

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary



Inspection of Kent Police

Professional Standards

JANUARY 2006

ISBN 1-84473-819-1

CONTENTS

A – INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

1. Introduction
2. Inspection scope
3. Methodology
4. Baseline grading

B – FORCE REPORT

1. Force Overview and Context
2. Findings
 - **Intelligence** - *what a force knows about the health of professional standards*
 - **Prevention** - *how the force tries to improve and prevent the abuse of standards*
 - **Enforcement** - *its effectiveness in dealing with emerging problems*
 - **Capacity and Capability** – *having the resources and skills to address reactive and proactive challenges (including timely and proportionate response to lapses in professional standards)*

C – GLOSSARY

INSPECTION OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS 2005

A - INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

1. Introduction

'Professional standards' within the policing context has evolved significantly in recent years, following the HMIC thematic 'Police Integrity' (1999), the establishment of an ACPO Presidential Taskforce to tackle corruption and the introduction of the ACPO Professional Standards Committee. Since 2000, virtually every force in England and Wales has significantly expanded the activities of pre-existing Complaints and Discipline Departments to include an element addressing anti-corruption, including covert investigation. These larger units are generically known as Professional Standards Departments (PSDs).

The issue of complaints holds a unique importance for HMIC in that legislation¹ creates a responsibility on Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMIs) to 'keep themselves informed' as to the handling of complaints in forces. Traditionally this has involved inspection of individual forces on a rolling programme. The advent of HMIC's annual Baseline Assessment (from 2003/04), the establishment of the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) in 2004, and a series of public inquiries have changed the professional standards landscape significantly. In view of this, HMIC decided to carry out a simultaneous programme of inspection of professional standards in all 43 English and Welsh forces to provide a comprehensive picture of current performance and identify any issues of national importance.

2. Inspection scope

While this national programme of inspection of 'Professional Standards' has focused primarily on the operation of the PSDs, and their sub-sections, it has also examined issues of professional standards in the wider policing context, and therefore touched on other departments and areas of responsibility, for example Human Resources (HR). The core elements identified nationally for examination were:

Professional Standards Department

- The umbrella department within which all 'professional standards' activities are delivered, including the investigation of complaints and misconduct and proactive anti-corruption work.

Complaints and misconduct unit

- Responsible for reactive investigations into public complaints as well as internal conduct matters.

Proactive unit

- Responsible for the intelligence-led investigation of vulnerability to or allegations of corruption.

Intelligence cell

¹ Section 15(1) of the Police Reform Act 2002

- Responsible for:
 - Overall intelligence management
 - Analysis
 - Field Intelligence
 - Financial Investigation
 - Managing risks and grading threats

Handling of civil claims, security management and personnel vetting

- Individuals or units responsible for identifying risks to the integrity of the police service manifested within civil actions, civil claims, employment tribunals, breaches of security and infiltration of the service by inappropriate personnel.

Handling ‘Direction and Control’ Complaints

- Processes for handling complaints relating to:
 - operational policing policies (where there is no issue of conduct)
 - organisational decisions
 - general policing standards in the force
 - operational management decisions (where there is no issue of conduct)

Impact of unsatisfactory performance and grievance

- Relevant personnel within HR and operational departments, to establish that processes exist to identify any conduct issues or organisational lessons.

NB: The above list is not exhaustive nor does every force have each of these units or responsibilities as separate functions. The inspection sought to examine as many of the identified activities as are relevant to each force.

3. Methodology

Since 2003/04, HMIC’s core methodology for assessing force performance has been Baseline Assessment (BA), which consists of a self-assessment process supported by visits to forces for validation and quality assurance. BA assesses performance annually across 27² areas of policing via a framework of questions for each area. The mainstream BA process for 2004/05 was completed during spring 2005 and the results published in October 2005.

Professional Standards is one of the BA frameworks and would normally have been included in the mainstream BA activity. With the full programme of professional standards inspections scheduled for October and November 2005, however, the assessment of this framework was deferred to await their outcome.

The programme of inspections has been designed to:

- Provide a full inspection of professional standards in all England & Wales³ forces;
- Gather evidence for Baseline Assessment reports and grading of professional standards in all forces; and
- Identify key issues, trends and good practice that may have implications for professional standards on a national basis.

The standard format for each inspection has included:

- The completion of self assessment questionnaires by all forces;

² Number of frameworks in the 2004/05 assessment

³ Also including British Transport Police and Ministry of Defence Police

- Examination of documents;
- Visits to forces with group and individual interviews;
- Consultation with key stakeholders; and
- Final reports with grade.

4. Baseline Assessment grading

HMIC applies a qualitative grading to the inspection of Professional Standards. These grades are:

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

In allocating individual force grades, HMIC assesses all the available evidence and identifies how well the force matches an agreed set of Specific Grading Criteria. To ensure fairness and transparency in the grading process, HMIC worked with key partners in the APA, IPCC, the Home Office and ACPO to develop and agree these Specific Grading Criteria for Professional Standards.

The criteria set out expectations for a “Good” force. Grades of Fair, Good and Excellent all represent acceptable performance levels but indicate the degree to which the force has met the grading criteria. An Excellent grade indicates ‘benchmark’ performance including significant implementation of good practice.

The full grading criteria are set out in HMIC’s website at:
www.inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk.

The key elements appear under four headings, namely:

- **Intelligence** - *what a force knows about the health of professional standards*
- **Prevention** - *how the force tries to improve and prevent the abuse of standards*
- **Enforcement** - *its effectiveness in dealing with emerging problems*
- **Capacity and Capability** – *having the resources and skills to address reactive and proactive challenges (including timely and proportionate response to lapses in professional standards)*

The remainder of this report is set out under these headings, for ease of reference to the evidence presented.

B – FORCE REPORT

1. Force Overview and Context

Kent Police covers an area of 1,443 square miles in the south east of England. The county is divided into nine policing areas (basic command units – BCUs) with a resident population of approximately 1.6 million, a quarter of whom live in rural areas. The minority ethnic population accounts for 3.5% of Kent's total population, and the majority of minority ethnic permanent residents are concentrated in the North Kent and Medway policing areas, while a significant population of asylum seekers are to be found in South East Kent and Thanet. The county is the principal gateway to Europe, with the Channel Tunnel and major ferry ports to France and Belgium being situated in Kent, and around 33 million cross-channel passengers travel through the county each year. This generates significant transport and social infrastructure issues; notably asylum-seeking matters as mentioned above.

Full-time equivalent staffing levels as of November 2005 were 3,630 officers, 2,228 police staff, 105 police community support officers and 338 special constables.

The Force has a proven history of focusing on crime, and introduced the Kent policing model (KPM) in the mid-1990s. A forerunner of the National Intelligence Model (NIM), the KPM directs resources through intelligence-led policing and, as a consequence, performance against headline crimes has been historically good. The Chief Constable, and the Police Authority, have recently signalled their intention to place more emphasis on the reassurance agenda and community policing through an enhanced KPM.

Professional Standards

The DCC holds portfolio responsibility for professional standards however under an ongoing force restructuring early in 2006 the department will be realigned under the portfolio of ACC P&T.

The professional standards department (PSD) is led by a chief superintendent head of department (HoD) and a superintendent who oversees both investigations and intelligence. A detective chief inspector supervises complaint investigations.

The entire department which includes data protection, legal services, complaints and misconduct, intelligence development, chief of staff and support, consists of sixty-two staff members (including part-time and job share).

The complaints team consists of a blend of experienced police officers, two of whom are investigating officers (IO) with eight assistant investigating officers (AIO), seven of whom are retired experienced detectives and the eighth a suitably qualified member of support staff.

The proactive anti-corruption unit is managed by a detective inspector and supervised by the detective superintendent who is head of investigations. The unit consists of three police officers with good proactive and covert criminal investigative skills and two retired experienced detectives. The unit has its own analytical support.

There are five field intelligence officers, three of whom are detectives.

Force security, data protection, legal services and administration all sit within the PSD who comprise the rest of the establishment mentioned above.

Additionally the Force employs an operational security officer (OPSY), situated within the intelligence cell. He is charged with implementing and promulgating best practice into intelligence handling and operational security and undertaking independent review and audit of the operational use of intelligence and operational security arrangements including professional standards and all other covert intelligence gathering activity. This individual reports directly to the DCC.

GRADING : GOOD

2. Findings

Intelligence - *what a force knows about the health of professional standards*

Strengths

- There is considerable evidence from the baseline process to indicate that NIM is driving all PSD activity both proactive and complaint matters. The Deputy Head of Department has sent out a clear message that intelligence is not just about corruption but serves to demonstrate the corporate health of the organisation. The intelligence unit's remit has been extended to service all of the sub-departments under the widest heading of PSD, which includes all direction and control complaints.
- The HoD, Head of Investigations and the DCC regularly meet to update and overview PSD business including strategy, policy and, in a number of cases, objectives for the investigation of corruption and related matters. The Head of investigation and the HoD regularly meet to discuss ongoing cases and any policy or strategy issues that may arise therefrom. Both officers have direct oversight of the strategic threat assessment. The structure, strategy and operation of PSD closely accords to the ACPO guidelines and are regularly reviewed by the Head of PSD.
- Excellent progress has been made in the proactive use of the Centurion database which, linked to I2, enables effective analysis. The resulting tactical assessments are informing the organisation and developing opportunities to identify and bridge gaps in the force's defences against corruption and misconduct. In due course the growing information available from the direction and control data, now being recorded within the Centurion database, will further provide detailed information to supplement this process.
- Intelligence flows into the PSD are good at all levels and most are through direct contact. Field intelligence officers are allocated geographical areas of responsibility and have built up excellent networks across the organisation. They carry their own workloads and receive intelligence as well as being tasked to produce packages for further development by others in the PSD. Structurally the department is set out in purest NIM compliant terms with excellent firewalls between the intelligence and investigative/proactive arms. The secure intelligence cell is now preparing regular briefings and updates sanitised to the level required within the department. Work is in hand to prepare a further sanitised version, which will be made available to the Force as management information.

- The Force employs an operational security officer (OPSY) who undertakes independent review and audit of the operational use of intelligence and operational security arrangements force-wide. The OPSY reports to the DCC via the Head of PSD and works independently from the intelligence chain of command. This was the first post of its kind outside an intelligence agency and has proved so successful in this and, more recently, other forces that many are set to follow suit.
- The ethos within the intelligence department is to manage and collate intelligence and create packages to a high standard which can be passed to the proactive wing of the department for investigation or execution. Members of both the intelligence and proactive units meet monthly to discuss performance and the tactical assessment but all other business is dealt with between the detective inspectors or through the department head thereby maintaining a sterile corridor and auditable process.
- Department policy on intelligence is clear. The department has devised categorisation of intelligence in relation to officers into Kent police language highlighting 'high earners' of complaints as 'category Ds'. Each FIO, IO and AIO is expected to submit intelligence using the 5x5x5 grading system, which is working well. It is also an expectation that BCU commanders, personnel staff and any employee with intelligence for PSD submits such in the standard method which is then filtered within the department by the detective inspector responsible for intelligence. The intelligence unit will then continue to develop CHISs and other means of intelligence capture.
- Each source handling unit within the Force uses an IT system called Covert Operations Source Management System (COSMoS) to monitor all covert human intelligence sources (CHIS) payments and activities. This system has also been fully adopted within the PSD. All informants are centrally authorised by the force authorising officer and the central authorities bureau manages COSMoS.
- There is good consultation between the Force, the Police Federation and Unison. They have regular input into policies across a range of issues including professional standards and the associations believe that they can and do influence Force policies.

AFIs

- The use of 'Service Evaluation' (Mystery Shopper) to capture information by examining service quality is under consideration. The HoD has explored the issues around mystery shopping and has bid for funding to conduct a series of exercises. It relates to the Kent Police Standard (KPS) as well as PSD in particular and is on hold pending prioritisation amongst other bids. This may, however, be an area, which the force wishes to explore in the medium term.
- Numerous examples of organisational learning were apparent during the baseline assessment but they were disparate and uncoordinated. There is scope for greater centralisation and correlation of these processes possibly by the KPS monitoring officer within the PSD. Organisational learning is being captured but

there is no central recording point. Whilst staff consider there are sufficient forums to flag issues of note it is important to ensure an audit trail which is formalised and co-ordinated centrally so that opportunities for wider organisational learning are not missed.

Recommendation 1

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the Force should implement a central co-ordinating method whereby organisational learning from enquiries, grievance, ETs, civil actions is co-ordinated and disseminated.

Prevention - *how the force tries to improve and prevent the abuse of standards*

Strengths

- The Force Standards Committee chaired by the DCC oversees a range of PSD activity and includes the newly developed Kent Police Standard. This steering group is attended by key personnel from across the organisation including training, legal advisors, PSD and HR.
- Kent Police Authority (KPA) is briefed on a monthly basis as to emerging issues and is provided with a range of performance data. The Authority is also given the opportunity to quality assure a range of files and dip sample at their discretion. Priority is given to complaints relating to racist or discriminatory behaviour. Members believe this gives them the necessary reassurance that investigations are being properly completed.
- It is possible to make complaints against the police by a number of media including emails, telephone and third party reporting and the Force external website allows members of the public ready access. However, it is recognised within the Force there is scope to increase the availability of information in languages other than English. The department has an internal Intranet page, which is updated regularly. The page incorporates information on learning points supplied by other departments such as Kent Police College. It contains a section on frequently asked questions and organisational learning in the form of case studies.
- The HoD is a member of the training user group where he is able to influence training provision in response to identified learning points. A recent example would be the issues identified in relation to handcuff techniques. There is evidence of considerable activity within the training regime, to a range of staff, in relation to professional standards issues.
- The Proactive Scanning Group, chaired by the ACC P&T is a monthly meeting consisting of heads from PSD, legal, HR and absence management, welfare, employment and domestic violence departments. This is a confidential meeting with only two sets of minutes being retained, one by the ACC and one by the head of legal services for any future civil claims. All suspended officers and those deemed to be of concern are discussed so that welfare processes and

other arrangements can be initiated and monitored. BCUs are able to refer staff to this forum through their personnel managers.

- Kent has fifty-two workplace fairness / grievance advisors and nineteen workplace mediators. The details of the former are available to all employees through the Force Intranet. This will be expanded in 2006 with workplace investigators for all police staff employee (PSE) matters. The Force has recognised through monitoring grievances that poor management of flexible working has been the cause of several grievances. A recent 'master class' has been run in order to improve the awareness and skills and another master class is set for January 2006 the subject being grievances.
- The Force Security Manager, who also has responsibility for vetting, has instituted systems across the Force under the banner Minerva launched in 1997 and recently refreshed to reflect current practice. Under his leadership Kent has been at the vanguard in vetting for many years. This has resulted in exceptional opportunities to shape the national vetting agenda together with another lead force (see also AFIs).
- Kent police has demonstrated a robust and rigorous risk assessment in relation to the development of its partnerships to prevent unauthorised access to IT systems. Effective protocols regarding access to IT systems and sanctions for misuse have been brokered and agreed with external agencies such as Port Police in Dover. This is a growth area of business with an increasing drive towards co-location and partnership working.
- In February 2005 the security department conducted a rigorous and robust internal risk management exercise covering many aspects of the IT networks including the capacity for loss of information or security breaches and opportunities for more effective monitoring. Having surfaced these issues it is now important that the strategic risk management board makes appropriate additions to the risk register.

AFIs

- The Force may be vulnerable due to the lack of effective recording and monitoring of the ethnicity of complainants. Suspicions around the under-recording of ethnicity were confirmed in a number of interviews where it was acknowledged that some staff lack confidence in the process and there are errors in the completion of forms. Furthermore, there is a lack of follow-up to ensure completeness or quality assurance.

Recommendation 2

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the Force should ascertain the degree of non-compliance with the statutory requirement to effectively record and monitor the ethnicity of complainants and take steps to minimise the gaps in data acquisition and monitoring.

- The Force does not have an independent external confidential reporting line. These are available through various private sector companies and this issue has

been the subject of a CRE recommendation, which should be given serious consideration. Possibilities are being explored with Crimestoppers but this work remains at a conceptual stage. The current reliance on the internal direct telephone line and proactivity by FIOs is producing significant quantities of intelligence but the Force should nevertheless consult with staff associations and support groups across the organisation before discounting this measure.

- Vetting is being carried out across a range of disciplines within the Force. This is a potential area for vulnerability as there is little quality audit on these systems and processes and some evidence to suggest varying levels of efficiency.

Recommendation 3

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends that the Force should, in order to comply with the ACPO vetting policy, introduce a more robust, centralised vetting function with improved quality control and corporate management.

- There is a continuing concern around the lack of vetting conducted against personnel from partner agencies such as the CPS who, following co-location and statutory charging arrangements have routine access to Force systems. This matter has been the subject of protracted negotiations with the CPS, led by the Force Security Manager as secretary of the ACPO National Vetting Working Group. Despite these negotiations little progress has been made but discussions with CPS are continuing. This is an area of vulnerability for all forces that requires early resolution.
- The FCC initially receives most complaints from the public. These are recorded onto the relevant forms and forwarded to the duty managers (inspectors) at BCU. A significant number of these complaints are being recorded onto the wrong forms causing problems further down the line. This is an issue, which may be resolved by improved training and enhanced supervision. One possibility could be to ensure a control room supervisor checks completed forms before sending them to BCU.

Enforcement - *its effectiveness in dealing with emerging problems*

Strengths

- The PSD head and deputy actively drive the strategic direction of the department. Changes within the department over the last twelve months have led to a review, change of processes and streamlining of working practices within both the proactive and misconduct wings. These changes have focused activity and have pushed boundaries.
- The DCC takes responsibility for the suspension of all police officers with responsibility for police staff currently held by the ACC P&T, though responsibility for all staff is likely to soon fall to the ACC. BCU commanders and department heads keep policy logs and contact records relating to all staff under suspension and clear policies are in place to ensure the continued need for suspension is considered and monitored on a regular basis by the HoD. The Proactive

Scanning Group, mentioned above, keep oversight of welfare issues in relation to staff who may need particular support through this process.

- There is evidence of good internal and external liaison by the PSD with key agencies including the IPCC, KPA and internal support groups. The PSD has established a good network with the force internal support groups including grievance advisors, personnel managers and BCU commanders. The KPA adopts a prioritised approach to case review but will inspect all cases involving alleged discrimination. The Force voluntarily refers all such cases to the IPCC and regular updates are requested by and supplied to the IPCC Commissioner in her meetings with the HoD.
- Kent PSD has been proactive in establishing good working relationships with the CPS based in Hampshire and effective Police Authority oversight is maintained by regular briefings and the opportunity to access a complete range of files, challenging where appropriate.
- All complaints received within the PSD are screened and assessed by the complaint process manager in consultation with the chief of staff and Kent Police Standards Manager. Investigation plans are established at this early assessment stage and then progressed by the individual allocated the inquiry. The IO or AIO then completes a detailed investigation plan that is signed off by the DI/DCI. This adherence to the Lancet Principles helps ensure both proportionality and timeliness of investigations.
- The Force has employed the services an eminent QC to deliver training to superintendents and ACCs in a series of training sessions on the effective running of tribunals. This training is supported by a 'how to' pack and a slide show. From the graduates of this course, a cadre of eight has been selected to ensure currency and corporacy in terms of process and adjudication.
- There is a good working relationship between PSD and the HR department. These departments are clearly defined and separate and there are no evident rubbing points between the processes involving sworn and unsworn staff. HR advisors oversee all PSE enquiries. An agreement has recently been reached where PSD oversee all PSE enquiries emanating from public complaints or recordable misconduct. Under the direction of a HR advisor there has been organisational learning stemming from interview teams dealing with police officers and PSE during the custody process.
- Training from HR experts in the field of employment legislation has been provided for supervisors. Regular inputs to training courses are also provided from the legal department which sits within the PSD. Whilst there is not a great deal of training for supervisors in relation to ACAS or employment law there is good awareness, and use of the HR advisors and personnel managers do appear to manage most PSD matters on BCUs.

AFIs

- The Force continues to battle to address the low local resolution rate. The current rate is around 37% and whilst this is an improvement, there is still a long way to go to achieve parity with other forces. There may be a case for the introduction of a PSD champion at BCU level to drive and monitor performance (see also AFI within capability and capacity).
- The use of unsatisfactory performance procedure (UPP) within Kent as elsewhere in the country is limited. The limiting factors seem to be a lack of confidence, training, awareness and infrastructure to support the process. There are examples of these measures being used to positive effect but this type of management intervention remains a largely unused tool. Experience should be shared and confidence in the process amongst supervisors should be boosted.
- There is a need for improved methods of recording and monitoring low level discipline issues. There is a lack of corporacy across BCUs and the potential exists for loss of organisational memory. A range of methods of recording low level discipline are being used locally and the centralised IX file note system would appear to be underused. It is important to ensure that central records are kept to maximise the potential for oversight, monitor trends and retain organisational memory in relation to 'high earners'.

Capacity and Capability – *(Having the resources and skills available to address the reactive and proactive challenge and providing a timely and proportionate response to lapses in professional standards)*

Strengths

- The HoD has taken the department forward in many areas and has increased its standing in the eyes of many throughout the Force. He and his SMT have introduced increased compliance with NIM principles, more robust engagement with other stakeholders and better supervision and resilience throughout the department. His leadership and consultative style have been widely acclaimed throughout this assessment. Following his imminent departure it is important that progress in the past year is sustained.
- During the assessment it was evident there is widespread trust and confidence in the PSD and its staff. Employees felt there was a good level of anonymity regarding source protection and many stated that it would be a department they would consider applying to join. Indeed some experienced and creditable detectives are opting to do so from higher paid posts.
- Kent Police is one of the few forces who have overcome the frustrations and early teething troubles in relation to the nationally adopted Centurion IT system. The Force has developed automated downloads of Centurion data into the PSD I2 intelligence database created from I-base. The system has also been adapted to make best use of direction and control complaints and is being developed to manage the KPS data. These developments have greatly improved the analyst's capacity and the intention is to further develop the software to incorporate data

sources such as grievance, PSE discipline, force telephony, computer misuse and data protection.

- The department has recruited additional resources to handle an anticipated increase in work as a result of the Police Reform Act, April 2002. It has also expanded to meet the demands of the Kent Standard and management of direction and control complaints (See also AFIs).
- In terms of demography the PSD workforce is not dissimilar to the rest of the Force but there is an acknowledged gap in terms of BME staff. Attempts have been made to bridge this gap through marketing and the latest initiative is to positively recruit staff from BME backgrounds on a rolling programme of four-month attachments. The first of these will be undertaken by the force positive action officer, a member of Kent Minority Ethnic Police Association (KMEPA). This positive message may pave the way for highlighting the department and encouraging others to apply.
- There is a good level of training input to all staff across the Force from the PSD in the form of workshops, master classes and Intranet learning. The department is also proactive in arranging training events and has, as mentioned elsewhere in this report, utilised the hydra suite for the investigation of deaths in police custody.

AFIs

- The Force has an effective means of driving and monitoring performance across a range of disciplines, using key performance indicators allied to the PPAF domains. Whilst there is a suite of performance indicators in relation to professional standards, performance in this area of police work has yet to be mainstreamed as one of the primary considerations of BCU and departmental staff across the Force.

Recommendation 4

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the Force should mainstream professional standards performance. Local ownership would be reinforced if the suite of professional standards performance indicators were to be used in the same way as existing performance indicators.

- Whilst there is evidence of training on an as required basis and new staff are subject to an induction programme, there is no bespoke training package available for new staff to the department. There is also no evidence of training in relation to the Race Relations Amendment Act although generic diversity training has been undertaken via the Intranet. The Force may wish to consider a more structured approach to training for new staff to the department, including specialist race and diversity training.
- Despite increases in resources, staff in the proactive wing of the department have indicated they spend significant amounts of time assisting colleagues in the

investigation of reactive misconduct complaints. A claim has been made for greater support in terms of case preparation officers and the department does employ an experienced retired officer on part-time duties for this purpose. It may be appropriate for the Force to consider further funding to make this a full-time equivalent post or utilise appropriately skilled staff on restricted duties. Another way to reduce the overall burden on the department would be to increase the proportion of complaints resolved locally.

¹¹ Section 15(1) of the Police Reform Act 2002

¹² Number of frameworks in the 2004/05 assessment

¹³ Also including British Transport Police

Glossary

ACC	assistant chief constable
ACCAG	ACPO Counter-Corruption Advisory Group
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
ACPO PSC	ACPO Professional Standards Committee
AIO	assistant investigating officer
BA	baseline assessment
BCU	basic command unit
BME	black and minority ethnic
Centurion	electronic database
CHIS	covert human intelligence source
CID	criminal investigation department
COSMoS	covert operations source management system
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
CRE	Commission for Racial Equality
DCC	deputy chief constable
DCI	detective chief inspector
DI	detective inspector
DSU	dedicated source unit
ESU	ethical standards unit
ET	employment tribunal
FIO	field intelligence officers
FTE	Full-time equivalent
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspector
HMIC	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
HoD	head of department
HQ	headquarters
HR	human resources
I2	analytical tool
IAG	independent advisory group – a body advising a force or BCU on race and diversity issues
IiP	Investors in People
IO	investigating officer
IPCC	Independent Police Complaints Commission
IX	internal file noting system
KMP	Kent policing model
LR	local resolution
MMR	monthly management review
MSF	most similar forces – a way of grouping forces to which each police force can be compared that has similar social and demographic characteristics
NCDG	National Complaints and Discipline Group
NCIS	National Criminal Intelligence Service
NIM	National Intelligence Model
OPSY	operational security officer
PA	police authority

PCSO	police community support officer
PDR	performance development review
PNC	Police National Computer
PPAF	Police Performance Assessment Framework
PS	professional standards
PSD	professional standards department
PSE	police staff employee
RDS	Research, Development and Statistics
RES	race equality scheme
RIPA	Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act, 2000
QA	quality assurance
SGC	specific grading criteria
SLA	service level agreement
SPI(s)	statutory performance indicators (SPIs) are used to monitor key aspects of police performance and form a critical component of performance assessments. SPIs are set each year following consultation with partners in line with powers under the Local Government Act 1999. SPIs are also known as 'best value performance indicators'
SPOC	single point of contact
TCG	tasking and co-ordination group
UPP	unsatisfactory performance procedure