poor performance without having to embark on the unsatisfactory performance procedure (UPP) route. If UPP is necessary, despite early intervention, the evidence provided from the MPR process is often compelling.
- There is a clear vision communicated by the Chief Constable of 'Putting People First' that takes full cognisance of the national community safety plan (NCSP). This is starting to influence strategic decision-making and its full implication is being communicated to staff. The vision is now beginning to impact on the force following a difficult period during which financial problems had to be overcome. Staff interviewed were aware of the vision and how it could be applied both internally and externally.
- There is a full appreciation of the protective service debate; indeed Cleveland PA has been particularly vociferous in its proposals. Co-operation and collaboration is being undertaken with adjoining forces, most notably with Durham Constabulary, but it is in the early stages of development (see AFIs). The Chief Constable has committed to the utilisation for protective service issues of 36 police posts freed following a review of custody.
- The force performance management framework formally includes CDRPs and local criminal justice boards (LCJBs) as part of the strategic performance cycle and corporate governance framework. Attendance is not mandatory but on an 'as required' basis for key meetings or when key issues with crossover to that particular agency or partners is pertinent. District level JAGs have set local targets to deal with 'lower level' problems. The CDRPs and the LCJBs have strategic responsibility in relation to crime reduction, drugs issues, ASB and bringing offenders to justice.
- There are effective mechanisms to consult with and receive feedback from communities and partner agencies, eg CDRPs, courts and probation as well as staff within the organisation, to influence the formulation of the LPP. A range of meetings, surveys and other consultative fora are arranged throughout the year as part of an ongoing process. Views, opinions and priorities are summarised and presented to the PA as part of the strategic planning process, and both the LPP and force strategy go through many revisions following feedback before final publication.

October 2007

- The LPP has clearly articulated priorities and accountability from chief officer level to district commanders and departmental heads. Targets at all levels are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely (SMART) and there is clear ownership and accountability that is reinforced through the MPR and SPG processes.
- Budgets and resources have been tightly controlled from the centre in recent years via the resource management group (RMG) due to significant corporate budgetary shortfalls, which are now fully resolved, although the future grant settlements are likely to be extremely challenging. A recent innovation has been the development of a monthly resource meeting where planning, budgeting, resource distribution and succession planning are considered. This meeting, which will be chaired by the ACC (CD), is now the main decision-making forum for resource allocation.
- The force is keen to develop innovative initiatives that challenge traditional approaches to policing. One example is the force's commitment to and use of activity-based costing (ABC) which has been highlighted by the Audit Commission as good practice. The strategic assessment of efficiency and effectiveness through the force's ABC framework is integrated into the force's corporate performance framework as a key feature of performance improvement. The force's approach has stood up to scrutiny by a number of strategic bodies including ACPO, HMIC, the Audit Commission, Home Office, the APA, and to peer review by other forces.
- TPAM, an electronic, real-time, data-gathering and analysis system is utilised by the force and provides effective data to individual level as well as analysis at varying levels in the organisation. Comparisons with the MSF group and iQuanta data are effective and impactful. Qualitative data is also analysed and the system as a whole has been identified as being innovative and effective and is the subject of enquiries by other forces and institutions, eg the PCSD.
- There is evidence of partners, eg the British Transport Police (BTP), Department of Work and Pensions, immigration service, probation service and regional intelligence group attending the level 2 tasking and co-ordinating group (TCG) meetings and being tasked with actions to address joint areas of concern. The partners do not attend every meeting but when an issue of concern has been identified, eg theft of precious metals, the appropriate partner agency is invited to the tasking meeting, in this case the BTP.

### **Work in progress**

- Following an external review by independent consultants a new project management system is being introduced. Projects are classified as standard or extended dependent on the level of complexity, cost, associated risk and benefits of delivery. The governance is provided by a strategic development group.
- Further work is planned to ensure all departments are embraced within the performance framework and challenged at the SPG; currently they are held to account individually by chief officers. The development of suitable indicators and processes to capture the performance of the larger departments will be a significant challenge.
- Work is in hand, in the absence of suitable national indicators, to develop data sets that truly reflect the work of neighbourhood teams. This has to be a balance of

October 2007

quantitative and qualitative data, that accurately reflects the contribution of neighbourhood teams to the overall performance of Cleveland Police.

- Staff are aware of the qualitative aspects of performance and this will be driven on the back of the MPR process, with changes being made to encompass the customer service agenda.

### **Areas for improvement**

- The district commanders play a key role in delivering force performance, controlling the bulk of the force resources and front-line staff. They are held to account at a range of meetings which include two weekly meetings with the ACC (T) and other district commanders, monthly SPG, MPR with the ACC (T), quarterly challenges with all chief officers, and bimonthly performance meetings with PA members. Performance is also dependent on the support the districts obtain from other departments and often issues cannot be resolved without their support or co-operation. It is important that other SUMs are also held to account and HMI considers that the timing is now right to realign the performance focus so it accurately reflects the contribution of the departments as well as the BCUs. This may involve a reduction in the number or frequency of accountability meetings for district commanders, but would provide a better focus for the force as a whole.
- While the force is committed to developing greater capacity for protective services, eg releasing 36 staff from custody through a civilianisation and realignment process, there remains a significant strategic challenge to work more collaboratively with other forces in the north east to counter the threats from serious and organised crime and terrorism. Cleveland Police, the PA and other forces in the region must continue in their efforts along this route.

## Developing Practice

**TITLE: The development and implementation of a corporate performance management framework and supporting technical architecture**

**PROBLEM:**

Lack of a visible structured corporate performance management framework being consistently applied at all levels throughout the force.

**SOLUTION:**

Extensive research drawing on professional/academic knowledge and practice throughout the public and private sectors has identified the need to define and model the core elements of the framework so that they could be easily communicated and consistently applied throughout the force. The performance management framework, covering operational policing in the first instance, has now been fully implemented, and has led to a significant and positive change in the management of performance throughout the force. Several initiatives have been developed to provide an integrated and holistic approach. Three key elements are presented below.

**Element One: Corporate Performance Management Framework**

The process is not simple and hierarchical but complex and multifaceted. The solution delivers an integrated and consistent approach to the management of performance at all levels throughout the force. The framework and supporting processes provide the force with the ability to review and hold all staff to account, from senior officers to teams and individuals across a range of departments and functions, based on clear guidance and focused direction that is easily and regularly communicated. The core elements of this framework include:

- Strategic performance cycle – This defines the strategic interaction of planning, improvement, audit and review, underpinned by the NIM. External partners, eg CDRPs and the criminal justice board are involved and there is executive and PA ownership and involvement throughout the entire process.
- Performance measurement – The framework has taken a multi-dimensional view in order to integrate and link national measurement, force and BCU objectives with operational processes and activities into a complete and coherent framework.
- Operational performance review framework – This establishes a robust meeting structure for the force and ensures consistent links between each review meeting.
- MPR structure – A timely, consistent and standardised approach to performance review across the force is a key feature of the overall framework. Current performance is assessed monthly using quantitative and qualitative data, both of which are considered prior to agreed actions being developed.

**Element Two: Activity-based Costing**

Integrated into the force's corporate performance framework as a key feature of performance improvement is the strategic assessment of efficiency and effectiveness through the force's ABC framework. This framework demonstrates how resource allocation

October 2007

is transferred to activities and processes that are in turn directed through the NIM, performance management and organisational/operational management to drive service delivery. The framework comprises a number of initiatives:

The strategic implementation document sets out the force's short-to mid-term vision for practical integration of ABC within its assessment of police performance.

Assessment of activity against strategic policing objectives and against MSFs has informed efficiency by highlighting increased productivity against key priorities and strategic planning by identifying areas where resources should be focused.

The force has expanded its own technical initiative to the wider ABC community and developed a practical implementation model for comparing ABC data. Comparable ABC data from both the activity analysis and analysis of costs have promoted the benchmarking of activity and costs against policing performance assessment framework (PPAF) domain and over time at the MSF and national level. The force's approach has stood up to scrutiny by a number of strategic bodies including ACPO, HMIC, the Audit Commission, Home Office, APA, and to peer review by other forces.

### **Element Three: Supporting IT Applications and Technical Infrastructure**

The need to access data that is timely, consistent and in context is critical to any performance management framework. The PCSD suggests that the lack of a clear strategy for performance information is the biggest cause behind inadequate performance data within the police service and results in end users becoming overwhelmed by data. The force identified that the current use of multiple, tightly coupled, data extracts commonly found within conventional data warehousing was becoming increasingly difficult to maintain or develop. To deliver the data needs of the force's performance management framework and to overcome the issues identified above, Cleveland Police has defined a technical architecture and application infrastructure specific to supporting the data needs of performance management. The key elements of this technical initiative are:

- data integration and analysis architecture;
- standard performance reporting available electronically through the force intranet;
- operational information console (OIC) allowing access to near real-time data at an operational level; and
- electronic monthly performance review (e-MPR) for all staff.

### **OUTCOME(S):**

Cleveland Police has identified the core elements critical to a successful performance management framework and a formalised corporate solution. The PCSD has supported and monitored the development of this approach and has commended the outcome. The initiative has been the subject of extensive peer review both internally and externally to ensure its robustness and reliability. This solution delivers an innovative approach that has integrated the complexities of force performance with the daily management of directing and influencing individual behaviour to deliver improved performance.

**FORCE CONTACT:** Chief Superintendent Dave Pickard – 01642 301751

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Overview

### National contextual factors

The assessment framework for Protecting Vulnerable People was first developed in 2006 as part of HMIC's baseline assessment programme. It replaced two existing frameworks – Reducing/Investigating Hate Crime and Crimes against Vulnerable Victims – which focussed on hate crimes (predominantly racially motivated), domestic violence and child protection. Following consultation with practitioners and ACPO leads, a single framework was introduced with four components – domestic violence, the investigation and prevention of child abuse, the management of sex and dangerous offenders, and vulnerable missing persons. Although the four areas are discrete, they are also linked and share a common theme – they deal with vulnerable victims where there is a high risk that an incident can quickly become critical, and where a poor police response is both life-threatening and poses severe reputational risks for the force.

This year's inspection has been carried out using similar assessment standards as those in 2006. These highlight the importance of leadership and accountability; policy implementation; information management; staffing, workload and supervision; performance monitoring and management; training; the management of risk; and partnership working.

The work carried out by forces to protect the public, particularly those most vulnerable to risk of serious harm, is complex and challenging. No single agency, including the police, has the capacity to deliver the required response on its own. Success is therefore, dependent on effective multi-agency working and there are a number of established partnerships, involving a wide range of services and professionals, aimed at ensuring that an integrated approach is adopted to protecting those most vulnerable to risk of serious harm.

### Contextual factors overview

Following a recent realignment of ACPO portfolios, the DCC has overall strategic responsibility for all the elements of protecting vulnerable people (PVP). Operational delivery in respect of DV and missing from homes (MFHs) still rests with the ACC (T) and district commanders. Co-ordination of policy, audit for all four elements and the line management of child abuse and PVP is now the responsibility of a detective chief inspector (DCI) within crime and operations. This appointment is a recent development and is the force's response to an area for improvement identified in the HMIC baseline inspection 2006. The role will ensure co-ordination of all the different strands of vulnerability and may be the precursor of a corporate vulnerability unit.

### Generic protecting vulnerable people strengths

- As a result of a realignment of chief officer portfolios the DCC now has overall responsibility for all elements of PVP.
- Following a review of responsibilities a new DCI post within the crime and operations department has been created to provide strategic and line management responsibility for both child abuse investigations (CAIs) and public protection, and strategic responsibility for DV and MFHs. This brings together a strategic overview for all four disciplines and ensures effective linkage between units.

October 2007

- PA involvement in overseeing all PVP issues is via the community safety panel.

### **Generic protecting vulnerable people work in progress**

- The new DCI in charge of PVP within force is reviewing arrangements to identify whether there are any gaps in provision and to ensure compliance with policy.
- Not all staff in the child abuse investigation units (CAIUs) or public protection units (PPUs) are qualified to Initial Crime Investigators' Development Programme (ICIDP) standard. This in part is due to delays and financial issues with the external provider (Durham Constabulary). The force is aware of the problems and is taking steps to resolve the matter.

### **Generic protecting vulnerable people areas for improvement**

- The integrated computer architecture that is bringing together all force systems (IRIS) is causing considerable frustration to staff and delays in searches and risk assessments resulting from multiple searches having to be done for the same person. This in turn delays investigations and the whole administration of justice process. The information and communications technology (ICT) department was aware of the problem but not the extent or implications especially for the PPU and the CAIU. The head of ICT needs to ensure that an engagement takes place with staff in the PVP arena to identify the problems and implications and produce an effective resolution.
- No vetting is currently undertaken for staff within the PPU or child abuse posts. This is primarily due to staff shortages within the force vetting unit. While a business case has been submitted in relation to reviewing the vetting unit, the lack of appropriate checks on staff in the PPU is an issue of concern and should be addressed at the earliest opportunity.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 2**

HMI recommends that regular vetting should be undertaken for staff working within and applying for roles within the PPU and CAIUs.

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse

GRADE	FAIR
-------	------

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
3	17	21	2

### National contextual factors

The Children Act 2004 places a duty on the police to ‘safeguard and promote the welfare of children’; safeguarding children, therefore, is a fundamental part of the duties of all police officers. All police forces, however, also have specialist units which, although they vary in structure, size and remit, normally take primary responsibility for investigating child abuse cases. Officers in these units work closely with other agencies, particularly Social Services, to ensure that co-ordinated action is taken to protect specific children who are suffering, or who are at risk of suffering, significant harm. The Children Act 2004 also requires each local authority to establish a Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB). This is the key statutory mechanism for agreeing how the relevant organisations in each local area will co-operate to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in that locality, and for ensuring the effectiveness of what they do.

Membership of LSCBs includes representatives of the relevant local authority and its Board partners, notably the police, probation, youth offending teams, strategic health authorities and primary care trusts, NHS Trusts and NHS Foundation Trusts, the Connexions service, Children and Family Courts Advisory and Support Service, Secure Training Centres and prisons.

### Contextual factors

The CAIU is a central support unit but is based within districts. The line management rests with the DCI (vulnerability) in crime and operations supported by a detective inspector (CAIU) based at headquarters. There 4 detective sergeants and 19 detective constables spread across the 4 districts in Cleveland and they deal with all allegations of child abuse and historic allegations, but stranger abuse is still investigated by district investigation units.

The unit was formerly known as the child protection unit but changed its name and focus in April 2006 to better represent the work that was being undertaken. The unit currently has vacancies for two detective constables and this, coupled with the lack of resilience and administrative support, is creating considerable difficulty which is manifesting itself in late files and delayed investigations. There is evidence that these delays have attracted adverse comment from the judiciary.

There are three local safeguarding children boards (LSCBs) across Cleveland, South Tees covering Redcar and Middlesbrough, and the remaining two being coterminous with the police districts of Hartlepool and Stockton. The DCI (vulnerability) sits on two boards

October 2007

together with the local district DCI. In the Stockton district the chief inspector (neighbourhood safety) attends in place of the local DCI. These boards are reported to hold people to account for their actions and responsibilities.

The PA has put considerable effort and support into the development of a 'state of the art' sexual abuse multi-agency referral centre (SARC) which is to be opened in Middlesbrough in October 2007.

## **Strengths**

- The DCC has strategic responsibility and ownership for CAIs, while operational responsibility rests with the head of crime and operations.
- Accountability lines are clear with all staff aware that CAI is line-managed through crime and operations but geographically based in each district. The management structure is clearly defined by rank, role and responsibility from detective constable level to DCC.
- Protecting children and vulnerable adults, of which CAI is a part, sit as specific priorities within the corporate policing strategy 2007–10.
- Force policy regarding CAI is ACPO compliant and has been reviewed within the last 12 months. It is available in both hard copy and on the force intranet site. The detective inspector in charge of the unit ensures the policy is applied consistently across the force.
- In cases where officers attending any incident, irrespective of the nature of the call, believe a child may be at risk, they are mandated through policy to inform the CAIU. Front-line staff interviewed clearly understood this part of the policy and the need to ensure that referrals were made in a timely manner.
- At a local level individual case conferences are attended by the detective sergeant within each CAIU. The process is overseen by the detective inspector who also holds MPR meetings with the detective sergeants when individual cases and reviews are discussed. If it is necessary to attend a review meeting this is undertaken by the detective sergeant and again any decisions or recommendations are subject to overview by the detective inspector.
- Job descriptions for child abuse investigators are in place and up to date and accurately reflect the role. Feedback at various levels confirmed that staff are clear about their role and what is expected.
- The detective inspector in the CAIU conducts reviews of child abuse files every quarter, ensuring adherence to multi-agency protocols, appropriate information recording, storage and sharing, and sound decision-making is evidenced.
- The training budget for the CAIU has been increased over the last two years which has enabled the force to deliver child exploitation online protection (CEOP) training to all investigators within the unit. The force utilises Teesside University to train CAIU staff; the course mirrors the National Centre for Policing Excellence (NCPE) course in content. In addition, staff due to join the unit have an attachment prior to being appointed and benefit from mentoring and shadowing arrangements following their appointment.

October 2007

- The linkage between children’s issues is discussed on a regular basis at district management meetings; often this occurs daily for cases of concern.
- The force monitors a range of performance data and management information for the CAIU, including:
  - crimes recorded;
  - crimes detected;
  - live crime;
  - outstanding tasks;
  - persons arrested; and
  - persons interviewed under caution.

In addition the detective inspector undertakes dip sampling of child abuse cases to assess compliance and also attends the monthly supervision meeting within the four BCUs to share good practice. All staff are subject to MPRs where management information is used to inform the process.

- The IRIS system contains information from occurrences, domestic incident reports and crime logs entered and updated by the CAIU. This drastically reduces the need to submit separate intelligence logs as this information is available to other IRIS users as intelligence would be. Some information is blocked for reasons of sensitivity/confidentiality, but this can be accessed by the control room inspector if required. Where intelligence is received that is not already on IRIS then an intelligence report is submitted separately.

### **Work in progress**

- IT systems are used to support the work of the CAIU in the form of an integrated system called IRIS. This brings together all force IT systems, apart from case and custody. There was much evidence from staff of the problems with IRIS due to the quality of the data and the need to have identical matches on surname, forename and date of birth of nominals. Any slight variation will result in the need to conduct multiple searches which inevitably slows progress and causes immense frustration to staff and delays in investigation. HICT was aware of the problem but not the full implications. Work is ongoing to cleanse the data sources with suitable software; however, the ICT department has agreed to re-engage with staff in the CAIU (and other PVP units) to identify workable solutions.
- A new SARC is to be opened in Middlesbrough in October 2007, ahead of schedule. The centre will be a state of the art facility, serving the whole force, for the examination of victims of sexual abuse.

### **Areas for improvement**

- While distributed according to workload, staffing levels in the CAIU do not have any built-in resilience, although a non-abstraction policy is in place unless authorised by the head of crime and operations. The situation is exacerbated by the absence of dedicated administrative support in the units resulting in an additional burden being placed on supervisors thereby distracting them from their core responsibility to oversee the progress and quality of investigations. This lack of administrative support and additional nominal searches resulting from the IRIS IT system is also

October 2007

impacting on the work of the detective constables, resulting in adverse criticism from both the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and judiciary regarding excessive delays in the finalisation of investigations. It is imperative the force reviews the administrative support available and the staffing resilience within the CAIU.

### RECOMMENDATION 3

HMI recommends, as a matter of priority, that the force reviews and provides appropriate levels of administrative support for the CAIUs.

- At weekends there is only one member of staff on duty to cover CAI, and concern has been expressed by staff that this is not adequate given the nature of the work. It would be advisable for the force to review this cover arrangement.

### RECOMMENDATION 4

HMI recommends that the force reviews the police officer staffing levels within the CAIUs in order to provide effective resilience.

- There is clear policy in relation to the relationships and working arrangements between the police and social services; however, concerns have been expressed that in certain parts of the force area, notably Redcar, police staffing problems are delaying the processing of referrals and investigations, creating a potential risk to the organisation. Additional concerns were expressed particularly in respect of potential child neglect cases where pertinent information held by social services was not always being communicated in a timely manner. The force should review the working arrangements with social services departments to ensure compliance with policy and that effective dialogue is taking place between the two agencies.

October 2007

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Domestic Violence

GRADE	FAIR
-------	------

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1	13	27	2

### National contextual factors

There is no statutory or common law offence as such of ‘domestic violence’; the term is generally used to cover a range of abusive behaviour, not all of which is criminal. The definition of domestic violence adopted by ACPO does, however, take account of the full range of abusive behaviour as well as the different circumstances in which it can occur:

*‘any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse (psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional) between adults, aged 18 and over, who are or have been intimate partners or family members, regardless of gender or sexuality’.*

As with the investigation of child abuse, responding to and investigating domestic violence is the responsibility of all police officers. Again, however, forces have dedicated staff within this area of work, although their roles vary. In some forces staff undertake a support/liason role, generally acting as a single point of contact for victims and signposting and liaising with other agencies and support services; in others, staff have responsibility for carrying out investigations.

Irrespective of who carries out the investigation in domestic violence cases, an integral part of every stage is the identification of risk factors, followed by more detailed risk assessment and management. In 2004, HMIC, together with HMCPSI, published a joint thematic inspection report on the investigation and prosecution of domestic violence. At that time, risk identification, assessment and management were in the early stages of development throughout the service. Since then, there has been considerable progress in developing formal risk identification and assessment processes and - in a number of forces - the implementation of multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARACs). Other improvements include the introduction of specialist domestic violence courts and the strengthening of joint working arrangements.

### Contextual factors

Strategic ownership of DV policy rests within crime and operations under the direction of the DCI (vulnerability); however, operational responsibility rests with the ACC (T) and district commanders.

DV management information is routinely collected but due to current problems with the IRIS system, data for the full financial year is not available. However, for the period October 2005 to September 2006 there were 21.2 incidents per 1,000 population with a sanction detection rate of 26.4%.

Across the four districts there are eight staff dedicated to DV but seven full-time equivalents (FTEs). Three of the districts have domestic violence officers (DVOs) while Redcar has one domestic violence investigator (DVI) and proposes to introduce a second. The DVOs deal

October 2007

primarily with the victims of DV, while the DVI actually investigates the crimes and submits prosecution files leaving care of the victims to voluntary groups outside the police. The commanders in the other districts are watching this approach with interest.

An HMIC DV audit undertaken in November 2006 identified that there were serious deficiencies in the data compliance management and data testing for incidents of DV, both areas receiving a Poor grade. The force is aware of this area of concern and is seeking to address the issue.

Innovative approaches to assist in dealing with DV incidents are apparent, notably the use of digital headcams, and HMI will watch this development with interest.

## Strengths

- Strategic responsibility for missing persons rests with the DCC, while operational delivery is the responsibility of the ACC (T). A DCI within crime and operations provides the corporate overview and day-to-day management of policy and linkage between DV and other aspects of vulnerability (also see AFIs) at a corporate level.
- DV is a 'stand-alone' local policing priority within the policing plan 2007/08. The approach the force now adopts towards DV has received support from members of the PA, in particular the emphasis on positive action to achieve improved outcomes.
- It is made clear in the policy/guidance the action to be taken by all staff involved in the reporting, recording and dealing with incidents of DV. Front-line staff were aware of the actions to be taken at the scene and the emphasis on positive action.
- The force policy and procedures documentation provides guidance to officers on DV incidents and gives examples of those that should be crimed immediately and those which should be recorded as incidents. The guidance errs on the side of caution to ensure full compliance with National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS) recording requirements. In all cases a DV incident form should be submitted to the community safety team to provide a quality assurance check of the original decision.
- The latest policy was approved in August 2005 and is available on the force intranet. It is due for updating in February 2008.
- A comprehensive procedures document which links to ACPO guidance and sets out accountability requirements is attached to force policy and available on the force intranet. There is specific reference within the procedures document to DV incidents involving police employees.
- While there is no stand-alone IT system for the management of DV, the force does use the C&C system (Intergraph) linked to IRIS.
- Force procedures indicate the importance of risk assessments in relation to DV. The force has adopted the multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARAC) system, with externally funded co-ordinators in certain districts. The positive benefits of these arrangements and their linkages to other disciplines within the PVP arena were emphasised.

October 2007

- The identification of potential child abuse within homes that are the subject of DV is recognised within force policy and procedures are in place to effectively report and manage such occurrences. Front-line staff are aware of the procedures and linkages to the CAIU.
- Supervision of DV incidents rests with front-line inspectors and sergeants who either attend incidents or make themselves aware via the C&C system or contact with the control room. A second level of supervision is provided by the sergeants in the community safety teams in the districts who have an overview of DV incidents and ensure compliance with force policy by checking all DV incident forms and C&C logs to identify any incidents that have not been recorded or not recorded in accordance with NCRS guidance.
- The force uses Teesside University to train all specialist DV staff. The training follows the modular system and guidelines set out by Centrex. In one district, community safety staff provide input to operational personnel within the district in the form of professional development days.

### **Work in progress**

- In instances where victims choose not to pursue a complaint or withdraw support for the investigation the force is piloting digital photographic technology in officers helmets (headcams) to secure evidence which can be used to bring victimless prosecutions.

### **Areas for improvement**

- While the inspection confirmed that the operational lines of accountability are clear and that staff within the districts work to a corporate policy, it also highlighted the lack of a corporate approach towards DV across the force area. The variation in service provision between the districts has been recognised at the strategic level within the force. Consideration is being given to the introduction of vulnerability units (incorporating the several strands of vulnerability) which, if implemented, will provide an overarching/co-ordinated response to vulnerable persons/victims issues.
- Initial recording procedures for DV incidents using the force C&C system (Intergraph) includes a mechanism to flag the incident to the relevant BCU DVO or investigator. However, when audited by HMIC in November 2006 there was evidence that this procedure was not being applied consistently (see HMIC audit November 2006 – Domestic Violence). The force should address the AFIs relating to management arrangements and data testing contained within that audit report.
- The issues reported elsewhere in this document relating to the IRIS system were also evident within the DV arena.
- The current arrangements for MARAC co-ordinators are short term and the force needs to determine the long-term viability and funding of these posts.
- The presence of both MARAC and multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) risk-assessment processes are a positive innovation; however, there is currently no linkage between the two systems, and the force should seek to develop such linkages. There is a need to ensure that MARAC processes are 'informed' by

MAPPA risk assessments in relation to offenders where this is appropriate.

- Current arrangements for dealing with DV across the force area lack corporacy. In some districts the staff dedicated to this functional responsibility are designated as DVOs whose primary responsibility is providing co-ordination, risk assessment and welfare support to victims. In other areas – most notably Redcar and Cleveland – the approach is to have DVIs who undertake the effective investigation and risk assessment of DV incidents. The welfare aspects are the responsibility of external agencies such as women’s aid. Positive feedback was received relating to this latter approach. Current arrangements lead to a variation in standards and job descriptions across the force area and decisions need to be taken on the preferred corporate approach to DV and the adequacy of staffing levels for effective management of workloads.
- The force should review the force policy and procedures for DV, taking cognisance of the revised approach to investigating DV incidents, the Codes of Practice for Victims of Crime (Home Office October 2005), the HMIC audits undertaken in November 2006 and best practice elsewhere in the country.
- Feedback from front-line staff at various levels raised concerns about the consistency of approach to the recording and management of DV incidents in certain areas. The force needs to satisfy itself that all incidents are being dealt with in accordance with force policy and procedures. This is an area that may lend itself to internal inspection or audit.
- Management information in relation to DV is collected but there is little evidence of it being used proactively. The force needs to examine how best to utilise this information so that it is used to inform improvement or strategic development.

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Public Protection

GRADE	GOOD
-------	------

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
2	16	23	2

### National contextual factors

The Criminal Justice and Courts Services Act 2000 led to the formation of the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements, commonly known as MAPPA, requiring the police and probation services to work together as the Responsible Authority in each area of England and Wales to establish and review the arrangements for the assessment and management of sexual and violent offenders. Subsequent legislation brought the Prison Service into the Responsible Authority arrangements and also requires a range of social care agencies to co-operate with the Responsible Authority in the delivery of the assessment and management of risk in this area. These agencies include health, housing, education, social services, youth offending teams, Jobcentre Plus, and electronic monitoring services.

Under MAPPA, there are three categories of offender who are considered to pose a risk of serious harm:

Category 1 – Registered Sex Offenders (RSOs)

Category 2 – violent and other sex offenders

Category 3 – other offenders (with convictions that indicate they are capable of causing, and pose a risk of, serious harm).

To be managed under MAPPA, offenders must have received a conviction or caution. However, there are some people who have not been convicted or cautioned for any offence, and thus fall outside these categories, but whose behaviour nonetheless gives reasonable ground for believing a present likelihood of them committing an offence that will cause serious harm. These people are termed Potentially Dangerous Persons (PDPs).

Following risk assessment, risk management involves the use of strategies by various agencies to reduce the risk, at three levels:

- Level 1 offenders can be managed by one agency;
- Level 2 offenders require the active involvement of more than one agency;
- Level 3 offenders – the ‘critical few’ – are generally deemed to pose a high or very high risk and are managed by a multi-agency public protection panel (MAPPP).

In 2003, the Home Secretary issued MAPPA guidance to consolidate what has already been achieved since the introduction of the MAPPA in 2001 and to address a need for greater consistency in MAPPA practice. The guidance outlines four considerations that are key to the delivery of effective public protection.

October 2007

- defensible decisions;
- rigorous risk assessment;
- the delivery of risk management plans which match the identified public protection need; and,
- the evaluation of performance to improve delivery.

### **Contextual factors**

The PPU is centrally based and co-located with probation service staff. Staff have responsibility for the whole force and are line managed from within crime and operations. The unit consists of one detective inspector, two detective sergeants (currently one vacancy) and eight detective constables supported by a Violent and Sex Offenders Register (ViSOR) manager and two administrative support staff. There is also one detective constable employed to deal with Sexual Offence Prevention Orders (SOPOs) and one detective sergeant and one detective constable engaged in the vulnerable adult unit (VAU).

In excess of 500 violent and sexual offenders were monitored by staff in the unit during 2005/06, of which 23 were very high risk, 54 high risk and 298 medium or low risk. There were a further 138 offenders in custody.

The force has invested considerably in this area following criticism in previous HMIC reports and has managed to reduce the staff/offender ratio from 1:200 to 1:57. This is a considerable achievement and the force is to be applauded for this commitment.

The absence of any national training or national standard has been highlighted by both staff and senior management and HMI considers this to be a significant weakness which is beyond the remit of the force but needs addressing at a national level.

### **Strengths**

- The DCC has strategic responsibility and ownership for public protection, while operational responsibility rests with the head of crime and operations.
- Protecting children and vulnerable adults, of which public protection is a part, sit as specific priorities within the corporate policing strategy 2007–10.
- Following concerns expressed in relation to the workload of staff within the PPU in the last HMIC assessment in 2006, the force has quadrupled the size of the unit, bringing the workload ratio down from in excess of 1:200 to 1:57 cases.
- The PPU operates from single premises in Middlesbrough housing both police officers and probation staff who work jointly across the force area in four teams covering the BCUs. Line management up to DCC is via the central crime and operations structure, with the recently appointed DCI being the senior functional line manager.
- The accountability structure is clear, with the unit working to a joint strategy and information-sharing protocols co-ordinated via a senior management board (SMB).

October 2007

- The detective inspector in charge of the unit maintains an overview of attendance while day-to-day responsibility for level 1 and 2 meetings rests with the detective sergeants. Feedback from other agencies involved in the SMB process is very positive and confirms that the police are contributing effectively at all three levels of MAPPA covering single agency management through to multi-agency level 3 meetings attended by the detective inspector. Statistics from the SMB indicate that staff attend in excess of 1,200 meetings a year for MAPPA issues.
- The process for referrals is co-ordinated by the PPU. A referral submitted from an agency is jointly reviewed by a detective sergeant and the dedicated SOPO officer working within the PPU. An assessment is made and depending upon the information a joint meeting is called, or if the referral does not meet the MAPPA criteria it is sent back to the referral agency with suggested strategies for the agency to manage.
- A corporate policy for public protection and MAPPA issues is current and published on the force intranet site. Draft ACPO guidance is included within the policy and procedures. It clearly sets out the role of all individuals involved and emphasises the needs for effective linkage between PVP units and ensures that PVP staff on BCUs attend relevant MAPPA meetings.
- All PPU staff are risk management 2000 (RM2000) trained; they also have access to data and information from other agencies, ie Offender Risk Assessment System (OAsys) (Prisons and Probation) which they review to inform and, where appropriate, to amend the risk assessments. MAPPA offenders are risk assessed at their homes – those deemed unstable are seen weekly. If new information is forthcoming a new assessment takes place.
- Those individuals who sit outside the formal category 1– 3 MAPPA process are managed by the BCU commanders and prioritised via the NIM process following inputs from staff dealing with DV, MFHs or other related cases. Consideration is given as to whether these individuals are suitable for a Risk of Sexual Harm Order (RSHO). The SMB has a strategic overview of such individuals in a category 4 process that runs alongside the main MAPPA business.
- The PPU has a dedicated SOPO officer who co-ordinates all activity in relation to orders across the force area. This individual has been successful in prosecuting individuals for breaches of SOPOs.
- The force policy identifies the specific roles for operational staff in relation to reporting and recording of information following incidents involving those individuals flagged as being in the MAPPA system. Officers or staff who come in to contact with individuals flagged on the C&C system will currently contact the PPU, force intelligence bureau (FIB) or the control room inspector to pass on any information they have ascertained. Once the ViSOR system has been rolled out to the districts, officers will contact the nominated single point of contact (SPOC) in the district.
- Staff in the PPU have regular psychological assessment and supervisors are aware of the need to monitor those staff under their supervision for any signs that may indicate welfare issues or stress-related symptoms.
- Job descriptions for PPU staff are in place and up to date and accurately reflect the role. Feedback at various levels confirmed that staff are clear about their role and

October 2007

what is expected.

- The centralised nature of the PPU allows effective supervision of staff on a daily basis. Briefings and debriefings are undertaken and quality assurance of files is carried out within the unit by the detective sergeants. Each visit is checked and quality assured by a detective sergeant before being input onto ViSOR. Independent assessment of files is undertaken by a subgroup of the SMB on a monthly basis.
- In the absence of a national course for PPU staff (see recommendations), the force has developed its own training modules which include ViSOR, RM2000, CEOP as well as attachments to associated bodies, eg Barnardo's, CAIU and the force vice squad. Supervisors have training in chairing meetings and there are also joint development days with prison and probation personnel and attachments organised for staff to attend prison service establishments. (See generic section regarding investigators' training.)
- ViSOR is centrally managed with all inputting done by either the system manager or trained PPU staff. Records are checked by supervisors prior to input. This ensures consistency across the force. FIB personnel and control room supervisors have read-only access to ViSOR 24 hours a day.
- Management information on the full range of MAPPA categories is produced monthly down to BCU level. This is available to all supervision and the SMB. Individual performance is monitored via the MPR process.
- The linkage between the PPU and other units within the PVP arena, ie DV, CAI and MFH, is effective and co-ordinated via the DCI. The forms utilised for DV and MFH provide linkage and cross over with child protection and sexual offending to enable issues of concern to front-line operational staff to be flagged to the appropriate unit. There are effective information-sharing protocols in place with key agencies in relation to PPU activity.
- Proactive operations are undertaken when appropriate utilising force surveillance assets. The subject and frequency are determined through NIM level 2 tasking and co-ordinating processes.

### **Work in progress**

- The force is now starting to proactively target people via weekly level 2 TCG meetings that run alongside MAPPA to identify potential offenders.
- The force intends to identify and train a SPOC within each district who can access the ViSOR system.
- Briefings are currently being undertaken to raise the awareness of staff in neighbourhoods in relation to PPU issues. There are no plans for neighbourhood officers to undertake visits to anyone on the MAPPA register.

### **Areas for improvement**

- There is no MAPPA co-ordinator and this is a source of concern to participants in the process. It has been identified as good practice to employ an individual to undertake

October 2007

this role to assist the SMB in a co-ordinating function so that the SMB is better sighted on key issues. The individual would attend all the district meetings to provide a consistent approach and be in a better position to inform the strategic group of any areas of concern or lack of corporacy. This role does not need to be staffed by a police officer; indeed in some forces the role is undertaken by an employee from one of the other agencies such as the probation service. The force should seek to appoint a MAPPA co-ordinator following discussions with the other agencies involved in relation to funding for such a post.

- Feedback confirmed that individual members of staff on occasions are visiting registered sex offenders within their home environment without being accompanied. While professional judgement is being applied there is no evidence of any formal pre-home visit risk assessment being undertaken. As a result this practice could present the individual officer with an unacceptable level of risk and should be supervised more effectively.
- At present the ViSOR system does not contain details of violent offenders. This is not unique to Cleveland and is a national issue that requires clarification.
- Checks have revealed that there is an absence of a supervisory audit trail on ViSOR. Supervision is paper-based and the details of the supervisor checking the records are not being identified on the computerised ViSOR system. This issue needs to be addressed by the force.

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons

GRADE	GOOD
-------	------

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1	21	21	0

### National contextual factors

Each year, thousands of people are reported to police as missing. Many have done so voluntarily and are safe from harm, whether or not they return home. But a number are vulnerable, because of age or health concerns, and the police service has developed well-honed systems to respond swiftly and effectively to such cases. For obvious reasons, missing children arouse particular concern, and many forces deploy 'Child Rescue Alert' to engage the media in publicising such cases. Key good practice in this framework are early recognition of critical incident potential, effective supervision of enquiries, the use of NIM problem profiles and other intelligence techniques to analyse repeat locations (eg, children's homes), and the use of an IT-based investigation tracking system such as COMPACT.

### Contextual factors

There is a comprehensive policy and separate procedure document for missing persons and the force constantly reinforces with staff, through scenario-based training, the critical importance of dealing with missing persons enquiries effectively. The force works to the ACPO guidance on the management, recording and investigation of missing persons issued in 2005, and a force action plan was developed to address all the issues in that document.

Innovative work with outside agencies such as Barnardo's is being undertaken in Middlesbrough to try and trace long-term missing persons.

### Strengths

- Strategic responsibility for missing persons rests with the DCC while operational delivery is the responsibility of the ACC (T). A capability assessment in relation to the NCPE/ACPO guidance has been undertaken and an action plan developed.
- Liaison with other PVP units is through the DCI with portfolio responsibility for this area (see generic section).
- There is a comprehensive policy for the effective management of missing persons written in accordance with ACPO guidance, which was last reviewed in December 2005. Ownership and accountability are clearly identified within the policy together with the supervision and review requirements. There is a link from the main policy to a procedures document, both of which are available on the intranet and available to all staff.
- The procedures document reinforces ownership, accountability and the role of the senior investigating officer (SIO). It also covers in great depth specialist issues

October 2007

relating to minority groups as well as a comprehensive risk-assessment process. Linkages to the NIM process are also reinforced in this document.

- A wallchart called 'A timely reminder', designed to reinforce and remind staff of the importance of dealing with missing persons thoroughly and professionally, has been produced and exhibited in stations across the force area.
- Effective processes are in place within the districts for the recording, monitoring and investigation of missing persons. Active supervision takes place daily and risk assessments are undertaken in accordance with policy to identify those cases requiring additional support. Management is undertaken via the daily management meeting. A nominated officer in the BCU community safety unit has oversight of all missing persons enquiries and undertakes investigation of long-term missing persons and liaison with other agencies, eg Barnardo's, women's refuges and the IAG network within force.
- There is evidence of a multi-agency approach within Middlesbrough to missing persons using Barnardo's. This is an innovative approach utilising the Barnardo's 'Safe Choices' scheme whereby the safety of young persons is deemed more important than making moral judgements, eg young girls staying with a boyfriend. The other districts are seeking to adopt this approach and establish their own links with this external organisation.
- While there is no stand-alone IT system for the management of missing persons, the force does use the C&C system (Intergraph) linked to IRIS.
- Active supervision of MFHs takes place within the BCUs. The MFH reporting form is very comprehensive and the initial enquiries are supervised by front-line sergeants and reported to and monitored at the morning management meeting within the district. Where a high risk is assessed an SIO can be appointed and the full raft of force resources made available to progress enquiries speedily.
- Risk-assessment procedures are well honed and the force is capable of identifying and responding to high-risk missing persons, calling on other agencies where necessary. The force has a child abduction trigger plan and can instigate a child rescue alert via local media organisations in the case of particularly vulnerable young persons and children.
- When appropriate the cases of missing persons can be and are raised at the tasking and co-ordinating meeting, but more active daily management is undertaken via the regular morning meeting where resources can be allocated and missing persons are a standard agenda item.
- Supervisory staff are trained utilising scenario-based input – codenamed Operation Melissa – that is based on a real-life situation. This provides interactive decision-making opportunities and training in live risk assessment.

## **Work in progress**

- Discussions are currently ongoing between the DCC and the head of crime in relation to the longer term missing persons strategic lead with a view to continuous improvement in service delivery.

### **Areas for improvement**

- There is an absence of effective management information in relation to missing persons used to monitor and improve performance within this specific area of activity.
- While there is evidence of multi-agency working in certain areas of the force, this could be taken further with the development of multi-agency strategies, clearly defined joint objectives, targets and protocols. This would be particularly relevant for joint working in relation to children missing from the care of the local authority.

## Recommendations

### Neighbourhood Policing

#### Recommendation 1

HMI recommends, as a matter of priority, that the force should review and reassess the training being delivered to PCSOs, taking cognisance of good practice elsewhere in the country.

### Protecting vulnerable people

#### Recommendation 2

HMI recommends that regular vetting should be undertaken for staff working within and applying for roles within the PPU and CAIUs.

#### Recommendation 3

HMI recommends, as a matter of priority, that the force reviews and provides appropriate levels of administrative support for the CAIUs.

#### Recommendation 4

HMI recommends that the force reviews the police officer staffing levels within the CAIUs in order to provide effective resilience.

## Appendix: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

### A

ABC	activity-based costing
ACC	assistant chief constable
ACC (CD)	assistant chief constable (corporate development)
ACC (T)	assistant chief constable (territorial)
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
APA	Association of Police Authorities
ASB	anti-social behaviour

### B

BCU	basic command unit
BME	black and minority ethnic
BTP	British Transport Police

### C

C&C	command and control
CAI	child abuse investigation
CAIU	child abuse investigation unit
CDRP	crime and disorder reduction partnership
Centrex	the national police training organisation
CEOP	child exploitation online protection
CIA	community impact assessment
COG	chief officer group
CompStat	computational statistics
CPP	corporate performance and planning
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service

**D**

DCC	deputy chief constable
DCI	detective chief inspector
DV	domestic violence
DVI	domestic violence investigator
DVO	domestic violence officer

**E**

e-MPR	electronic monthly performance review
-------	---------------------------------------

**F**

FIB	force intelligence bureau
FTE	full-time equivalent

**H**

HICT	head of information and communications technology
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspector
HMIC	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
HR	human resource(s)

**I**

IAG	independent advisory group
ICIDP	Initial Crime Investigators' Development Programme
ICT	information and communications technology
IQuanta	a web-based tool for policing performance information and analysis, developed by the police standards unit of the Home Office
IRIS	Integrated Records Information System
IT	information technology

**J**

JAG	joint action group
-----	--------------------

**K**

KIN key individual networks

**L**

LCJB local criminal justice board

LPP local policing plan

LSCB local safeguarding children board

**M**

MAPPA multi-agency public protection arrangements

MARAC multi-agency risk assessment conference

MFH missing from home

MORI Market and Opinion Research International

MPR monthly performance review

MSF most similar force(s)

**N**

NCPE National Centre for Policing Excellence

NCRS National Crime Recording Standard

NIM National Intelligence Model

NCSP national community safety plan

**O**

OAsys Offender Risk Assessment System

OBTJ Offences Brought to Justice

OIC operational information console

OPT operational performance team

**P**

PA	police authority
PCSD	Police and Crime Standards Directorate
PCSO	police community support officer
PDR	performance development review
PI	performance indicator
PPAF	policing performance assessment framework
PPU	public protection unit
PRINCE2	Projects in Controlled Environments 2
PVP	protecting vulnerable persons

**Q**

QoSC	quality of service commitment
------	-------------------------------

**R**

RM2000	risk management 2000
RMG	resource management group
RSHO	Risk of Sexual Harm Order

**S**

SARC	sexual and multi-agency referral centre
SC	special constable
SGC	specific grading criteria
SIO	senior investigating officer
SMART	specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, timely
SMB	senior management board
SOPO	Sexual Offence Prevention Order
SPG	strategic performance group
SPOC	single point of contact
STEM	Safer Together in East Middlesbrough

SUM service unit manager

**T**

TCG tasking and co-ordinating group

TPAM team performance accountability mechanism system

**U**

UPP unsatisfactory performance procedure

**V**

VAU vulnerable adult unit

ViSOR Violent and Sex Offenders Register