



**HMIC Inspection Report
Hampshire Constabulary**

October 2007



Hampshire Constabulary – HMIC Inspection Report

October 2007

ISBN: 978-1-84726-460-2

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://inspectorates.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

October 2007

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 the 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.

HMIC risk-based frameworks
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.

Planned Inspection areas
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

Hampshire Constabulary covers the two counties of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. There are two principal cities, Portsmouth and Southampton, together with many towns and villages. Both Portsmouth and Southampton have their own universities and premier and championship football teams. Portsmouth is the home of the Royal Navy and is also a continental ferry port. Southampton is a major commercial port and situated nearby is one of the largest petrochemical refineries in Europe.

As well as the cities, the force area contains thriving modern towns and a vibrant tourist industry that has developed in the historic market towns and rural countryside. There are many local areas of interest, including the ancient Saxon city of Winchester. The area hosts a number of annual events and festivals, including the Isle of Wight festival, Farnborough International Air Show, the Bestival, Slammin' Vinyl 48-hour dance festival, music events at Beaulieu, music and international sporting events at the Rosebowl and the Chinese New Year parade (Southampton), as well as regular royal and VIP visits.

The two counties have a significant motorway network and have some of the busiest roads in the country, particularly along the coast. There is a significant military presence, with a number of army, navy and air force establishments located within the two counties.

Demographic profile of force area

Hampshire Constabulary is the second largest non-metropolitan police service in England and Wales and polices an area of 418,000 hectares, serving a population of 1.8 million in 730,000 households. Approximately 411,000 people live in the two main cities; about 135,000 people live on the Isle of Wight.

There is a lower than national average black and minority ethnic population and average earnings are higher than the national average, although there are areas of deprivation. Hampshire reflects the national picture regarding traffic congestion, green belt urbanisation, an ageing population and social pressures in areas that lack housing.

Strategic priorities

Hampshire Constabulary and its police authority (PA) believe that policing is best delivered when it takes account of and responds to local needs. These views are obtained through the PA's process of consultation with the public and through local intelligence gathering and consultation by the force. Regard is given to both the Home Secretary's key strategic priorities for the police service for 2007/08 and Hampshire PA's three-year strategic plan for 2005 to 2008. The priorities are:

- enhancing Safer Neighbourhoods;
- strengthening public protection (with an emphasis on missing persons, child abuse, domestic abuse, multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) and hate crime);
- protecting communities from terrorism, domestic extremism and major disasters; and
- reducing and detecting crime, specifically drug/alcohol-related crime, violent crime, major crime, and serious and organised crime.

October 2007

Force developments since 2006

Hampshire Constabulary has responded positively since the 2005/06 baseline assessment graded professional standards as Poor (following a separate inspection in 2005) and volume crime investigation and performance management as Fair/Declined. Significant progress has been made in professional standards, with all the recommendations and areas for improvement being addressed. The investigation of volume crime continues to improve; the force invited the Police Crime Standards Directorate to identify systems and processes for improvement, and this has resulted in sustained improvement in sanction detections. Much has changed in the way in which performance is managed across the force; it is now much more focused and includes specialist departments, and, later in 2007, it will include partnership involvement. All three areas of business are performing at an acceptable level and further comment is made later in this report about performance management, which is now graded as Good.

The force successfully restructured the ten territorial basic command units (BCUs) into six operational command units (OCUs), ensuring as far as possible that they were aligned to the boundaries of their respective crime and disorder reduction partnerships (CDRPs), helping the drive towards delivering Neighbourhood Policing. Furthermore, within the specialist operations portfolio, two new OCUs for operations and crime were formed. The critical incident cadre, now firmly embedded within the structure, ensures that the force is able to deal more efficiently and effectively with the risks associated with critical incidents. Newly formed corporate structures that incorporate, for example, community safety teams and prosecution support teams, ensure that risks posed by the management of dangerous offenders are reduced. Linking with this, the force is currently embarking on improvements to the way in which it delivers protective services, fortifying its proactive and reactive response to serious, organised and major crime, enhancing its ability to collate and assess community intelligence, strengthening its resilience in the arena of emergency planning, and creating a full-time professional response to incidents involving firearms.

The Safer Neighbourhood project has been a key priority for the force throughout the last year. Learning from the national and force pathfinder sites was used to prepare for the implementation of Safer Neighbourhoods across the force area in April 2007. New neighbourhood areas have been defined and 154 Safer Neighbourhood teams (SNTs) have been introduced, covering the whole of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. The SNTs are dedicated, visible, accessible and responsive to their neighbourhoods; their aim is to deliver the four key elements of Neighbourhood Policing – access, influence, interventions and answers. SNTs work with local communities and with key partners to reduce crime, reduce concern about crime and address the issues that matter most to local people, creating neighbourhoods that are safe and feel safe.

The composition of SNTs varies according to the needs of the particular neighbourhood and can include police community support officers (PCSOs), special constables, volunteers and police officers, working closely with partner agencies, accredited community support officers, community wardens and rangers. Over the last year, the force has achieved the selection, recruitment and training of 338 PCSOs to meet the revised government target. The PCSOs are providing a highly visible and reassuring presence within local communities.

Staffing as at 30 June 2007 was as follows: 3,902 police officers, 2,652 police staff, 338 PCSOs and 424 special constables.

Findings

National summary of judgements

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Neighbourhood Policing				
Neighbourhood Policing	6	14	21	2
Performance management				
Performance management	6	29	8	0
Protecting vulnerable people				
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

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

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 police community support officers (PCSOs) patrolling their streets, addressing anti-social behaviour 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

The aim of Neighbourhood Policing is to increase satisfaction and confidence, reduce the fear of crime and resolve local problems of crime and anti-social behaviour.

Police forces should be implementing the model of Neighbourhood Policing most suited to their local environments while ensuring compliance with the ten Neighbourhood Policing principles and the findings of the Neighbourhood Policing Reassurance Programme.

In Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, the aim of Safer Neighbourhoods is to achieve: "The right people, at the right places, in the right numbers in order to create neighbourhoods that are safe and feel safe." Significant progress has been made since the 2006/07 inspection, with some 154 neighbourhoods having been identified and dedicated teams assigned to them. The Neighbourhood Policing pathfinder site at Portsmouth began on 22 March 2006 and was seen by the force as a natural evolution of its sector policing model introduced in Hampshire in 2004.

Neighbourhood Policing continues to be the number one priority in the integrated planning/force control strategy. The dedicated pathfinder team and the force project team work to a detailed project plan, utilising PRINCE2 methodology, are well established, and

October 2007

are working to deliver a Safer Neighbourhood strategy and operational model that has now been rolled out across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.

As at 30 June 2007, there were some 100 Safer Neighbourhood sergeants and 402 Safer Neighbourhood officers (SNOs), plus 338 PCSOs based within the 154 Safer Neighbourhoods. There are also some 424 special constables within the force, which amounts to 10.9% of the force strength.

Performance indicators that are available from the current suite and can measure the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Policing include:

- statutory performance indicator (SPI) 2a: the British Crime Survey (BCS) percentage of people who think that their local police do a good job;
- SPI 10b: BCS perceptions of anti-social behaviour; and
- the key diagnostic indicators for the percentage of people who agree that the police in their area:
 - understand the issues that affect the community;
 - are dealing with the things that matter most to people in the community; and
 - can be relied on to deal with minor crimes.

Hampshire Constabulary is above the most similar force (MSF) average in all five of these indicators (second in the MSF for SPI 2a, fourth for SPI 10b, and second for each of the key diagnostic indicators).

Strengths

There is clarity about the commitment of the force and its PA to Neighbourhood Policing, which features prominently in the 2006/07 and 2007/08 local policing plans (LPPs) (see www.hampshirepoliceauthority.org/hpa/hpapublications/policingplan.htm). This is led by the Chief Constable and driven by the assistant chief constable (territorial operations) (ACC (TO)) at a corporate level. There is a Neighbourhood Policing project team, led by a superintendent who manages the project on behalf of the force, and on each OCU there is a Neighbourhood Policing change manager to ensure corporate delivery at a local level. Decisions of meetings are recorded and minuted. The PA has its own lead member for Neighbourhood Policing and there are link members assigned to each OCU.

There is evidence of near complete implementation and full coverage across every OCU. The revised target to recruit and train 338 PCSOs was reached in April 2007; currently, the force is over its establishment by five and it has some 50 applicants interviewed, vetted and ready to join as vacancies arise. There are some 154 Safer Neighbourhoods, each with its own SNT led by a sergeant and staffed by a blend of SNOs and PCSOs (not all of the 154 Safer Neighbourhoods are fully staffed). A matrix for intelligence-led deployment of the Neighbourhood Policing fund PCSOs (borrowed from Merseyside Police) has been used to ensure that they are deployed appropriately, and SNT supervisors endeavour to ensure that they are deployed correctly (see 'Areas for improvement').

There is clarity in the role definitions for the SNT inspector, sergeant and constable, and there is a PCSO deployment plan. A training needs analysis was carried out for the pathfinder OCU in April 2006 and for the force as a whole in September 2006. The training plan drew upon the Core Leadership Development Programme (CLDP) key learning outcomes and training packages were devised around these. The Neighbourhood Policing

October 2007

project manager meets regularly with the force training manager and with the specific training leads for PCSOs and Problem Resolution in Multi-agency Environments (PRIME) IT, Initial Police Learning and Development Programme (IPLDP) and Safer Neighbourhood training. An evaluation process is in place for all aspects of Safer Neighbourhood training. For both the Safer Neighbourhood course and the PRIME IT course there is a formative evaluation throughout the course and a level 2 evaluation in the form of a written test is conducted at the conclusion. The PCSO training course has been subject to a full level 3 evaluation.

The force has actively participated in the ACPO (now National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA)) assessment of its Neighbourhood Policing system. It has a member of the NPIA Neighbourhood Policing programme team sitting on its Neighbourhood Policing programme board. It has regularly undertaken assessments and has combined these with the HMIC Neighbourhood Policing SGC to identify the gaps, and it has developed and utilised action plans to address these. Using PRINCE2 methodology and having a dedicated project team and OCU-based change managers have helped overcome obstacles and share good practice. Each OCU has a change manager who drives local implementation of the Neighbourhood Policing project plan together with the OCU's own readiness plan, assessment and action plan to address these gaps. The Neighbourhood Policing project team carries out reality checks at sites to check progress. Progress reports are also made to the full PA by the Neighbourhood Policing project manager. Actions are reviewed after one and three months. The force participated in the Centrex-run neighbourhood improvement workshops in November 2006.

Following the pathfinder experience at Portsmouth using a sector-based model of deployment, it was decided at the programme board to adopt the laminate model instead. This model has larger targeted patrol teams available to respond to the vast majority of reported incidents, with SNT officers who are protected from abstraction or deployment to incidents other than those graded as most serious or ones relating to identified local priorities. The Merseyside Police resource allocation matrix was used to inform staffing levels for each of the 154 identified Safer Neighbourhoods (see above).

Through its deputy chief constable (DCC), Hampshire Constabulary played a key role in the development of the National Call Handling Standards. The force was picked to join 'wave one' of the single non-emergency number (SNEN); its bid to the programme board was highly commended and the intention was that various partners would assist the force in dealing with quality of life and reassurance issues. Some 16 partners are engaged in SNEN and cover the whole force area, with regular meetings across the partnership. All chief executives have signed up to consistent service levels and collaboration over service delivery, which offers significant benefit to the Safer Neighbourhood programme. By September 2007, a new SNEN tasking system will be in place that will allow web access to 'in-scope' tasks – this will allow the public to contact the police for advice or request non-urgent help via the internet. Data will be available to the force and the public through business objects and CADDIE (Crime and Disorder Data Information Exchange). The SNEN service aims to ensure that the public has 'one-stop shop' access to a range of services. However, during this phase the inspection team has received mixed messages about its success (see 'Areas for Improvement').

The importance of SNTs and effective community mapping and engagement is well understood by the senior management team of the crime OCU and is evidenced in their strategic planning and operational response to counter-terrorism and major, serious and organised crime. Senior detectives led the introduction of community intelligence in the Portsmouth pathfinder project and latterly in the wider force. One of the key performance indicators of the crime OCU is the production of community intelligence reports.

October 2007

Neighbourhood profiles and the local knowledge of SNOs and PCSOs are sources of information about the cultural representation of their communities. Mapping of communities to inform the neighbourhood profiles drew upon several sources, including Language Line, MapInfo and the Migrant Worker Information Exchange.

A variety of means is used to inform the public about their SNT, including an easily navigable interactive website, www.hampshire.police.uk/Internet/localpolicing/index.htm. Bus advertising, newsletters and leaflets are in use, and fridge magnets are in the process of being developed that will feature pictures and contact details of SNTs. SNTs are also maximising the use of local radio, eg Xpress FM, which has a regular Wednesday evening slot for the SNT to communicate with communities in the Portsmouth area (see www.xpressradio.co.uk/schedule). There is also input to Unity 101 FM, which describes itself as the south's only Asian and ethnic radio station (www.unity24.org/supporters.php).

While feedback to the community is an area that needs to be developed, the force provides some performance information that is accessible at community meetings and on its website, www.hampshire.police.uk/Internet/stats/. This information is available down to district level. The police and other agencies also provide incident data to the crime and disorder partnership -supported CADDIE web-facing IT system (which was launched publicly on 15 May 2007 and is accessible via a link from the Hampshire Police website or at www.hantsiowcaddie.gov.uk).

The use of PRIME as the structured means for problem solving has been in place for some time now and the force and its partners make use of the problem analysis triangle and the problem-solving function. During the 2004/05 baseline assessment, positive comment was made about how the force had received national and international recognition in the form of the Tilley and Goldstein awards for the way it had tackled vehicle crime in the Portsmouth OCU. During 2006/07, an officer was a winner in the Tilley awards (criminal damage section) and a runner-up in the Goldstein awards for his work at Mayfield School. This year (2007), the force has a PRIME project selected as one of the five finalists in the Goldstein awards that will be held in October 2007.

The PRIME methodology, which is established across Hampshire, is now further supported by a sophisticated bespoke IT system. An extensive programme of PRIME IT training to SNTs and partners is under way (see 'Work in progress'). There are 150 live PRIME problems currently registered on the PRIME IT database and an additional 87 PRIME projects listed on PRIME IT as partnership interventions dealing with Acceptable Behaviour Contracts, Anti-Social Behaviour Orders and prolific and other priority offenders (PPOs). PRIME IT is now used in over 35% of neighbourhoods; the remainder still use PRIME while the IT roll-out continues. HMIC staff officers attended a joint partnership performance meeting on the Isle of Wight, where health and ambulance data on injured people was used to identify problem licensed premises that will be subject to targeted operations to reduce violent crime.

There is a history within Hampshire of joint tasking and problem solving. The Pride of Place project on the Leigh Park estate in Havant has been part of a previous BCU inspection, and the bi-monthly written contact that the then BCU commander had with each household was seen as good practice in engaging the community and keeping it informed. The Pride of Place initiative has been the subject of a recent visit by the Princess Royal.

Joint partner training features in the Neighbourhood Policing training plan. Partners were invited to the two-day Safer Neighbourhood awareness training. Take-up of the training was variable across the OCUs with some notable successes, eg Central OCU, where some 30 partners have been trained in problem solving, and North and East OCU, which ran precursor partner training ahead of the two-day awareness training. The Isle of Wight OCU

October 2007

ran a training session that included SNOs, community wardens, environmental health officers and fire and rescue representatives. Partners have been offered training places for the forthcoming PRIME (problem resolution in a multi-agency environment) IT training (see below), which has already taken place in Portsmouth OCU where there has also been joint training with police, fire and rescue and community wardens to tackle problems relating to bonfire night.

Hampshire Constabulary maintains a community safety accreditation scheme under which people who are employed by Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council (two schemes), Southampton City Council, Rushmoor Borough Council, Isle of Wight Council and the Vehicle and Operator Services Agency are accredited. The range of powers available to each scheme is tailored to the requirements and objectives of the local partnerships of individual organisations and the police. The force supports applications from other organisations that can contribute towards community safety and combat crime and anti-social behaviour.

Policies are in place for community impact assessments (CIAs), which are carried out at force level by the community safety department or locally by the SNT – usually by the SNT inspector. Evidence was presented to the inspection team of how the force carried out dynamic risk assessments at a local level when the photograph of a recently released child sex offender was distributed to the community.

There is some recognition that SNT roles (inspector, sergeant, SNO and PCSO) are specialisms. SNOs are in receipt of special priority payments and their posts will be subject to a two-year tenure period to ensure continuity. There is evidence that the major crime team and serious and organised crime senior investigating officers (SIOs) recognise the value that the SNTs can add to the investigation of counter-terrorism and major, serious and organised crime through their links with and knowledge of the community. This is evidenced by the crime OCU strategic planning and operational response to such issues. Individual territorial OCUs hold awards for SNO of the year and community team of the year.

Investigative workloads for SNOs are limited. There is an allocation policy in place for community crimes and repeat offences that are suitable for investigation by SNOs. Caseloads are monitored by SNT supervisors. The nature and type of the repeat offence will dictate the type of support given to the repeat victim, eg a repeat victim of domestic burglary will receive support from the SNT, while a repeat victim of domestic abuse will receive support from the domestic abuse co-ordinator (see 'Domestic violence'). SNOs and PCSOs have Neighbourhood Policing-related objectives in their personal development reviews (PDRs), eg working on a project with schools, reducing crime on their beat or tackling priorities identified at community meetings.

PCSO training has been designed to provide officers with the necessary skills to fulfil their role in the deployment plan. The training has also been adjusted as additional powers have come 'online'. The staff in the force control room (FCR) now have a better understanding of how PCSOs can be deployed and PCSO supervisors check their deployment.

Work in progress

While there is strong leadership at force level with the ACC (TO), who has the Neighbourhood Policing project team working to him, there is a need to ensure that the philosophy of Neighbourhood Policing runs throughout the force. It is evident from group interviews with officers and staff that awareness of the work of SNTs is directly related to their proximity to an SNT (see below).

October 2007

The service provided by the force enquiry centre (FEC) and by the FCR is not meeting the needs and expectations of either the community or the SNTs. It is evident from group interviews with senior and middle managers, officers, staff and community members that there is disconnect between the aims of Neighbourhood Policing and call handling. FEC and FCR operators were not aware of neighbourhood priorities and the screening process adopted by the FEC/FCR meant that many, if not most, low-grade calls that may feature as priorities identified at neighbourhood meetings were being screened out, much to the frustration of the public and SNTs. A PRINCE2 project within the call management function is under way and should provide all call handlers with details of agreed priorities in the 154 Safer Neighbourhoods. This needs to be adopted as soon as possible if the trust and confidence of communities is not to be lost.

The resolution of grade 3 (non-urgent calls) has been a thorny issue that the force has been trying to resolve for some time. It is piloting on its Western OCU a method of resolving grade 3 calls by telephone rather than by despatching an officer or PCSO. It is able to do this by enhancing the staffing levels in its incident management unit (IMU) with officers on restricted duties. Evaluation of the pilot was being undertaken at the time of publication, and it is not clear whether the other five territorial OCUs would have the staffing capability to follow this model in its present form.

The Neighbourhood Policing programme board intends that the Neighbourhood Policing project team will be wound up if the project remains on target against the gap analysis. The territorial operations department will carry on as corporate owners of Neighbourhood Policing and will provide OCUs with a corporate steer to ensure that effective implementation is maintained. The ACC (TO) inspection process should be adjusted to oversee this.

Engagement with partners in joint intelligence gathering and action against crime and anti-social behaviour is being established in Hampshire. Each district (coterminous with a CDRP) has its own community tasking and co-ordination meeting, but the attendance levels of the various partners varies greatly. HMIC staff officers attended the Isle of Wight meeting, which was well attended by the police, the PA, the local authority, social housing, the probation service, fire and rescue, the ambulance service and others. The meeting addressed important local issues of concern raised by the police, partners and the community, eg burglary of beach huts, cars racing in a local car park and problems associated with alcohol consumption. It is evident that the unitary local authority structure benefits such a meeting and that the level of attendance should be seen as a model for the rest of the force to follow. In time, such a meeting would benefit from the chair being passed from the police to another partner.

Community profiles are in place for the majority of the 154 Safer Neighbourhoods and have been written in conjunction with OCU analysts, who have built in crime and disorder data as well as demographic data to help identify community groups. Ownership of the profiles rests with the SNTs. A community engagement strategy has been developed along with a community engagement handbook for SNTs to use (see below).

There is a longstanding corporate approach to multi-agency problem solving through PRIME. Part of the PRIME process includes evaluation, and good practice is shared among OCUs. The force has embarked on implementing an IT version of PRIME and is in the process of training around 900 officers and partners in its use. The PRIME IT package is viewed as good practice by the head of the NPIA Neighbourhood Policing team (see 'Developing practice'). Training has already been undertaken in Portsmouth OCU with the City Council, and HMIC staff officers have seen examples of how the system works. PRIME IT is a potentially powerful tool as it is possible to cost both the problem and the solution, using agreed costing mechanisms provided by the force finance department, and therefore

October 2007

provide a cost/benefit analysis of problem resolution.

Portsmouth OCU and CDRP will be the first to produce a joint strategic assessment with their partners in October 2007, with the remaining OCUs and CDRPs producing their strategic assessments by April 2008.

Learning from Neighbourhood Policing performance and implementation is still in development. Comment has already been made above about the learning from the pathfinder and the change to the laminate model. Further comment will be made later in this report about the use of performance indicators specific to Neighbourhood Policing.

The Isle of Wight and Portsmouth OCUs are piloting the training of officers, staff and partners in the collection and processing of community intelligence. Once the pilots have been evaluated, the training should be rolled out across the OCUs and must include partners. There is some evidence that partner agencies are submitting intelligence to OCUs but this is varied and patchy across the six OCUs. Comment is made elsewhere in this report about the force intelligence bureau community desk.

There is some evidence that issues of organised crime and counter-terrorism are linked to Neighbourhood Policing, with two special branch (SB) officers linked to three OCUs each. SB undertakes input to SNT and PCSO training about Operation Rainbow. Senior detectives from the serious and organised crime group are utilising SNT inspectors to carry out CIAs. The force has adopted Operation Delphinus, with implementation to be co-ordinated by the chief superintendent (community safety department) in conjunction with SB. On each OCU the deputy commander is responsible for implementing the seven strands of Delphinus within the OCU. Delphinus is one workstream that will report to the newly established force counter-terrorism board. A new CIA process has been prepared that includes guidance and amended templates for completion at OCU/SNT and force level.

Engagement activities are occurring across all the neighbourhoods, but community engagement is described by the force as variable, with the 'already engaged' easier to build a relationship with while the 'hard to reach' are still being identified and engagement mechanisms put in place. The force has made in-roads into addressing this gap; a community engagement handbook has been developed for SNTs along with 'how to' guides on planning and organising police surgeries and neighbourhood meetings as well as carrying out environmental audits and setting up and managing key individual networks (KINs). There is some evidence of community engagement influencing local priority setting, but it is by no means embedded as the current drive to improve crime reduction and sanction detection rates appears to take priority.

While there are force and OCU consultation plans in place, the degree of engagement with and feedback to the community varies across the OCUs. The Isle of Wight and Portsmouth OCUs are seen as the most advanced in the integration of partnerships and feeding back to the community, eg community meetings on the Isle of Wight have enabled the public to vote for their top priorities that require tackling by the police and by partners in the wider neighbourhood management field. On the Portsmouth OCU, SNTs tap into existing neighbourhood forums for the community to identify their priorities (see 'Areas for improvement').

A Safer Neighbourhood communications strategy has been implemented which covers both internal and external communications. It aims to increase awareness and understanding of Safer Neighbourhoods and to increase two-way dialogue between SNTs and their communities, thereby identifying and addressing local issues, with the aim of reducing crime and the fear of crime and increasing public confidence in community safety agencies (see www.hampshire.police.uk/Internet/localpolicing/safer/). However, objectives within the

October 2007

strategy have yet to be made SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely).

Funding has been secured to provide a dedicated central Neighbourhood Policing marketing manager and 0.5 of a post on each OCU for Neighbourhood Policing media assistants. Internally, the degree of awareness of Neighbourhood Policing is varied and understanding of the role of SNTs needs to be developed, eg the understanding by targeted patrol team (TPT) officers and call handlers with the FEC and controllers in the FCR is not advanced, and those further away from the front line have a lower level of understanding. Externally, there will be a major roll-out of publicity for Neighbourhood Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods; this was not carried out before owing to a lack of funding. More needs to be done to manage the expectations of the public as to what Neighbourhood Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods can deliver to help break the 'spiral of demand'. The PA has approved an additional 34 sergeant posts to be allocated to SNTs during 2007/08 and a further 16 during 2008/09. The level of staffing at the time of the inspection fieldwork indicated that some 19.6% of staffing is dedicated to Neighbourhood Policing and is higher than the national average of 15.5%. There is concern, however, expressed by the force and its PA, about the sustainability of 338 PCSO posts once funding from central government has ceased.

An abstraction policy has been approved by the Neighbourhood Policing programme board. The force computer aided resource management system (CARMS) is being developed to capture abstractions and vacancies so that they can be fed directly into the Safer Neighbourhood Performance Framework. The SN Performance Framework will report abstractions at individual, team, OCU and force level; and vacancies at team, OCU and force level.

KINs are beginning to have confidence that they can influence neighbourhood priorities. However, they are frustrated by the lack of understanding of these by call handlers (see 'Areas for Improvement').

There is a Hampshire-wide information-sharing protocol in place which is being revised to cater for Section 17 (Crime and Disorder Act) responsibilities and will be bespoke for the county council and the three unitary councils.

There is evidence of money being spent to accommodate SNTs and progress is being made to make changes in the accommodation in a number of OCUs. Remote working using the record management system (RMS) has faced the challenge of meeting the force security requirements, and a bid has been made to obtain the necessary software to enable this (see also 'Child abuse').

The performance management system is being enhanced through the use of business objects to help extract meaningful and timely data from RMS. Previously it was possible to drill down to individual level for personal performance indicators (PPIs); this system was unavailable, owing to an IT migration and upgrade, for a number of months but it is now back online. Work continues on enhancements to the PRIME IT system for beat manager boxes to be built in to help improve local accountability. The PA has agreed to fund survey work to assess the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Policing. Measurement of confidence and satisfaction of communities to district level will be available from November 2007 (see 'Areas for Improvement').

The need for the Hampshire independent advisory group (IAG) to scrutinise CIAs has been recognised and actioned. In addition to the Operation Restraint CIA, the IAG scrutinised the CIA for Operation Oak Tree (Glasgow and London bombs – June 2007) while the operation was still running; the IAG meeting was held on 4 July and the operation closed on 9 July

October 2007

2007. Evidence of the discussion regarding the CIA and a debrief of police/IAG interaction is included in the IAG minutes of 4 July 2007.

Areas for Improvement

To overcome the situation where members of the public are unable to have their problems resolved through the FEC, SNOs and PCSOs are giving out their mobile phone numbers for the community to make direct contact with them. While this is a laudable and pragmatic solution, it is not what the Neighbourhood Policing programme board intended. To obviate important calls being missed while SNOs and PCSOs are not working, a system of call transfer or voicemail should be put in place, while at the same time resolving the issues identified earlier.

There is a Neighbourhood Policing programme board chaired by the ACC (TO) that meets every quarter to discuss, among other things, progress against the Neighbourhood Policing implementation plan. Among the board's membership are members and officers from the PA and a community safety manager representing local authorities. There is, however, fragmented evidence across all the OCUs that partners, and other groups such as the Hampshire IAG and voluntary and charitable groups, are influencing strategic priorities and arrangements for Neighbourhood Policing.

Notwithstanding the expectations set out in the force engagement handbook, which clearly articulates the need to identify and tackle local priorities with the involvement and active participation of community members, opportunities to involve the community in problem solving have been missed. For example, at community meetings on the Isle of Wight, after the public were asked to vote on their top priorities the meeting then went to a closed session with the police and partners discussing how these could be tackled. It is important that neighbourhoods follow the expectations in the force engagement handbook and that the community is involved.

The 2005/06 baseline assessment highlighted officer and staff concern about the adequacy of e-learning packages supplied by the force to its workforce. Officer and staff perceptions still exist that this type of training does little more than raise awareness – in particular the training on the Victims' Code (a component of this assessment). There is a need to overcome this perception and reinforce learning in a cost-effective way, while ensuring that individuals take some responsibility for their own learning and development. Furthermore, officers and staff (including some of those involved in call handling) have not received specific customer service training.

There is little evidence of a robust system of continuity and succession planning for SNOs and PCSOs. Comment was made by several KINs about the absence of continuity of SNOs and PCSOs. A tenure policy is currently out for consultation; the intention is for there to be a two-year tenure period for SNOs but they will be allowed to apply for specialist posts or for promotion during this period. There is no policy in place for the retention of officers or staff in Neighbourhood Policing posts.

While the force intelligence bureau has a community intelligence desk, the intelligence, analytical and research resources based on OCUs have not. With the exception of the compilation of neighbourhood profiles, there has not been an adjustment of intelligence assets to support the needs of Neighbourhood Policing. OCU intelligence is geared towards crime types (eg domestic burglary, vehicle crime and violence), yet some 25.1% of crimes recorded during 2006/07 were cases of criminal damage, and this is not included in the force control strategy. Furthermore, following numerous individual and group interviews, it is evident that there is a need to review the current analytical structure to ensure that there is

October 2007

a balance between analytical and research capability and that needs are met within finite resources.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the force adjusts its intelligence systems and processes at operational command unit level to ensure that they support Neighbourhood Policing.

Notwithstanding the positive comments about the resource allocation matrix used to inform staffing levels for the 154 identified Safer Neighbourhoods, there is a need to evaluate the staffing levels in each SNT periodically to ensure that where demand has changed the allocation of resources is reviewed to ensure optimum staffing within the teams. For example, on the Isle of Wight OCU there appeared to be an imbalance of SNOs between east and west Wight when compared with the demand profile.

The force performance review group (FPRG) meeting (see 'Performance Management') is currently being reconfigured to take into account the performance of support departments such as crime and operations. It has yet to fully embrace measures to test the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Policing. The holding to account of SNTs is primarily through the system of PPIs, PDR objectives and the delivery of crime reduction and achieving sanction detections. Comment was made in the 2005/06 baseline assessment that a performance framework for Neighbourhood Policing was not yet in place and that the force awaited national guidelines. While there is evidence on some OCUs that Neighbourhood Policing activity is being measured (eg meetings attended and problems solved), this is by no means universal, and a yardstick for measuring the success of Neighbourhood Policing remains largely absent.

The provision of feedback to the community is an area that police forces traditionally have difficulty with, and the force and its PA recognise this. For the calendar year 2006, Hampshire Constabulary was above its MSF group average for burglary and road traffic collisions and below its MSF group average for follow-up for victims of vehicle and violent crime. Group and individual interviews with KINs indicate that being kept informed of the progress of crimes and incidents that people have reported was an area that the force must improve upon.

While positive comment has been made earlier in this report about joint problem solving and the use of PRIME, there is limited evidence that the response of partners is included in the performance management process at force or OCU level. The Isle of Wight has created a specific partnership performance meeting that was seen by the inspection team; other OCUs incorporate partnership performance in their community tasking and co-ordination group (TCG) meetings and their CDRP to various extents, but this is not uniform and needs development. Unitary local area agreement (LAA) meetings and the county LAA meetings are attended at executive and steering group levels by chief officers (including the ACC (TO), who chairs the Safer and Stronger Communities steering group). The FPRG meeting is being reconfigured as indicated above, and the agenda is broadening from a focus on detection towards crime reduction and public service agreement targets and OCUs driving reduction targets together with partners.

While there is clarity in the role definitions for the SNT inspector, sergeant and constable and a PCSO deployment plan, there is a need for all officers and staff within the force to understand these roles, as mentioned elsewhere in this report. There were no specific role definitions for special constables in SNTs, and they have yet to be integrated into SNTs. While some 86% of special constables are allocated to SNTs (the remainder are with TPTs

October 2007

and the Road Policing Unit (RPU)), it is evident from group interviews with officers that SNTs, TPTs and special constables themselves would welcome clarity about their role and how they might be deployed to support either SNTs or TPTs. Currently there are occasions where special constables are turning up for duty, self-briefing and self-deploying without regard to OCU and SNT priorities.

There is some evidence that neighbourhoods have been defined through local agreements between the force and some of its partners, eg local authorities. During the 'Forward Together' process when ten BCUs were restructured into six OCUs, there was a great deal of public consultation that was not evident when the 154 Safer Neighbourhoods were being formulated. While adjustments have been made since the pathfinder to move from a sector to a laminate model, there does not appear to be a process for later review or adaptation of neighbourhood boundaries.

The reluctance of partners to engage in Neighbourhood Policing is not included in the Neighbourhood Policing risk register as the force claims that there are no pockets of reluctance to engage by partners. However, there is some evidence to suggest that some partners are less engaged than others (eg health).

While SNT sergeants have supervisory responsibilities for PCSOs, and the PCSO Student Officer Learning Assessment Portfolio (SOLAP) training given to sergeants includes information on the PCSO role, powers and deployment, there was nonetheless concern expressed by sergeants that they felt they were not adequately equipped to manage and supervise members of police staff (PCSOs) and there is a need to augment the training given.

While there is evidence of the use of volunteers in the Portsmouth and Central OCUs, this is by no means widespread. There is a policy and procedure in place for volunteers but there is no central co-ordination of their use.

Developing Practice

INSPECTION AREA: Neighbourhood Policing

TITLE: PRIME partnership working IT

PROBLEM:

There was no IT support for problem-solving activity to guide staff through the scanning, analysis, response and assessment (SARA) process or to provide a toolkit, access to best practice, or formal project management and quality control. There was no capability to record partnership problem-solving activity, including the resolution of local priorities, in a single accessible system.

SOLUTION:

The solution was to develop a bespoke, secure, web-facing IT system accessible by all partners without licensing issues. PRIME (Problem Resolution In Multi-agency Environments) IT has been developed with funding from the Home Office Innovation Fund. It combines many areas of activity that support community engagement, consultation and problem solving in support of Safer Neighbourhoods.

The system has:

- Policing Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF) questions built in to provide consistency of consultation;
- activity-based costing (ABC) via a resource object that automatically calculates the cost of police and partner attendance at incidents; and
- the capacity to place depersonalised project information in the public domain – making partnership problem-solving work accessible on the internet to the public.

The system allows for direct uploading of photographs, video footage and documents via a browser capability. It complies with the Data Protection Act by scoring the data input by the police and partners against 5x5x5 provenance, reliability and circulation criteria. It automatically separates personal and depersonalised data.

OUTCOME(S):

Early feedback from SNTs and trained supervisors indicates that the system will really support Safer Neighbourhood work. A variety of other forces have expressed interest, as it is a unique and innovative system that is highly intuitive, very adaptable and easily accessed.

FORCE CONTACT: PC 651 Steve Postlethwaite, Force Problem Solving Co-ordinator, Community Safety Department, PHQ – 01962 814880 / prime.team@hampshire.pnn.police.uk

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 Force performance review group (FPRG) is the prime means by which performance is managed. The group meets monthly and is chaired by the Chief Constable, with all members of the chief officer group present. Other permanent members of the group are all OCU commanders, including the newly formed OCUs for crime and operations, the head of corporate services, and the performance review manager. The agenda is agreed in advance by the force performance review committee, a body that effectively acts as the steering group for the FPRG.

In 2004/05, Hampshire Constabulary had one of the best records in detecting crime and was ranked in the top quartile for the detection of domestic burglary and robbery and the percentage of notifiable offences resulting in a sanctioned detection. The implementation of RMS and the changes in working practices in the recording of data meant that the force was without accurate performance information for many months. The force had to prioritise a significant number of key processes to enable an accurate picture of recorded crime to be available. The force had the courage to call in assistance from the Police Standards Unit (now the Police Crime and Standards Unit), who identified significant areas to improve processes and raise performance. By the end of 2006/07, there had been a sustained period of recovery, the force was in line with its peers for levels of all crime categories and was clearly improving, and for BCS crime the force was in line with its peers and stable. For domestic burglary the force is better than its peers and improving; for vehicle crime, while better than its peers, the force is showing signs of decline that may be attributable to the crime-screening policy (see below); it is better than its peers and stable for robbery; and for violent crime the force is in line with its peers and clearly improving. Sanction detections show a mixed picture; all but vehicle crime have improved since 2005/06, but while sanction

October 2007

detection rates for domestic burglary and robbery are better than the force's peers and improving, those for all crime, BCS crime and violent crime (even though up by 4.6 percentage points) are below its peers.

Strengths

There is a clearly articulated vision by the PA and the Chief Constable in the joint 2005–08 strategic plan, which is available in ten languages. The annual local policing plan (LPP) is the vehicle for delivering the strategy. Both documents have clear aims and targets for achievement and take into account local criminal justice board and CDRP targets as well as those contained in the National Community Safety Plan (see 'Areas for improvement'). The 2005–08 joint strategic plan includes contributions from finance, business and property, transport, science and technology and human resources (eg the recruitment of PCSOs, 'grow your own' detectives and implementing the race equality scheme).

The force has integrated its planning process. This supports enhanced understanding and management of national and local priority conflicts, enabling the force to make informed decisions on the allocation of resources to best meet both national and local requirements. This integrated planning process (which involves the PA) is fully compliant with the National Intelligence Model (NIM) and has facilitated the ability to integrate its policing objectives and priorities with its organisational development needs. This in turn will allow the force to build an organisational infrastructure to support effectively the delivery of its policing objectives.

The use of a resource allocation formula has been in place for some time. Medium-term financial planning is now produced as part of the process for financial forecasting and the annual budget-making cycle. Budget requests from OCUs and departments are linked to overall PA and force objectives and are considered by the resource management board and the PA. There is evidence that this is linked to operational planning. Decision conferencing was introduced for the first time for 2005/06, and participants included some OCU commanders and department heads.

The force participates in the annual ABC exercise. The results of the exercise are presented to the PA and are used for informed decision making for resource allocation at force and OCU level. There has also been some use of ABC for the assessment of case file quality by the prosecution support teams (PSTs) and prisoner interview and investigation teams (PIITs).

There is clarity on how the PA holds the force and its chief officers and directors to account for performance through its committee structure. Until the recruitment of a third ACC who covers operational services, the ACC (special operations (SO)) and ACC (TO) had a 50/50 split in operational responsibility for the force. While targets in the LPP have chief officer owners, these are not explicit in the plan. PA members attend the FPRG at least twice a year. The PA has link members who meet with territorial OCU commanders every six weeks to discuss performance, among other things. There are also lead members for specialist areas of policing but some gaps in this structure were found (see 'Protecting vulnerable people') and this is being addressed by the PA.

There are quarterly performance reviews of OCUs and departments conducted by the ACC (TO) and ACC (SO). If an OCU is struggling to meet its targets, it will be subject to intervention directed by the FPRG or by the PA. This intervention will be organised by the business improvement team and progress is monitored at subsequent inspection visits.

Following 'Forward Together' and the move from ten BCUs to six OCUs, each territorial OCU has its own finance and human resources function. All OCUs and departments have their own targets to achieve that complement the LPP. It is evident from the FPRG meeting

October 2007

that OCU commanders and department heads are trusted to deliver on those targets and are provided with support when they are seen to be struggling.

Each district within the force OCU structure has its own community TCG (see 'Neighbourhood Policing') that brings partners together and holds them to account in solving local problems. The Isle of Wight has its own partnership performance group meeting, chaired by the leader of the council, which holds the constituent partners in the CDRP to account for performance and is a model for others to follow.

It is evident from group interviews with officers and staff that they are clear about how they are held to account for performance. While the use of PPIs for this purpose varies across the OCUs, supervisors and managers now have access to PPIs through the use of a business objects tool alongside RMS and the use of scorecards (see 'Work in progress' and 'Areas for improvement'). While daily management meetings are not designed as a performance management tool, they do enable OCU, district and sector commanders to monitor performance on a daily basis.

The PA consultation officer and the force consultation and research team are responsible for public surveys that inform the LPPs. There are witness and victim experience surveys carried out every six months and monthly customer satisfaction surveys for each volume crime category and for road traffic collisions. The results of these surveys are published by OCU on a monthly basis. The force is now progressing from postal to telephone surveys and anticipates a more informed survey result that will present a balanced view.

The Hampshire IAG meets every six weeks to discuss force policy and any concerns it has are taken into consideration before publication of the minutes of these meetings, which are available at www.hampshire.police.uk/Internet/advice/hants_iag.htm.

The biennial staff survey, carried out by an outside contractor, helps inform the force on how it is performing as an employer as well as informing the planning process.

Hampshire Constabulary has a long history of rewarding the good performance of its officers and staff. It encourages them to apply for national recognition for their work and in the past has received both the Tilley and Goldstein awards for crime reduction initiatives. The Chief Constable receives and assesses recommendations for congratulations and commendations. These are presented at award ceremonies held between eight and ten times per year and attended by the Chief Constable and the DCC. Commendations, congratulations, long service and good conduct medals and police staff long service certificates are presented, as well as a range of other awards for members of the public and multi-agency partners, eg prosecution team awards in conjunction with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). Continuous improvement is encouraged through Brainwaves (a staff suggestion scheme), run by the business improvement team within the corporate services department. This is well advertised across all the OCUs and departments and evidence was presented of how it has been used.

Policies and procedures are in place for the use of the unsatisfactory performance procedure, which is used on a frequent basis within the force with support from the personnel department. Examples of its use were given to the inspection team.

Work in Progress

Although it has been problematic, the implementation of RMS demonstrates innovation and integration of IT systems to support performance management. The force continues to develop RMS, and, while there are some 40 areas within it that require addressing (there

October 2007

are funds in 2007/08 to address two), the system is becoming better accepted by officers and staff, who are still learning how to operate it to best effect.

Although RMS is being improved, it still presents some significant challenges to those who have to rely on it for accurate and timely data. During a site visit, the inspection team found that the preparations for a daily tasking meeting were marred by the inability of officers to interrogate the system accurately to provide consistent performance information, for example on numbers and locations of domestic burglaries. The roll-out of business objects should now resolve this.

The performance management regime continues to be developed and there is recognition of the need to undertake better comparative analysis with its MSF and most similar BCU groups in order to identify good practice and implement it locally.

NIM compliance has been part of the force review process since 2005/06. However, since the reorganisation of the intelligence directorate (still in progress), a compliance check has not been carried out and it is anticipated that one will be conducted during 2007/08.

While the force strategic assessment and its control strategy provide the focus for level 2 deployments, it is developing a demand model based on the mapping of harm probability that will then overlay the level 2 TCG process and help inform the resourcing of protective service assets. The recent uplift in protective service assets has enhanced the deployment capability.

The community safety department is developing a customer survey process based on the Merseyside Police 'Your Voice Counts' model. Once implemented, it is anticipated that this will give the community the opportunity to submit comments on and its experiences of dealing with Hampshire Constabulary, and this in turn may influence policy (see 'Neighbourhood Policing').

A force-wide review of the PDR process is being carried out by the director of personnel. The aims of the review are to improve the quality of PDRs, their contribution to force objectives and completion rates by making the specific competencies used in the PDR more focused on achieving key role objectives. In achieving the above, each PDR will have no more than six key objectives, 12 key competencies and seven behavioural competencies. ('Respect for race and diversity' and 'Health and safety' will remain compulsory elements (competencies) in all PDRs.) The review is due to report before October 2007.

Since December 2005, the force has been able to submit data assessed as meeting minimum standards to the Home Office. The recent (2006/07) National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) compliance assessment places the force in the Fair category; concerns expressed by the Audit Commission still exist about the quality and accuracy of the data held on RMS. There are some 40 items within RMS identified from the Police Standards Unit report, an independent consultant's report and user groups that require rectification. The PA reports that there is funding to tackle only two items in this financial year (2007/08).

Areas for improvement

While there are shared targets with the local criminal justice board for bringing offenders to justice and for persistent young offenders at a force level, and while OCUs contribute to the achievement of targets in the CDRP plans, there is little evidence of other shared targets and accountability contained within the LPP.

October 2007

RECOMMENDATION 2

That the force develops shared targets and accountability with partner agencies at operational command unit and force level.

Notwithstanding the positive comments made about the strategic plan and LPP above, it is evident from group interviews with officers and staff that the only elements of the plans that they are familiar with are reducing and detecting crimes. Locally on OCUs there was some understanding of what the OCU wanted to achieve, for example Portsmouth wanting to become the safest city. Those who did have a better understanding of the contents of the LPP had a perception that there was a conflict between what SNTs were trying to achieve (implementation of Neighbourhood Policing) and what the force and its PA required to drive down crime and increase sanction detections.

While a large amount of work was carried out during 2006 in preparation of becoming a strategic police force, and the protection of communities from terrorism, domestic extremism and major disasters is contained within the force control strategy, there are no performance measures linked to this business area and there are no costs attached.

Despite the positive comments made about PA involvement in performance management, there is scope for its members to play a more active part in the FPRG and in the performance of the two non-territorial OCUs. This is now being addressed by the PA through its performance committee and new lead members.

There is scope for the remainder of the force to follow the work undertaken by Central OCU, which has provided a one-day training session for its sergeants on how to manage performance. This is of particular importance as some sergeants were struggling to come to terms with how best to exploit RMS and proffering the explanation of 'being too busy' or 'under too much pressure' to be able to interrogate RMS speedily and efficiently.

RECOMMENDATION 3

That the force ensures an appropriate level of training on performance management is provided for all managers and supervisors.

The OCU, district and sector daily management meetings are currently carried out on a Monday-to-Friday basis. There is scope to extend this over the weekend in order to manage performance. Meetings could be adjusted to accommodate changes in the availability of senior managers.

The objectives in the 2007/08 LPP do not contain details on how or whether they were costed.

Comment has been made in the Neighbourhood Policing section above on the adequacy of e-learning packages supplied by the force (which are viewed as 'file and forget' training), in particular training on the Victims' Code. There is a need to overcome this perception and reinforce learning in a cost-effective way while ensuring that individuals take responsibility for some of their own learning. Furthermore, officers and staff (including some of those involved in call handling) have not received specific customer service training and their level of knowledge of the Quality of Service Commitment is not sound.

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

During last year's baseline assessment, Hampshire Constabulary was graded Fair for the inspection area of protecting vulnerable people. The force has sought to improve, assisted by its PA, which has funded additional posts. This significant growth has led to improved capacity and capability within the dedicated public protection units (PPUs).

The PPU's each have a dedicated detective inspector (DI) and a uniform inspector who split the protecting vulnerable people disciplines to ensure adequate and appropriate management. While the management of missing persons is retained by the targeted patrol teams (TPT), the quality assurance and development of partnership working and procedures are the responsibility of the PPU uniform inspector.

The co-location of these disciplines within a dedicated team is improving the communication links between them, providing a unit that brings together vulnerability and dangerousness to more effectively manage risk and provide a higher level of service to victims.

The strategic and operational accountability framework is outlined within policy, and public protection issues are considered within the Hampshire Constabulary policing plan for 2007/08 and form part of the force control strategy.

Strengths

Hampshire Constabulary recognises its responsibility to assist in the protection of the vulnerable. In 2006, the force introduced six OCU-based PPU's with responsibility for all the protecting vulnerable people disciplines linking vulnerability and dangerousness. The PPU's are led by the OCU detective chief inspector (DCI). Daily PPU and community safety team

October 2007

meetings have been introduced to pick up on areas of risk and provide an opportunity to share and discuss current intelligence on individual cases, where appropriate. Where areas of risk are identified, they may be raised with children's services, probation or the mental health team. The structure brings together child abuse, vulnerable adult abuse, domestic abuse, hate crime and sex/dangerous offender management for each OCU. This is supported by the specialist investigations unit, which includes the child abuse investigation unit (CAIU – which handles the most serious child abuse investigations), the central Violent and Sex Offenders Register (ViSOR) team for sex/violent offenders, the performance and review unit and the major crime team.

Staffing levels for PPU were set according to the 'Forward Together' models, which predicted levels of offenders and the resources required to manage them. A central bid was submitted that was set according to need by the DCI force lead. Data continues to be submitted on a quarterly basis. The staffing levels are owned by individual OCUs.

The force strategic priorities are set by the chief officer group at ACPO planning days. The protecting vulnerable people areas are included in the force control strategy and there is an expectation that this will feed into the control strategies of the six territorial and two specialist OCUs. The priorities are published annually and progress is monitored by the corporate services department. Priorities were determined as a result of a previous baseline assessment that identified areas for improvement.

The portfolio responsibility for protecting vulnerable people is split between the ACC (TO) and ACC (SO). The links across the business areas are made at various informal and formal meetings.

The Hampshire PA has been supportive and has direct links with the lead ACCs. PA members also sit on the children and young persons strategic group. It has provided additional resources to establish PPUs, but governance of the four strands of protecting vulnerable people is not uniform.

Work in Progress

Performance is monitored via the FPRG. Volume crime has skewed performance meetings and has not allowed specialist areas to be reviewed, but this is currently being addressed.

There is recognition of the need for effective and efficient partnership working and information sharing, however the cost and security issues of installing IT away from police sites is hindering opportunities. The force is working to identify solutions to this problem.

A domestic abuse and vulnerable adult partnership seminar was recently held to provide training to people working in those areas. It was recognised that some MAPPA offenders target vulnerable adults, therefore staff working with vulnerable adults are being invited to join MAPPA training.

A more structured training programme is being developed for the PPU investigative teams. Investigative officers will go through the Initial Crime Investigators' Development Programme (ICIDP) and opportunity to attend police and partnership training events.

Investigating officers are being recruited following an agreement for an increase in PPU resources from April 2007 – they will be multi-skilled and investigate domestic abuse as well as child protection, adult abuse and some MAPPA cases. Funding was provided for 12 investigators and one detective sergeant (DS) per OCU.

October 2007

Areas for improvement

The PA could provide improved support across the protecting vulnerable people disciplines if there were a lead member with overall responsibility rather than individual lead members for each discipline.

Welfare issues are dealt with by supervisors and managers. Officers are invited for a yearly counselling session, which is voluntary not mandatory. It is not considered by some to meet the needs of all officers, as they feel there is a stigma attached to the counselling and there is a need for all CAIU/PPU officers to be seen by specialist counsellors. Consideration should be given to increasing officers' awareness of counselling arrangements and reviewing the provision of specialist counselling.

Special constables receive limited training on PVP issues and their level of knowledge varied, therefore a training needs analysis should be conducted with a view to prioritising their training around the areas identified as higher risk.

RECOMMENDATION 4

That the force conducts a training needs analysis for special constables in respect of all four protecting vulnerable people disciplines, with a view to raising their level of awareness, understanding and capability to act.

Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse

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

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

Hampshire Constabulary investigates child abuse at three levels. All cases are managed through a central referral unit (CRU) that provides consistency of recording and allocation. Force policy provides clear direction for the grading of investigations to ensure that the most appropriate resource is allocated.

The most serious allegations of child abuse are dealt with by the Child Abuse Investigation Unit (CAIU), which is a centralised dedicated unit comprising specialist officers. The CAIU is staffed with a mixture of detective and police constables. All supervisors and managers up to the rank of superintendent are detective officers. Minimum standards of investigation also detail specific responsibilities and investigation requirements for officers and supervisors.

The CAIU has 59 police officers who have various skills – SIOs, HOLMES (Home Office Large Major Enquiry System), family liaison officers, sexual offences investigation trained officers and tactical interview managers (TIMs). They are also trained in tier 2 and 3 suspect and witness interviews. OCU staff have the opportunity to attend the joint interview course and other multi-agency training provided by the local safeguarding children board (LSCB). All supervisors on the CAIU are detectives, while there is a combination of uniform and detective constables. Officers within the CAIU provide multi-functional roles; these include

October 2007

trained family liaison officers who are deployed in cases of sudden unexpected deaths in infancy (SUDIs) and other serious investigations. The unit also has sexual offences investigation trained officers for deployment to the investigation of sexual offences. The posts are not subject to routine abstractions, but CAIU staff can be deployed either via the crime OCU TCG process or at the direction of the head of department.

Those offences that fall outside the CAIU's remit to investigate are passed to the relevant OCU PPU for allocation to the PPU child protection officer or a response officer.

Strengths

There is a strong lead by the ACC (SO), who as an experienced detective has a good knowledge and working experience of child abuse investigations. He has good support from the detective superintendent CAIU (head of profession). The ACC (SO) is the police lead for the four LSCBs; if he is unable to attend, he is deputised by the CAIU detective superintendent. The ACC (SO) is also the force lead for child abuse investigations and safeguarding matters. The force contributes £52,000 split between the four LSCBs. The ACC (TO) has responsibility for the implementation of the wider Every Child Matters agenda and is a member of the LAA.

The force strategic priorities are set by the chief officer group at ACPO planning days. The protecting vulnerable people areas are included in the force control strategy and there is an expectation that this will feed into the control strategies of the six territorial and two specialist OCUs. The priorities are published annually and progress is monitored by the corporate services department. Priorities were determined as a result of a previous baseline assessment that identified areas for improvement.

The Hampshire PA has been supportive and has direct links with the ACC (SO). It has provided additional resources to establish PPUs but governance of the four strands of protecting vulnerable people is not uniform. There is a specified lead for children and young people who sits on the children and young persons strategic group with the community safety department's chief superintendent and the ACC (SO).

The portfolio responsibility for protecting vulnerable people is split between the ACC (TO) and ACC (SO). The links across the business areas are made at various informal and formal meetings. For child abuse investigations the lead is the ACC (SO), and the performance of OCUs is the responsibility of the ACC (TO); this ensures a good understanding by both strategic leads, who are able to provide support within their respective portfolios. The ACC (TO) attends the public protection steering group and the ACC (SO) attends children and young persons strategic group meetings, which are chaired by the community safety chief superintendent.

A written accountability framework clearly shows responsibilities and the supervisory structure for the central CAIU. The structural chart shows the various roles, lines of supervision and lines of accountability to the ACC (SO). OCU commanders are held to account through ACC (TO) visits to OCUs and through performance panels.

The ACC (SO) monitors the progress of implementation of NPJA guidance through a workstream that is managed to PRINCE2 methodology. It has now been fully implemented and incorporated into policy. Performance is monitored at the Force Performance Review Group (FPRG). The child death procedures (murder investigation manual) and the Kennedy report in relation to child deaths have also been taken into account in policy and procedures. Policy and guidance is published on the force intranet. The grading policy was amended on 1 May 2007 to ensure that the CAIU deals with the most serious and complex cases. Changes in policy were promulgated force-wide by a global e-mail.

October 2007

CAIU performance is monitored and managed through the crime OCU performance management framework. Some cases have been the subject of a review by the performance and review team. LSCB multi-agency child protection forums across the county also audit cases. This process is reflected on the territorial OCUs. Management information is fed back to managers through monthly performance meetings and the senior management team. There is a performance management framework in place that uses quantitative and qualitative assessments for judging CAIU performance.

CAIU DSs are responsible for approximately five staff each – supervisory resources have been increased and this has reduced responsibility. There are two teams within each geographical area, each one overseen by a DI. Each OCU PPU team has at least one dedicated child protection team (CPT) officer who reports to a DS. The CAIU should not retain vacancies at either force or OCU level, but there have been difficulties recruiting due to various factors, including shift patterns, criminal investigation department (CID) work/life balance and, in the North East OCU, housing costs. However, special priority payments have been introduced and a student officer attachment programme has been reintroduced to raise awareness.

Staffing levels for the CAIU were set in 1998. The OCU commanders for the crime OCU have responsibility for staffing the CAIU teams, and territorial OCU commanders have responsibility for staffing levels of child protection staff within PPUs. The resource allocation formula sets the levels of resourcing within the territorial OCUs. There has been an increase in resources following the introduction of OCU-based PPUs, which include a DS and a minimum of one dedicated child protection officer. The hours of coverage provided by the CAIU are 8am to 10pm, a call-out service is provided, and urgent intelligence checks for children's services are provided 24/7 by the force intelligence management unit. The crime OCU senior officer also provides an SIO rota of DCIs and detective superintendents to provide strategic direction.

OCU-based PPUs have dedicated child protection officers who deal with lower-level child abuse investigations. The units ensure that child abuse and other closely related disciplines such as domestic abuse, vulnerable adults, hate crime, the management of registered sex offenders (RSOs) and violent offenders and missing persons investigations are brought together.

CAIU and OCU CPT staff have up-to-date job descriptions and clear terms of reference. Their roles were updated in 2005.

There is a planned approach for training specialist staff. New staff receive an induction pack that explains the LSCB structure, *Working Together to Safeguard Children, 2006* and the Climbié report. Detective constables are trained and trainee detective constables (TDCs) are going through the ICIDP. There is a cadre of interview-trained officers and the majority of detective constables are trained in Achieving Best Evidence. Tier 2 interview training is being rolled out. There is joint training with other agencies – all new staff attend a multi-agency foundation training course. Joint interview courses and the Specialist Child Abuse Investigator's Development Programme (SCAIDP) are included in the force training calendar. The force has signed up to the Centrex child abuse investigation training and delivered its first course in April 2007 in collaboration with Surrey, Sussex and Thames Valley Police. Some OCU officers have received vulnerable witness training and PPU staff attended a child abuse training day in 2006. A force-wide training programme that contains the interview PEACE package (mnemonic stands for preparation and planning, engage and explain, account, closure and evaluate) is being rolled out to every police officer. Newly promoted DIs, student officers and officers on the Core Leadership Development Programme (CLDP) all receive an input from the CAIU. All staff joining the CAIU are tested

October 2007

on their diversity awareness as part of the selection process (pass or fail). Diversity training is delivered in initial training for all constables.

All referrals go through the CRU, which provides a consistent and independent approach to recording and allocation. The grading and allocation policy means that the CAIU has performance indicators to achieve: 100% in grade A investigations and 90% in grade Bs. (The grades are allocated to the seriousness of incidents reported to police in order that they are given the appropriate police or partner responses). The CAIU will on occasion carry out grade C investigations on behalf of the OCU or will support the OCU with victim interviews and examination. Territorial OCUs pick up all other grade B and grade C investigations; these are then investigated by the PPU CPT, CID or TPT depending on the seriousness of the investigation. The CRU has taken on an IMU role whereby they will file child abuse investigation reports.

The force IT system is RMS, which allows all staff to have access to records unless they are restricted. It combines custody, crime and intelligence records. The IMPACT nominal index (INI) is used regularly by the CRU for all referrals graded A and B. The system is effective and allows for active supervision and monitoring. Intelligence and information on individual cases, victims and offenders are fed into the CAIU and into the TCG process. The specialist investigation intelligence unit completes critical incident searches on a daily basis using keyword searches to flag up relevant critical incidents. CAIU officers attend MAPPA meetings and multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARACs) when appropriate.

DIs are informed of all grade A investigations and are expected to review them. All staff are subject to monthly meetings with their supervisors, CRU decisions are dip sampled on a monthly basis, SUDIs undergo a 72-hour review by the DCI, all SUDIs are reviewed quarterly by the senior management team, and the TCG allows a fortnightly review of investigations.

Case conferences set up for child abuse investigations are attended by PPU staff and CAIU officers provide support in cases where they have specific involvement. A written report is also supplied. The minutes of case conferences are filed on RMS. Each LSCB audits and monitors case conference attendance and compliance. The level of representation at LSCBs is from ACC to DCI, which is comparable with partners. Attendance is consistent and officers able to make decisions on behalf of the force.

All strategy meetings are attended by a supervisor. Grade A investigations are overseen by a CAIU DI and each area CAIU DI is the designated officer for allegations received about people who work with children.

The police actively participate in serious case reviews – there were 12 live cases as specified under Chapter 8 of *Working Together to Safeguard Children, 2006*, at the time of the inspection. Lessons learnt are actioned and monitored by the LSCB through action plans. When complete, they are signed off and are then reviewed by the LSCB sub-committees. The public protection steering group, the children and young persons strategic group and the ACC (TO)/DCI meetings are forums that allow any concerns to be raised. Dip sampling also takes place within the CRU to ensure that the grading policy is applied correctly.

The force policy on joint investigations clearly outlines when the police and social services will carry out a joint or single investigation. Decisions in relation to action taken and the progress of investigations are recorded on RMS, which allows active supervision and monitoring. Strategy meetings record decisions in the meeting minutes, and decisions are recorded in policy files in cases of serious crimes including SUDIs.

October 2007

The force has minimum standards of investigation that specify supervisory roles for child abuse cases. Supervisors drive performance and manage their staff, ensuring that monthly one-to-one meetings are held, performance data is captured and roles and responsibilities are carried out at an appropriate level. Supervisors are set a departmental performance indicator to review six interviews with child abuse victims, witnesses and suspects per officer per year.

Child abuse intelligence is considered within the daily TCG process in both the crime OCU and territorial OCUs, ensuring a safety net that identifies risk across the force. There is no specific risk assessment tool; however, assessing risk and managing risk are part of the role of all officers, in particular supervisors and managers. Problem profiles and analytical work have been completed for the following areas of child abuse investigations: forensic examinations of children; a problem of Asian males approaching young girls in Southampton; deaths of twins; factors in child deaths; intelligence linking paedophile activity to local churches; network analysis of suspected paedophile offenders attending Portsmouth Guildhall; and referrals concerning people working with children.

There is clear evidence that the child or young person at risk (CYP(R) form is understood and used. The forms are forwarded through the PPU's to social services to identify children who may be at risk.

October 2007

Work in progress

Performance is monitored via the FPRG. Volume crime has skewed performance meetings and has not allowed specialist areas to be reviewed, but this is currently being addressed. Child abuse investigations are not monitored separately in these meetings, only as part of volume crime.

Interagency guidelines are followed and joint procedures are currently being updated to incorporate Working Together 2006.

Areas for Improvement

Quarterly reports are provided to the PA committees, but there is limited information provided on child abuse. The provision of management information on child abuse and other areas of protecting vulnerable people should be provided regularly to the PA lead member.

While training for police protection orders is provided on the IPLDP for student officers, within the SCAIDP for CAIU officers and within CLDP for sergeants and inspectors, not all officers are clear about their legal powers and the law, and they are reliant on the duty sergeant to provide support and guidance where appropriate. Further training and guidance should be provided to officers to improve their understanding and knowledge of action to be taken.

While there was evidence of strong links between the protecting vulnerable people disciplines at OCU level, there was less evidence to demonstrate the links between the headquarters (HQ) CAIU and territorial OCUs.

RECOMMENDATION 5

That the force develops stronger operational links and intelligence sharing between the child abuse investigation unit and territorial OCUs.

There is a lot of time devoted to LSCB work, which can make it difficult for managers to provide visible leadership and drive performance. Attendance at LSCB meetings is a performance indicator for the department.

Welfare issues are dealt with by supervisors and managers. Officers are invited for a yearly counselling session, which is voluntary not mandatory. It is not considered by some to meet the needs of all officers, as they feel there is a stigma attached to the counselling and there is a need for all CAIU/PPU officers to be seen by specialist counsellors. Consideration should be given to increasing officers' awareness of counselling arrangements and reviewing the provision of specialist counselling.

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/liaison 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

The force uses the term domestic abuse not domestic violence in line with new ACPO terminology.

The force has dedicated specialist staff who provide support for domestic abuse victims, complete risk assessments and give safety planning advice. They also work to support Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs). Staffing levels vary across the force:

- Central Hampshire – four full time and four part time members of staff;
- North East Hampshire – two full time;

October 2007

- Portsmouth – one full time;
- Southampton – six full time and one part time;
- Isle of Wight – one full time and one part time; and
- Western – four full time and one part time.

From April 2007 funding was agreed to provide a team of PPU investigators in each of the six OCUs. Their responsibility includes the investigation of domestic abuse cases.

The domestic abuse co-ordinators have strong partnership links, and MARACs dealing with the very high-risk cases have been introduced across the force area.

Strengths

There is a strong ACPO lead provided by the ACC (TO). He is supported by an inspector who is the force domestic abuse policy lead and is line managed by the DCI with responsibility for protecting vulnerable people on territorial OCUs. The ACC (TO) chairs a public protection steering group on a quarterly basis. Any actions arising from that meeting are monitored by the DCI in the intervening period and then reviewed at the next steering group meeting.

The portfolio responsibility for protecting vulnerable people is split between the ACC (TO) and the ACC (SO), with links across the business areas made at various informal and formal meetings. For domestic abuse the lead is the ACC (TO); the performance of OCUs is also his responsibility.

The accountability structure is clearly detailed in force policy and procedure. It shows where responsibilities lie and what expectations are up to OCU commander level, not to the ACPO lead (see below in 'Areas for improvement'). OCU commanders are held to account through ACC (TO) visits to OCUs and through performance panels. Domestic abuse strategic and policy responsibility is retained at the centre.

The force strategic priorities are set by the chief officer group at ACPO planning days. Domestic abuse is specified in the force control strategy for January 2007 to December 2007 and there is an expectation that this will feed into the six territorial and two specialist OCU control strategies. The priorities are published annually and the current strategy emphasises the force's aim to protect vulnerable people. Progress is monitored by the corporate services department.

Performance is monitored via the FPRG. Violent crime is assessed in detail and domestic abuse is broken down into three areas: arrests, detections and crime versus occurrences. In the last year, the force received reports of 22,700 domestic abuse incidents, 33% of which resulted in recorded crime.

Hampshire Constabulary was one of the lead agencies securing domestic abuse as a flagship issue for the first Hampshire Local Area Agreement (LAA). This provides a co-ordinated multi-agency response to domestic abuse, including a range of advocacy, support and engagement with the criminal and civil justice systems, as well as with voluntary and statutory agencies. The overriding priority remains the safety of the victim and of any children subjected to abuse, while holding perpetrators to account.

The force has engaged with partners to improve its response to domestic abuse, including through multi-agency domestic abuse fora, multi-agency domestic abuse seminars and Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs). Southampton OCU has had a

October 2007

MARAC process in place for two years and there are now MARACs in each of the other OCUs. Funding has been agreed from April 2007 for each OCU to employ one MARAC co-ordinator to support developments in this area of work. There are two specialist domestic abuse magistrates' courts. Magistrates have received training, and a domestic abuse victim attended the magistrates' meeting to raise awareness.

There was evidence of some joint preventative work, eg the Hampton Trust perpetrator programme and Freedom courses run by outreach workers. Partnership working and joint funding provides a sanctuary scheme; this includes making premises more secure to allow victims of domestic abuse to remain in their homes, and supplying mobile phones or SIM cards temporarily to assist victims to contact the police.

The force has introduced OCU-based PPU's with responsibility for all the protecting vulnerable people disciplines linking vulnerability and dangerousness. The PPU's are led by the OCU DCI. This ensures that domestic abuse investigations are linked to other closely related disciplines, including violent and sexual offenders managed under MAPP, child abuse, hate crime, vulnerable adults and missing persons investigations. Daily PPU and community safety team meetings have been introduced to pick up on areas of risk and provide the opportunity to share and discuss current intelligence on individual cases, where appropriate. Where areas of risk are identified, they may be raised with the probation service, social services, children's services or the mental health team.

Domestic abuse officers are not subject to routine abstractions outside their specialist role. Job descriptions are up to date and are relevant to the generic role; they were reviewed when PPU's were established in 2005/06. Supervisors and managers understand what their roles are and the roles reflect their job descriptions.

The force IT system – RMS – links crime, custody and intelligence. A flagging system highlights previous incidents of domestic abuse. Domestic abuse is considered within the NIM framework through daily management meetings and the TCG process.

Processes are in place to ensure that risk is identified, assessed and agreed. Supervision and management of domestic abuse incidents ensure that appropriate responses take place. All decisions not to arrest are reviewed by the TPT police sergeant (PS) and duty inspector. Defensible decision making is recorded on RMS. Specialist officers agreed that the standard of risk assessments has improved since training was delivered early in 2007.

The domestic abuse policy is held on the intranet under policy and guidelines. It was last updated in May 2006 for risk assessments and was rewritten in September 2006. All policies are subject to an annual review. There was evidence to show that the positive action policy was understood and was being applied. All officers have a pocket book-sized patrol guide that details what constitutes an incident of domestic abuse and the positive action that should be taken.

The force has a policy for dealing with domestic abuse involving police officers and staff. There are protocols in place and RMS can be restricted to prevent officers and other staff having access. There is a homicide prevention model and domestic abuse is one of ten strands. Officers were very clear that positive action should be taken and viewed domestic abuse incidents as potential murders.

All specialist resources are concentrated on high and very high-risk cases. These are identified by the number of calls the police receive – high is three calls, very high is four calls or by risk assessment of other aggravating factors. The officers judge the risk to victims and where necessary receive calls from or make calls to other agencies to obtain additional information to assist with the assessment of risk. Initially contact is made by

October 2007

telephone and then in person to provide guidance and support. The risk assessment decision is normally reviewed and agreed by the PPU DS. In some cases joint visits are carried out with social services; this can provide reassurance to the family that children will not be removed.

Officers attending a domestic abuse incident where a child resides – even if not present at the time – must complete CYP(R) form. This is forwarded to the OCU PPU for dissemination to the relevant children's services, highlighting that a child may be at risk.

Audit and quality processes are in place through routine trawls of RMS. A performance management process is maintained by the force domestic abuse inspector, who dip samples the MARAC process to ensure that standards are being met. Domestic abuse incidents are inspected for quality and compliance with NCRS and Home Office Counting Rules by the force incident and crime registrar. Audits for compliance of domestic abuse incidents are carried out on a twice yearly basis for every OCU. In May 2007, an Audit Commission NCRS compliance audit was completed – the force was graded as Fair.

Front-line training has been delivered to over 75% of officers and some 60% of control room staff. Some officers received face-to-face training with domestic abuse co-ordinators. Student officers receive an input during their initial training from the force domestic abuse leads. Call handlers and controllers receive a modified training package focusing on the early identification of known risk factors faced by victims, allowing this information and the risks identified to be passed to attending officers to give them advance notice of the situation (see below in 'Work in progress'). Diversity is reflected in training, which includes consideration of minority community issues.

Work in Progress

Portsmouth OCU is looking to co-locate its domestic abuse team with domestic abuse staff at Portsmouth City Council, which will be supported by partnership funding. The cost and security issues of installing IT away from police sites is hindering effective and efficient information sharing by partnerships, but work is in progress to find a way forward.

There was some evidence to show that problem profiles and other analytical work had been carried out for domestic abuse. Staff had completed their own research and in some cases had used the divisional researcher to assist, but in general it was on a case-by-case basis. Since spring 2007, the HQ corporate services department analyst has produced an in-depth analysis of domestic abuse across the force area, looking at hotspots, trends, age profiles, etc. This analysis was passed to the six PPU inspectors to review and then to implement actions or further local reviews. The ACC (TO) refers to the analysis when conducting OCU inspections. The HQ analyst has also done some considerable work in reviewing CPS data to address concerns about the attrition rate in respect of domestic abuse cases. The information gleaned has been used to initiate work with the force criminal justice department lead.

The force control strategy specifies that the force is trying to improve the level of supervision for cases of domestic abuse, in particular for correct classification and consistent risk identification and improving links between domestic abuse and child abuse in terms of identification, referral and investigation.

The working hours for domestic abuse officers is variable, with most cover being provided Monday to Friday between 8am and 6pm. Some limited cover is provided at weekends. However, as the investigation teams are established, specialist cover will improve to include shifts from 8am through to 10pm or later.

October 2007

The force lead is developing an improvement plan in liaison with the FCR inspector to improve the consistency of information provided by call handlers to responding officers.

A more structured training programme is being developed for the PPU investigative teams. Investigative officers will go through the ICIDP and will attend a training event in September 2007 where specialist domestic abuse officers will deliver presentations.

Areas for Improvement

In 70% of domestic abuse incidents arrests are made; however, there need to be improvements in the conviction rate. Liaison is taking place with the CPS to resolve the difficulties with victimless prosecutions, but it is unclear what has resulted from this.

During the inspection period, training needs analysis for officers and staff regarding domestic abuse matters was ad hoc. While the force had delivered front-line training to officers and staff, there was no specialist training programme for domestic abuse officers and co-ordinators. Work is scheduled to take place in October 2007 for specialists in the PPUs as part of in-house training sessions. There was no evidence to show that special constables had recent domestic abuse training.

The domestic abuse co-ordinators monitor and review the risk assessments of those cases graded as very high risk and those with prosecutions pending. Some officers were carrying a high volume of cases, meaning that contact and monitoring was difficult to maintain. In some instances, due to the significant workloads, MARAC co-ordinators were monitoring and reviewing risk assessments. The force does not formally monitor the caseloads of specialist officers. Caseloads are managed locally by the respective PPU managers, resulting in an inconsistent approach across the force. A growth bid to the PA has resulted in approval for six OCU MARAC co-ordinators to be recruited. The co-ordinators will receive specialist training and should be in post by December 2007. They will be able to relieve the domestic abuse co-ordinators of some of their workload but this is recognised as just the beginning. Caseloads vary, but at the time of the inspection approximately 80 to 100 cases per week were being reviewed by each team. Caseloads should be reviewed to ensure appropriate management of domestic abuse cases. A further growth bid will be submitted imminently and will seek to establish more posts within the PPUs to better manage the work.

RECOMMENDATION 6

That the force develops and then implements a formal caseload monitoring system for specialist officers.

Evidence showed that some officers – particularly non-TPT officers – do not always submit CYP(R) forms after house searches and effecting arrests for incidents that are not flagged up as domestic abuse.

Force policy does not show the lines of responsibility and accountability through to the ACPO lead; however, this was clearly understood by officers who were interviewed (see above in 'Strengths') and is due for completion 31st October 2007.

Some OCUs have employed police staff members in the domestic abuse co-ordinator role to support the victim and have released police officers to front-line or investigative roles. There are further opportunities across the force to identify positions that would allow police officers to move into posts where their skills and warranted powers are required.

Developing Practice

INSPECTION AREA: Protecting Vulnerable People

TITLE: Hate crime MARAC

PROBLEM:

There is a need to manage 'high-risk' hate crimes in a multi-agency way. There is a need to provide a quality of service for vulnerable victims and build trust and confidence in hard-to-reach communities.

SOLUTION:

MARACs have proven very effective for high-risk victims of domestic abuse. Southampton OCU has extended this practice of engaging stakeholders in a multi-agency approach to dealing with crime problems experienced by hate crime victims. This initiative is led by the City Council and the police but engages partner agencies.

The aims of the conferences are to:

1. take actions that will reduce the risk of harm (physical or psychological) to victims of hate crime and their families;
2. provide a forum for inter-agency information sharing; and
3. provide support for the victims of such crime or their families.

The conferences are held on a monthly basis and the cases stay on until such time as the problem has been solved or the risks reduced. This decision is made in consultation with community representatives.

It is intended that this approach will be developed across the rest of the Hampshire Constabulary area, learning lessons from the Southampton pilot.

This process is also linked to an independent counselling scheme called Jamillia's Thank You, which has been running for a year and is a group of volunteers trained to support victims.

OUTCOME(S):

There are currently no performance measures but the process is reducing repeat victimisation as the cases are not released from the MARAC process unless the risks and the offending are reduced.

About 150 cases have been taken to hate MARACs to date. The feedback from the community so far has been very good.

FORCE CONTACT: DCI Mark Ashthorpe – 01962 814 899 / PS Melani Morgan – 0845 045 4545, ext 725366

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

Public protection is managed within OCU-based units with operational accountability and control devolved to OCU commanders, but with strategic and policy responsibility retained centrally.

Staffing levels vary across the force depending on the numbers of offenders managed by the OCUs:

- Central Hampshire – eight members of staff;
- Isle of Wight – two;
- North East Hampshire – seven;
- Portsmouth – six;
- Southampton – five and a half post
- Western – eight

Each OCU was able to recruit one additional post after 1 April 2007 with funding provided by the PA. Each OCU has a DI, DS, administrative support and ViSOR co-ordinator posts in addition to the resources detailed above. The OCU PPUs are supported by the central ViSOR unit.

Strengths

There is a strong ACPO lead provided by the ACC (TO). The ACC (TO) chairs a public protection steering group on a quarterly basis. Any actions arising from that meeting are monitored by the DCI in the intervening period and then reviewed at the next steering group meeting. There is a written accountability framework for MAPPA with clearly defined lines of strategic and operational responsibility from practitioners through to the ACPO lead. The DCI for public protection and offender management holds bi-monthly meetings for PPU supervisors and quarterly meetings for management teams.

The force has introduced OCU-based PPUs with responsibility for all the protecting vulnerable people disciplines linking vulnerability and dangerousness. The PPUs are led by the OCU DCI. This ensures that the management of violent offenders and RSOs is linked to other closely related disciplines, including domestic abuse, child abuse, hate crime, vulnerable adults and missing persons investigations. Daily PPU and community safety team meetings have been introduced to pick up on areas of risk and provide the opportunity to share and discuss current intelligence on individual cases, where appropriate. Where areas of risk are identified, they may be raised with the probation service, social services, children's services or the mental health team.

October 2007

There is a clearly defined MAPPA structure in the force that complies with MAPPA guidance. Supervisors speak with officers prior to a MAPPA meeting to allow all information to be assessed, agreed and documented on RMS. While there is no formal MAPPA level 1 meeting, a strategy discussion takes place between the supervisor/manager and probation if appropriate. OCU PPU DIs have regular meetings with senior probation officers to review and set levels for cases. DIs review cases at level 1 with the DS and MAPPA officer (see 'Work in Progress'). The OCU DI attends level 2 MAPPA meetings and the OCU DCI attends level 3 MAPPA meetings.

Attendance at meetings is consistent; if the nominated officer is unable to attend, then, following agreement with the senior management board (SMB), a dedicated MAPPA DS or PPU DI will attend as the police representative. Meetings are chaired by the agency with lead responsibility for the MAPPA offenders – either police or probation – and they follow a rigid agenda. Police involvement is monitored and co-ordinated by the central MAPPA co-ordinator, and attendance is monitored through the performance management framework and fed into the SMB.

The SMB business plan containing joint performance measures runs from April 07 to March 08. Performance against the agreed objectives will be published on the probation website.

Partnership working is being driven by the police and probation. In general, information sharing works well between the police, probation and adult services, with involvement and contributions at MAPPA meetings by housing and mental health services. Social services and children's services do not always see MAPPA processes as an obligation. The DCI has taken this back to the SMB.

The process for identifying, assessing and agreeing risk is through MAPPA for all three categories. Public protection officers use RMS and ViSOR to record decision making for both sex and violent offenders. Risk can be flagged in a number of ways – pre-conviction probation, courts or the prison service carry out an assessment. The police receive notification and look at previous and current intelligence. The reports are then centrally co-ordinated. Risk is recorded in MAPPA meeting minutes and entered on ViSOR.

Southampton OCU has introduced a level-setting meeting for the police and probation. They meet weekly to identify RSOs or violent offenders who are likely to be subject to 12 months' imprisonment or more and set the MAPPA level early. This allows early intervention and risk management plans to be agreed and implemented.

Offenders falling outside the MAPPA criteria but who present a risk of harm are identified as potentially dangerous people. They are managed under a MAPPA-like process on ViSOR and are flagged on RMS. Advice is sought from probation and the mental health team. A conference meeting is held that follows the MAPPA agenda and the same principles and risk management are applied, but there is not the same support.

If an offender or potentially dangerous person commits a serious offence, it triggers a MAPPA meeting and/or a serious case review if it results in death or serious harm. There is a tiered approach, so if it is a less serious offence the offender management team refers it to the DCI for discussion with the SMB. The MAPPA officer and their supervisor are informed. The SMB panel decides if a review should be single or multi-agency and there are three stages of review – a reports review or a full review with reports, or an independent review can be commissioned. If a case raises serious public concern, a serious case review is undertaken.

Lessons learnt from serious case reviews go through the gold group (when established), where there are actions to implement the recommendations. Compliance is reported back

October 2007

via the PPU steering group. The MAPPA SMB also enforces actions. Lessons learnt from less serious cases are monitored through the PPU steering group. The SMB undertakes a bi-annual audit where it dip samples a number of cases. Officers and the management team are called in to provide explanations. The panel consists of police managers, a senior probation officer and an area manager. A variety of cases are selected from across the force area and the criteria are set before the meeting. Each case is reviewed with information provided by all relevant partners. Results are published and feedback is provided to case managers.

Low- and medium-risk offenders are reviewed at least every six months by the DS. High- or very high-risk offenders are reviewed at least every three months. The review process for level 2 and level 3 meetings considers the risk assessments and other factors; for the police this includes the RM2000 risk assessment and ViSOR entries to collate intelligence and other information relevant to the offenders.

If intelligence and information concerning RSOs and violent offenders is entered on RMS, then the force IMU flags the intelligence to the offender management team inbox, which ensures that they are made aware and, where necessary, that the risk an individual poses can be reviewed. The probation Offender Risk Assessment System (OASys) is accessed regularly to inform and assist with decision making.

When a new offender is identified, the intelligence unit places details on the briefing sheets. Prominent nominals are discussed and actions raised through the TCG process. New RSOs are flagged up to the relevant offender management officer. Any change in risk should be recognised and would form part of the risk management plan.

The central ViSOR unit creates new records and the PPU offender management teams (MAPPA officers, co-ordinators, supervisors and managers) update existing records. The ViSOR/MAPPA team quality assures all new subjects to ensure that they qualify for MAPPA.

Home visits follow national standards – every 12 months for low risk, every six months for medium risk, every three months for high risk, and every month for very high risk. The visits are carried out by dedicated, trained members of staff, who record the details on the activity log attachments under the 'home visit' drop-down. MAPPA officers and their co-ordinators have been instructed to populate the corresponding ViSOR attachments and to ensure that any intelligence gained from the visit is also placed on RMS. The timescales are monitored on PPUs and form part of their performance indicator package.

All information regarding an offender to be visited is collated and assessed to consider the risk posed to the officers who carry out the home visit. Force policy states that officers should carry out visits in pairs and wear personal protective equipment. Two officers normally carry out the initial visit and some offenders always have two officers attend.

Supervisors do not carry their own workloads and do not have responsibility for other disciplines, this allows them to carry out their supervisory responsibilities to their teams which include: overseeing endorsement, reviewing and monitoring of offenders as well as reviewing actions and risk management plans. When an initial home visit has been completed, the offender management officer completes a detailed risk assessment which is reviewed by the DS and then endorsed, agreeing with the officer's decision.

MAPPA officers generally work office hours, although some are required to work one late turn a week and one weekend day per month. Officers demonstrate flexibility by changing shifts as required to carry out their roles. Out-of-hours access to ViSOR is via the force

October 2007

intelligence management unit, although most OCUs place entries on both ViSOR and the RMS intelligence system, which enables all officers to view records.

Job descriptions are up to date and are relevant to the generic role. Job descriptions were reviewed when PPU were established in 2005/06. Constables, sergeants and DIs understand policy and guidance and what their roles are, and agreed that the roles reflected their job descriptions. Officers have agreed PDR objectives relating to their role. An abstraction policy is in place for all PPUs, and officers do not generally undertake general duties away from their offender management roles. Abstractions are managed within the team and at the time this report was compiled there were no vacant posts.

There is evidence of a structured approach to the training of offender management team officers and supervisors. All specialist staff are ViSOR trained; ViSOR is seen as a good management tool for MAPPAs officers and is adequate for the role (see below in 'Work in progress'). All specialist staff are trained in the use of RM2000 and have also been on the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) risk management course. Staff were aware of how to complete the risk assessment and were aware that RM2000 assessed the risk of conviction and not the risk of harm. The police and probation regularly meet to bring together all risk assessments to allow a judgement to be made and to develop risk management plans.

All offender management officers, including the DSs and DIs, have a mandatory requirement to attend the CEOP foundation, interviewing sex offenders and risk assessment courses. The DIs and DSs also attend other CEOP courses. The force also provides a two-day joint police/probation MAPPAs foundation course that includes policy and guidance and an emphasis on victim focus. MAPPAs chairs and meeting note takers also receive training jointly with probation.

A PPU review was conducted late in 2006 to assess the impact of the teams. Areas for improvement were identified and processes put in place to ensure that changes were made, eg an increase in resources. The review identified level 1 review as a weakness and the force has implemented a level 1 review process (on 10 May 2007) which will run for six months and be subject to review to assess its impact.

A performance management process has recently been introduced to monitor attendance at MAPPAs meetings, caseloads and timeliness of home visits. Officers collate data for Home Office audits and statistics for the DCI on a quarterly basis. HQ monitors activity at OCU level through the MAPPAs co-ordinators, PPU DCI and via the PPU steering group. A quality assurance process of MAPPAs cases is completed by the central MAPPAs team, with 10% of cases being reviewed annually.

All police officers and police staff are subject to conviction and non-conviction data checks prior to employment. The force has introduced vetting procedures for designated posts. Twelve posts have been identified for developed vetting, and others for varying levels of security check, counter-terrorist check and management vetting where lifestyle, association and finance checks are completed. The designated posts are subject to annual vetting reviews. If vetting issues arise, there are a number of options available to the force, such as suspending or withdrawing clearance pending further investigation. The professional standards department owns the process and there is good support from ACPO, in particular from the DCC who is the strategic lead.

October 2007

Work in Progress

Only two OCUs achieved in excess of 95% of their home visits within the specified time frames; four did not, and one achieved only 55%. Improvements have been made to resourcing levels, performance monitoring and focus by supervisors and managers, but management processes need to be put in place to improve and sustain the level of timely home visits. This work is being monitored as a performance indicator and compliance is being driven through the steering group. The force average is still 80% within time guidelines, with one OCU dipping badly; this was attributed to local management issues as well as exceptional staff shortages.

Following the increase in PPU staff, some have had to wait up to six months for their ViSOR training. Three members of the central ViSOR team will be qualified to train new members of staff (two have already received training and one is awaiting training). This will enable new staff to receive one-to-one training if there is no formal training course available (see above in 'Strengths').

A domestic abuse and vulnerable adult partnership seminar is scheduled to be held on 15 October 2007 to provide training to people working in those areas. It was recognised that some MAPPA offenders target vulnerable adults, therefore staff working with vulnerable adults are being invited to join MAPPA training.

The workload carried by officers varies between 57 and 100, made up of all categories of offender including those currently serving terms of imprisonment. The aspirational workload is 50, and there has been investment in resources to reduce current workloads. Caseloads are subject to monitoring and review both by OCU and centrally.

Full records of all categories of offenders are entered on ViSOR. Following the Bichard report, the force made a decision to back-record convert paper records. Additional funding was provided to bring in extra staff to assist with making skeleton entries for all nominal records, and work is due to finish early in 2008.

PPUs have responsibility for raising awareness of MAPPA offenders to their SNOs. Briefing documents are being prepared and will form part of the neighbourhood profile as well as raising the awareness of SNOs.

New policy and guidance are being trialled across all OCUs. When the trial has finished, details will be published on the intranet and guidance will be circulated more widely. There is a MAPPA home page on the intranet that contains all relevant information.

Areas for Improvement

Following a review in December 2006, a policy decision was issued from the public protection steering group that officers should not use their own cars to carry out home visits, as concerns were expressed that offenders could identify these vehicles, putting officers and their families at risk. Pool cars and/or hire cars were introduced across all but one OCU. However, it is apparent that there is still limited availability of vehicles and some officers continue to use their own vehicles for home visits. There is a need to ensure that the use of officers' own vehicles to carry out visits is stopped.

RSO registrations are carried out by local officers at designated stations. Entries are not put straight onto ViSOR or RMS as the details are faxed to the Police National Computer (PNC) team and a copy forwarded to the central ViSOR team. This could result in papers going astray or entries on ViSOR being delayed. The management of this process should be assessed to ensure that records are entered in a timely and detailed manner. To help move

October 2007

this forward, a small project is being run by the ViSOR manager to tighten up procedures and get direct entry to RMS.

While there is some evidence of proactive management, the workloads do not allow for continual proactive management of offenders. A growth bid has been made for administrative support, and requests for surveillance can be made via the TCG process on the OCU.

Supervisors monitor activity but supervisory levels do not always allow for proactive supervision due to the level of work required for the MAPPA process and reviews of offenders.

Dedicated PPU DIs and a central DCI have responsibility for managing the public protection discipline across the force. The DSs/DIs managing public protection officers act as duty DS/DI some weekends to provide personal development and resilience to the OCUs. Some DIs also have responsibility for other disciplines. A review should be conducted to ensure appropriate supervision and management levels.

A gap has been identified by officers with offenders who are managed by mental health services. The mental health representative is not able to chair any meetings and officers are frustrated by the lack of information provided about offenders who are being temporarily released on escorted or unescorted visits from secure accommodation. However, progress is being made on two OCUs in establishing links with mental health hospitals, and one has meetings to discuss risk and share information. These arrangements should be in place force-wide where appropriate.

Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons

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

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

Every year there are around 210,000 incidents of missing people reported in the UK. About half of these are teenagers. Most people return home within a few days, but thousands do not. The UK Police National Missing Persons Bureau (PNMPB, www.missingpersons.police.uk) is a specialist police unit that acts as a centre for the exchange of information connected with the search for missing persons both nationally and internationally. It is based at New Scotland Yard and serves UK forces and overseas agencies. It focuses on cross-matching missing persons with unidentified bodies and people.

During 2006/07, some 8,904 people were reported missing in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. This strand within protecting vulnerable people does not yet have its own dedicated resource within Hampshire Constabulary. However, roles and responsibilities are very clear and the investigation of missing persons is naturally treated very seriously by the force.

Strengths

There is a strong lead by the ACC (SO), who, as an experienced detective, has a good knowledge and working experience of missing persons. He has good support from the DCI in the crime OCU performance and review unit, who is the force lead, and the deputy lead is an inspector from a territorial OCU, which ensures that there are links between specialist and territorial operations.

Policy and guidance are reviewed annually to ensure that they are kept up to date. They were last reviewed earlier in 2007 and published on 2 May 2007. There is opportunity for policy to be amended at any time; the force lead would have responsibility for this. The force has adopted the ACPO guidance on missing persons, which has been incorporated into force policy and guidance. The action to be taken at an incident is clear, as is what follow-up

October 2007

action is required. The ACC (SO) monitors progress of the implementation of NPIA guidance through a workstream managed to PRINCE2 methodology. He opened an officer awareness seminar in January 2007 which provided practical guidance on managing missing persons investigations.

Policy and guidance are located on the intranet. All officers have a pocket book-sized patrol guide that details what a missing person is, what constitutes a low-, medium- and high-risk missing person, and the action to be taken. In particular, it specifies signs of a high-risk missing person and a reminder that this could lead to a murder investigation.

The accountability structure is clearly detailed in force policy and procedure, which show where responsibilities lie and what expectations are up to OCU commander level, but not to ACPO lead (see 'Areas for Improvement').

Missing persons investigations are managed on the force RMS. This system links incident, crime, custody and intelligence records. No paper records are held. Risk assessments are completed for every missing person and decisions are recorded on the RMS missing person form. There is a decision-making guide on the RMS form to assist officers in considering risk factors. Supervisors can actively supervise missing persons investigations on RMS from across the force; they can task staff and monitor progress via work sheets added to the initial report. Paper files exist in relation to historical long-term missing persons (LTMPs) and are held centrally at the PNC bureau. Also, a limited paper file exists in relation to each missing person reported. This contains material such as original manuscript statements, notes and photographs of the subject. There is, however, no live log of events or investigative progress in hard copy generally (see 'Areas for improvement').

Policy on the review of missing persons states that the duty inspector has responsibility for reviewing all outstanding missing persons. The review must be recorded on the RMS working sheet under the heading of 'Inspector Review' and be timed and dated. The review should summarise the investigation so far and include all outstanding actions with a plan to resolve them.

High-risk missing persons are managed and reviewed daily by the OCU DI. In the case of an emerging critical incident or other significant concern, the case may be referred to the crime OCU performance and review unit for an expedient review in support of the OCU investigation. The performance and review unit has a remit to assist OCUs with rapid review interventions in support of the OCU SIO and enquiry.

Missing persons cases are reclassified as LTMP status after a period of six months, at which point a review is undertaken and recorded by the OCU (PPU) DI and the case appropriately reclassified within RMS. The case is then retained within RMS as a 'live enquiry' (ie not closed and filed by the IMU) in order that it still continues to show on all daily searches of RMS for outstanding missing persons. The case is then referred to the PNC bureau, which undertakes the central collation (including PNC and RMS updates) of all historical and LTMP cases and is responsible for prompting thereafter an annual review of the case, which may be tasked through either the 'host' OCU DCI or the crime OCU performance and review unit detective superintendent. All review processes are recorded within RMS, and LTMP cases subsequently considered appropriate for closing and filing are submitted for final endorsement through the detective superintendent in the performance and review unit to the head of CID and/or the ACC (SO). This process is currently being implemented by the performance and review unit with OCUs and the PNC bureau, and collation is currently being undertaken (see 'Work in Progress').

The recently formed performance and review unit has responsibility for reviewing LTMP investigations to ensure compliance with force policy and procedures, to consider the

October 2007

investigation against current NPIA best practice, and to establish new lines of enquiry to locate the missing person.

Both SNT and TPT officers have a good understanding of the action they should take when receiving the report of a missing person. PCSOs receive missing persons training in their initial training programme. Control room staff are clear about their role in obtaining details and grading missing persons as a prompt response. They had received training in identifying critical incidents.

Supervisors and managers take responsibility for missing persons and are clear about the action they should take. Officers stated that there would be a good response if the missing person was high risk and all necessary resources would be pulled in to assist with the investigation.

There is a 24/7 critical incident cadre of superintendents who take responsibility for critical incidents. Details on how the cadre works can be accessed at www.hampshire.police.uk/Internet/so/operations/cadre/. The inspection team was provided with examples of how the cadre has provided support, guidance and leadership where appropriate. In one example, the cadre superintendent was instrumental in co-ordinating activity across two police forces and successfully traced a missing man and his 3-year-old child, both of whom were deemed high risk.

The force identifies risk in the first instance when the report is made to the FCR. The member of staff obtains details and generally the incident is given a priority response grade that gives a target time for officer attendance within 30 minutes.

The first responders carry out a risk assessment which is then reviewed by a sergeant and/or inspector. A DI reviews all high-risk missing persons and the duty inspector reviews all medium-risk missing persons. If there is new information that requires the risk assessment to be increased or decreased, then the reassessment and reasons for it are recorded on the RMS working sheet.

There was evidence of a structured approach to the supervision of recording, attendance and investigation. Risk identification and assessment were carried out in a timely fashion and reviewed by both supervisors and managers. Ownership of the investigation was passed between duty inspectors to ensure appropriate resourcing. Tactical options are detailed in the patrol guide and officers are clear about their actions, including calling out a missing persons manager when requiring a POLSA (police search adviser) search or further advice. The potential for a missing persons case to lead to a critical incident is clearly understood by staff at all levels.

Whenever a person goes missing, an interview must be carried out on their return and details recorded on the RMS log; brief guidance is contained in the patrol guide (see below in 'Areas for improvement'). Specific guidance is provided for missing children from care, where policy states that an independent social worker is required to be present during return interviews.

Missing persons are routinely considered within appropriate NIM business processes and are included at the OCU daily management meeting as a standing agenda item so that consideration can be given to providing additional resources. There was evidence that missing persons are reviewed at section, district and OCU level.

The force has introduced a quarterly inspection process for missing persons cases completed by each of the OCU community safety team inspectors (the first meeting was on 9 July 2007). The meeting harnesses good practice, identifying and developing areas for improvement within policy and discussing quality assurance and performance. The results

October 2007

will be fed back to the DCI in the crime OCU and then to the ACC (SO) and will produce a more consistent approach across the force area.

Work in Progress

Protocols are being drawn up with partners to manage children missing from care. This will cover all six OCU areas and ensure that there is a clear, co-ordinated and consistent approach to managing regular missing persons from care. Concerns were raised about the action taken for regular missing persons. There is frustration on the part of officers who feel limited as to what action they can take – particularly when they return regular missing persons home, only for them to leave again within minutes. They also feel that those who have responsibility for young people should take more action themselves, in addition to notifying the police when they go missing. There is recognition that these are often vulnerable individuals.

The new missing persons policy makes the PPU inspector the OCU champion for missing persons. This role performs a quality assurance function as well as managing the response to local repeat missing persons. This will involve liaison with care homes, foster carers and other partners as necessary to develop a plan (or plans) to tackle the longer-term issues.

Performance management information for missing persons has not been gathered; however, the new policy outlines what information will be obtained and fed back to senior managers. A performance management framework is being developed using a range of quantitative and qualitative assessments. It is intended that this performance management information will be used to monitor and improve performance.

Areas for Improvement

If RMS fails, there is a three-hour loss of service. As no paper records are kept, this could hinder missing persons investigations – this has happened on at least four occasions. A process to maintain limited information, especially on current high-risk missing persons, should be considered.

RMS records all details of missing persons investigations. However, supervisors find it time consuming to review all the working sheets as there is no automatic summary. Efforts should be made to simplify the summarisation process.

While work is in progress to develop an improved policy to tackle missing persons from mental health establishments, work needs to be undertaken with partners to identify opportunities for preventative work for repeat missing persons who are not in care. There was no evidence to show that multi-agency working or responses had been developed. There were no multi-agency strategies, joint objectives or targets, protocols or service-level agreements in place.

RECOMMENDATION 7

That the force develops multi-agency working to identify opportunities for preventative work for repeat missing persons who are not in care.

Policy does not show the lines of responsibility and accountability through to the ACPO lead; however, this was clearly understood by officers who were interviewed (see 'Strengths').

October 2007

Special constables had not received training in missing persons investigations and their knowledge of policy and guidance was limited, having been picked up from colleagues. Additional training should be provided to special constables to raise their knowledge and understanding of missing persons investigations.

Some supervisors have received risk assessment training for general issues but not specifically for missing persons. Officers received training to risk assess missing persons cases in basic training but could not recall receiving further training. Guidance is written in policy and on RMS.

Staff have not received training to carry out return interviews and have learnt from colleagues. Consideration should be given to this being included in the force training programme (see 'Strengths').

RECOMMENDATION 8

That the force ensures there are sufficient trained staff on OCU's to conduct interviews with missing persons who return home.

The Hampshire PA has been supportive and has direct links with the ACC (SO) but does not receive formal reports on missing persons. The PA has provided additional resources to establish PPU's but governance of the four strands of protecting vulnerable people is not uniform. At the time of the inspection fieldwork, there was not a specific named PA member for missing persons. This has now been addressed, but it is too early to comment on the impact of this change.

There is a need to carry out a problem profile or other analytical work in relation to missing persons to provide a clear picture of where, when and how frequently resources are being deployed. Further analytical work would identify regular missing persons, allowing multi-agency preventative work to be carried out.

RECOMMENDATION 9

That the force develops multi-agency strategies, joint objectives and targets for missing persons.

The Hampshire Constabulary website could be enhanced by providing better public information about how to report a missing person and what the force will do to investigate such a report. Furthermore, opportunities exist to provide links with the Police National Missing Persons Bureau (PNMPB) and with charities that provide help and advice.

Recommendations

Neighbourhood Policing

Recommendation 1

That the force adjusts its intelligence systems and processes at operational command unit level to ensure that they support Neighbourhood Policing.

Performance management

Recommendation 2

That the force develops shared targets and accountability with partner agencies at operational command unit and force level.

Recommendation 3

That the force ensures an appropriate level of training on performance management is provided for all managers and supervisors.

Protecting vulnerable people

Recommendation 4

That the force conducts a training needs analysis for special constables in respect of all four protecting vulnerable people disciplines, with a view to raising their level of awareness, understanding and capability to act.

Child abuse

Recommendation 5

That the force develops stronger operational links and intelligence sharing between the child abuse investigation unit and territorial OCUs.

Domestic violence

Recommendation 6

That the force develops and then implements a formal caseload monitoring system for specialist officers.

Missing persons

Recommendation 7

That the force develops multi-agency working to identify opportunities for preventative work for repeat missing persons who are not in care.

Recommendation 8

That the force ensures there are sufficient trained staff on OCUs to conduct interviews with missing persons who return home.

Recommendation 9

That the force develops multi-agency strategies, joint objectives and targets for missing persons.

Appendix: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

A

ABC	Activity-based Costing
ACC	Assistant Chief Constable
ACC (SO)	Assistant Chief Constable (Specialist Operations)
ACC (TO)	Assistant Chief Constable (Territorial Operations)
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers

B

BCS	British Crime Survey
BCU	Basic Command Unit

C

CARMS	Computer Aided Resource Management System
CADDIE	Crime and Disorder Data Information Exchange
CAIU	Child Abuse Investigation Unit
CDRP	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
CEOP	Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre
CIA	Community Impact Assessment
CID	Criminal Investigation Department
CLDP	Core Leadership Development Programme
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
CPT	Child Protection Team
CRU	Central Referral Unit
CYP(R)	Child or Young Person at Risk

D

DCC	Deputy Chief Constable
-----	------------------------

DCI Detective Chief Inspector
DI Detective Inspector
DS Detective Sergeant

F

FCR Force Control Room
FEC Force Enquiry Centre
FPRG Force Performance Review Group

H

HMIC Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
HQ Headquarters

I

IAG Independent Advisory Group
ICIDP Initial Crime Investigators' Development Programme
IMU Incident Management Unit
INI IMPACT Nominal Index
IPLDP Initial Police Learning and Development Programme
IT Information and Technology

K

KIN Key Individual Network

L

LAA Local Area Agreement
LPP Local Policing Plan
LSCB Local Safeguarding Children Board
LTMP Long-term Missing Person

M

MAPPA Multi-agency Public Protection Arrangements

MARAC Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference

MSF Most Similar Force(s)

N

NCRS National Crime Recording Standard

NIM National Intelligence Model

NPIA National Policing Improvement Agency

O

OASys Offender Risk Assessment System

OCU Operational Command Unit

P

PA Police Authority

PCSO Police Community Support Officer

PDR Personal Development Review

PEACE Interview model – (preparation & planning, engage & explain, account, closure, evaluate)

PIIT Prisoner Interview and Investigation Team

PNC Police National Computer

PNMPB UK Police National Missing Persons Bureau

PPAF Police Performance Assessment Framework

PPI Personal Performance Indicator

PPO Prolific and other Priority Offender

PPU Public Protection Unit

PRIME IT Problem Resolution in Multi-agency Environments IT

PS Police Sergeant

PST Prosecution and Support Team

R

RM2000	Risk Matrix 2000
RMS	Record Management System
RPU	Road Policing Unit
RSO	Registered Sex Offender

S

SARA	Scanning Analysis Response Assessment
SB	Special Branch
SCAIDP	Specialist Child Abuse Investigator's Development Programme
SGC	Specific Grading Criteria
SIO	Senior Investigating Officer
SMART	Specific Measurable Achievable Realistic Timely
SMB	Senior Management Board
SNEN	Single Non-emergency Number
SNO	Safer Neighbourhood Officer
SNT	Safer Neighbourhood Team
SO	Specialist Operations
SOLAP	Student Officer Learning Assessment Portfolio
SPI	Statutory Performance Indicator
SUDI	Sudden Unexpected Death in Infancy

T

TCG	Tasking and Co-ordination Group
TIMS	Tactical Interview Managers
TO	Territorial Operations
TPT	Targeted Patrol Team

V

ViSOR	Violent and Sex Offenders Register
-------	------------------------------------