



HMIC Inspection Report

Leicestershire Police

October 2007



Leicestershire Police – HMIC Inspection Report

October 2007

ISBN: 978-1-84726-465-7

CROWN COPYRIGHT

FIRST PUBLISHED 2007

Contents

Introduction to HMIC Inspections

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

Force Overview and Context

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

Findings

National summary of judgements

Force summary of judgements

Neighbourhood Policing

Performance Management

Protecting Vulnerable People – Overview

Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse

Protecting Vulnerable People – Domestic Violence

Protecting Vulnerable People – Public Protection

Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons

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

Leicestershire is a mid-sized county in the East Midlands region that covers an area of approximately 2,084 square kilometres (804 square miles). It has good transport links; it is connected to the motorway network, London is just over an hour away by train and East Midlands International Airport (which is in Leicestershire) services numerous European and worldwide destinations. The M1 motorway runs through Leicester, carrying road traffic from London to Leeds; east to west is served by the M69, which connects to the M6. Local government is administered through Leicestershire County Council along with the two unitary authorities of Rutland County Council and Leicester City Council. There are seven district or borough councils.

Demographic profile of force area

Leicestershire has a population of approximately one million people. The county's economy is varied, with manufacturing and wholesale/retail trade accounting for about 40% of employment. Other significant employment includes business activities and the public service sector. Unemployment in the city is higher than the regional and national average, while the county has lower than average levels. More than 30 million tourists visit the city and county annually. The principal conurbation is Leicester, where more than a third of the population is from the black and minority ethnic community. In total, more than a quarter of the city's population is of Asian/British Asian origin, the largest such community in England and Wales.

Leicester was ranked in the bottom 10% of the Government Index of Local Deprivation as 31st out of the 50 most deprived areas in England. By contrast, Rutland has a large number of very small settlements with low population density and a high standard of living. The largest population centre is Leicester, followed by Loughborough; other major towns include Ashby de la Zouch, Coalville, Hinckley, Market Harborough, Melton Mowbray, Oadby and Wigston. Rutland is the smallest county in the country, having been awarded unitary status in 1997. It consists of two market towns – Oakham and the county town of Uppingham – and 58 parishes.

Strategic priorities

In line with the Home Secretary's key priorities for 2006–09 and targets set by the local criminal justice board (LCJB), crime and disorder reduction partnerships (CDRPs), primary care trusts and Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service, the force is working towards priorities set by the community safety board for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

The force is represented on three force-wide children and young persons strategic boards that govern the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) and is working proactively to achieve the five recommended outcomes of 'Every Child Matters'.

The force priorities for 2007/08 include:

- complying with quality of service commitments;
- answering 90% of all non-emergency calls within 30 seconds;
- reducing the number of people killed or seriously injured (KSIs) on the roads in line with national targets;
- implementing regional forensic procurement;
- continuing with introducing the national strategy for police information systems (NSPIS) case and custody system;

October 2007

- achieving compliance with codes of practice for the management of police information;
- achieving 70.4% of police officer time spent on front-line policing duties;
- delivering savings and achieving 3% efficiency savings, in addition to the £25 million savings achieved in the last ten years;
- rolling out the automatic vehicle location system (ORB) force-wide, ensuring timely responses to calls;
- working closely with the East Midlands region forces to identify further collaboration and procurement opportunities;
- contributing to the development of regional level 2 intelligence and investigative assets, and
- introducing level 2 scientific support officers.

HMIC is aware that the force faces a challenging position financially and has reduced its police establishment to manage this situation. HMIC cost comparisons identify relative efficiencies by the force, compared with its most similar forces (MSFs), as delivering some of the lowest costs per head of population, but with a high level of policing presence. The force is currently working with the police authority (PA) on potential plans to reduce posts further over the next two years, unless the position on financial 'floors and ceilings' changes so that the force's allocation from the national funding pot more closely reflects the objective needs assessment.

Force developments since 2006

In April 2007, the force restructured from four to three BCUs and realigned local policing units (LPUs) with local authorities.

In the 2006 baseline assessment the force was graded Fair and Declined for Improving Forensic Performance; this area has been the subject of re-inspection in 2007. The commitment to building on strengths and continuing to address areas for improvement in forensic performance is evident. The force appointed a scene of crime manager in December 2006, who has added managerial resilience.

Areas covered by the inspection included variability in the quality and quantity of forensic recoveries – specifically DNA and fingerprints – between scene of crime officers (SOCOs). Individual performance information is now available to scientific support unit (SSU) managers who address variances through regular meetings. All SOCOs now have updated personal development reviews (PDRs) with performance targets and a comprehensive performance report is produced quarterly by the SSU. December 2006 performance showed 217 fingerprints recovered from scenes, compared with 199 in December 2005, and 65 DNA recoveries compared with 56. A new tasking policy for SOCOs, using priority grading and SOCO location tracking, commenced in February 2007 as part of performance improvement plans. However, in December 2006 the increased number of forensic recoveries had not led to increases in forensic identifications and detections when compared with December 2005. Consequently, since January 2007 the force has been working with the forensic science service to address quality issues with recoveries and is confident that performance will improve.

Another objective was to increase the number of vehicle crime scenes examined. A vehicle recovery policy was implemented in June 2006, and is governed and monitored through the vehicle strategy group, with an interim assessment report already completed. Force forensic performance information for December 2006, compared with December 2005, shows an increase in vehicle crime scenes attended.

October 2007

The use of the forensic management system was previously limited and in this area good progress has been made. A new scenes of crime website (SOCweb) has recently come online. The integrated forensic evidence management system called SOCRATES has been migrated to SOCweb and the force IT department has provided dedicated support to deliver full functionality. More work is needed to ensure that all force staff are aware of the new site and how to access the forensic status of cases. SSU staff are trained and consideration is being given to realigning the SOCO shift pattern with demand data.

The force has introduced or is trialling a number of developments since the baseline report, including the use of hand-held mobile technology linked to SOCRATES to help improve SOCO efficiency and increased use of footwear mark (known as Treadmark) recoveries and identifications. A trial has begun on the use of mobile photo-fit technology for faster and more accurate identifications at scenes of crimes. The force is also reviewing its control strategies to ensure that forensic action and intervention is as effective as possible.

As well as providing a strong chief officer lead for forensic performance, the assistant chief constable (ACC) (crime), with significant support from the scientific support manager, is helping to drive forward regional and national collaborative developments to improve forensic financial efficiency and performance.

In June 2007 a forensic science data audit was conducted by HMIC. Overall, the force was awarded Good and Excellent grades for the various components of data quality and data management.

Taking into account all of these improvements, the grade for forensic performance is now Fair and Improved.

Current developments

The force has taken the primary lead in supporting and co-ordinating the British Government's police response to the disappearance of four-year-old Madeleine McCann (whose family live in Rothley, Leicestershire), from a holiday apartment in Portugal on 3 May 2007. It has committed significant resources and has established an incident room to manage its contribution to the investigation. It has also deployed a number of staff to perform various roles in Portugal. This ongoing enquiry will continue to be a demand on the force until the investigation is resolved.

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

October 2007

Neighbourhood Policing

GRADE	EXCELLENT
-------	-----------

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

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

Contextual factors

The Chief Constable is the ACPO lead for Neighbourhood Policing, working closely with the Home Office and forces across the country. Neighbourhood teams, supported by partnership and community participation, have been fully established for some time.

HMIC's inspection of Neighbourhood Policing reported in October 2006 identified a number of areas for improvement. All of these have been addressed, with several being converted into strengths. For instance, a draft consultation and community engagement strategy has become a key enabler for teams in effectively identifying and problem solving local priorities with partners. The force reorganisation in April 2007 reduced the number of BCUs from four to three and placed Neighbourhood Policing at the centre of force business, improving retention and deployment of neighbourhood team staff. A training needs analysis for neighbourhood teams has been developed into an ongoing comprehensive training programme, with formal accreditation.

Strengths

- A number of leading-edge developments in key areas of Neighbourhood Policing have been adopted by several other forces in the region; examples include the

October 2007

electronic beat profile and problem-solving plan templates. The Prime Minister's delivery unit recognised the good practice of linking new initiatives such as the single non-emergency number (SNEN) 101 with the inter-agency community safety bureau (ICSB). Use of the confidence, reassurance, accessibility and visibility evaluation survey (CRAVE) to measure and map satisfaction levels has also attracted national and regional interest.

- The ICSB has been adopted by Leicester City Council and Rutland, and more recently by Melton and Harborough districts, while the remaining districts are committed to introducing ICSBs. The co-located bureaux bring together the police and local authority to carry out joint review, analysis and tasking of community problems identified from calls received from the public, including those from the 101 national pilot. All partners are accountable through joint performance targets.
- Dedicated neighbourhood teams have been in place throughout the 110 identified neighbourhoods, together with all the appropriate infrastructure and support, for some time. These teams work with partners to resolve community priorities. Six police priority neighbourhoods, five within Leicester City, have been identified and these are aligned to local authority neighbourhood management areas where the process of tasking all partners to address local priorities is mature. For example, the development of joint neighbourhood profiles has resulted from the close working relationship between neighbourhood teams, neighbourhood managers, and community wardens/rangers.
- An integral component of the teams is the complement of PCSOs. All of the force's 229 PCSOs are fully deployed to neighbourhood teams. As well as carrying out consistently high levels of visible patrol, the officers are used as investigation support officers for beat officers; for instance, collecting CCTV evidence to help ensure that crimes are thoroughly investigated. All special constables are assigned to neighbourhood teams. Full implementation of neighbourhood teams has contributed to the force's strong performance in all relevant national key performance indicators. For 2006/07 the force achieved top quartile performance within its group of MSFs in respect of SPI 2A – the percentage of people who think their local police do a good job. In respect of SPI 10B – perceptions of ASB – the force achieved second quartile performance. The percentage of residents in the county who agree that the local police are dealing with things that matter to people in the community increased from the previous year and is higher (52.3%) than the MSF average (46.9%).
- A very visible Neighbourhood Policing philosophy is evident throughout the force. The Chief Constable is the national ACPO lead for Neighbourhood Policing and, together with the other command team members and senior managers, provides strong vision and leadership to develop this area of business; funding is available to ensure sustainability until 2011. The recent reorganisation from four to three BCUs has increased supervisory and management resilience for neighbourhood teams, enhanced the co-terminosity of LPUs, specifically with health trusts, and underpinned the priority the force gives to staffing Neighbourhood Policing teams.
- The 110 neighbourhoods in the force area were defined in early 2006, using guidance from the National Centre for Policing Excellence (NCPE) and in consultation with partners and communities. They vary in size and nature according to local factors and are reviewed on a six-monthly basis through the neighbourhood profile process.

October 2007

- There is clear evidence that Neighbourhood Policing is already integrated into the main stream of force business, with sustainability as a key theme. Systems and processes have been adjusted to support Neighbourhood Policing including the performance management regime Achieving Policing Excellence (APEX), community safety bureau (CSB) arrangements and the force reorganisation from four to three BCUs. One of the three themes of the force change programme is 'getting personal with communities'.
- A communication strategy in support of 'getting personal with communities' identifies a range of tactics to promote Neighbourhood Policing. A redeveloped force website has won a national award for accessibility.
- Partners influence the way Neighbourhood Policing is delivered. The community safety programme board (CSPB), chaired by the Chief Constable, is a chief executive-level forum with representation from all key partners, ensuring that Neighbourhood Policing strategic priorities are jointly developed and performance is monitored against a range of joint targets. Independent advisory groups (IAGs), key individual networks (KINs) and other community groups showed how they had influenced the delivery of local policing. For instance, Voluntary Action Leicestershire is consulted at a strategic level, while specific faith and race IAGs assist with community policing following major incidents.
- A human resources (HR) strategy for neighbourhood teams contains clear direction on roles, recruitment, development and retention. Recognition is evident through the award of incremental special priority payments to beat officers and sergeants, together with force APEX good performance awards. Neighbourhood Policing staff feel valued and retention is high. Succession planning to ensure continuity has a particular focus in the strategy and beat officer and PCSO vacancies are prioritised and filled quickly.
- The beat officer and PCSO training programme is based on national police improvement agency (NPIA) modules that combine learning with practical application in areas such as partnership development, problem solving and community engagement. In conjunction with a local university, staff will be awarded accreditation that can be used for career development.
- The force has identified learning needs for officers and staff during the process of implementing Neighbourhood Policing across the county, in terms of training and how to assess their performance. This learning has been incorporated in Neighbourhood Policing team training and the Neighbourhood Policing performance framework. Bespoke training on engagement has been delivered to neighbourhood team staff who police diverse communities – for instance, the Muslim community.
- Training courses are evaluated and there is evidence of changes being made to identify and meet Neighbourhood Policing staff training needs. The force has also provided a one-day training session for all staff on citizen focus and Neighbourhood Policing principles.
- Joint partnership training is taking place at both the strategic and local level. The force has been instrumental in planning large-scale conferences and planning exercises, aimed at chief executive level, on the integration of Neighbourhood Policing and neighbourhood management. Following the training of neighbourhood teams, LPUs and districts have identified key practitioners and delivered joint problem-solving training and awareness input into local working arrangements

October 2007

through formal meetings and workshops. In addition, a force-wide group with a mix of partners regularly receives training on tackling ASB and neighbourhood nuisance-related incidents.

- A regime of compliance checking is carried out by the Neighbourhood Policing project team, including checks on the quality of beat profiles and problem-solving plans. Reality checks are also carried out, testing how quickly Neighbourhood Policing teams respond to email communications from the community, and how well call-handlers deal with callers' enquiries on beat officers' contact details and local priorities. This regime will continue over the next 12 months, in conjunction with a force self-inspection template, as part of efforts to mainstream this activity.
- Self-assessment is undertaken in a positive manner. Each BCU has completed self-assessments in line with the national template, and action plans are being robustly implemented following input from the national Neighbourhood Policing team field officer.
- A joint partner strategic assessment was produced in September 2006 which identified strategic objectives supporting Neighbourhood Policing, including the extension of neighbourhood management. The assessment was used to inform the budget-setting process. Joint assessments are continuing to be delivered in line with the national intelligence model (NIM), feeding the BCU and force strategic assessments.
- NIM processes support neighbourhood teams in a number of ways. Firstly, BCU senior managers get an overview of all their neighbourhood priorities, with the main themes identified in BCU strategic assessments and fortnightly tasking meetings so that appropriate resources can be allocated. Secondly, analysts in ICSBs produce problem profiles on more persistent problems and also brief call-takers and neighbourhood teams on a regular basis.
- In addition to joint tasking that occurs in the ICSBs, tasking of both police and partners also takes place across the force at LPU level through joint action groups (JAGs), offender management meetings and information-sharing and tasking groups. The process is well developed in terms of coverage of communities, frequency, and the wide range of neighbourhood issues identified, with clear links to the BCU fortnightly tasking and co-ordination meeting. Updates on registered sex offenders (RSOs) are also provided in briefings to neighbourhood teams.
- Issues of organised crime and counter-terrorism are linked with Neighbourhood Policing at all levels. The 'Prevent' element of the counter-terrorism strategy is championed by the ACC (operations) at the CSPB, with tactical operations sitting with the force CSB, under which the Neighbourhood Policing project manager sits. The force and BCU strategic assessments articulate the links between organised crime and counter-terrorism. Neighbourhood teams have a clear understanding of community intelligence and have identified vulnerable locations, which have become microbeats, with KINs developed in association.
- Tried and tested information-sharing protocols are in place. A clear understanding of community intelligence and its importance in protecting local communities exists among neighbourhood teams. Identified vulnerable premises have become microbeats and these have also been developed in vulnerable communities. Staff and analysts are fully trained in the use of community intelligence.
- Leicester City BCU has been one of the twelve national pilot sites for the

October 2007

development of Neighbourhood Policing performance management information. Learning from this pilot has been used to develop the Neighbourhood Policing suite of performance indicators which are monitored at force level. The current suite of indicators has an emphasis on quality of service, confidence and fear of crime measures, which has helped the force assess the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Policing, partly through comparing results with the CRAVE survey. CRAVE samples of 1,600 people are conducted twice yearly, asking a range of questions, many mirroring those asked in the British Crime Survey. The suite of indicators holds BCUs and neighbourhood teams to account for performance against the indicators.

- The CRAVE survey has a series of confidence questions, including asking people if they think that 'we understand the issues that affect the community' and 'we are dealing with things that matter to the people of the community'. In the latest survey (not yet formally presented to the chief officer group (COG)) the results from respondents living in Leicester City BCU were positive, with 80% of people believing the local police understand their issues, while 78% think that local police deal with things that matter to the community.
- The consultation and engagement strategy has been recognised by the Neighbourhood Policing programme team (NPPT) as good practice. It has guided all neighbourhood teams to identify, prioritise and seek views on tackling local priorities through minimum standards of community engagement. A comprehensive range of community engagement tactics are followed, including door-knocking, street briefings, work with residents associations, the use of KINs and victim focus groups.
- The beat profiles provide a variety of information to assist neighbourhood teams in promoting community consultation to establish local priorities. This includes crime data, call-handling information, demographic and socio-economic data and identification of hard-to-reach groups. All local priorities, together with a rationale for their adoption as a priority, are contained within the beat profile.
- The force has actively developed the use of multi-agency data in problem solving at various levels, one example being the development of the ICSB which draws together neighbourhood data across partners and agencies. The data is then analysed and presented at the joint agency tactical meeting, which leads to jointly owned problem-solving plans.
- Problem-solving plans, which use a corporate electronic problem-solving template, exist for each local priority. The template, advocated as good practice by the NPPT team, follows a problem-solving model that uses victim, location, and offender details, as well as data from partner agencies. Problem-solving training with partners takes place through regular workshops.
- A neighbourhood profile process was implemented force-wide at the end of 2006. This process involved partners and fed into BCU strategic assessment, helping to determine the deployment of Neighbourhood Policing teams.
- The evident effectiveness of engagement with local communities is enhanced by the strong relationships that have been built with a wide variety of ethnic, religious and emerging communities (including refugee and asylum groups) throughout the county. Members of these communities are identified as KINs and work with neighbourhood teams in promoting Neighbourhood Policing, providing knowledge and understanding to build bridges with communities, helping validate neighbourhood profiles and giving feedback on consultation about local priorities.

October 2007

- A robust abstraction policy which includes pre-planned abstractions is in place and this has a meaningful and clear definition. The abstraction target – that beat officers should not be away from Neighbourhood Policing duties for more than 5% of their duty time – is monitored through the force APEX performance meeting.
- A detailed project plan and programme with critical milestones is in place to ensure that all aspects of Neighbourhood Policing are fully implemented by April 2008. This is overseen by a project manager based in the force CSB. Sustainability is a key theme.
- All neighbourhood teams are accommodated in fully equipped and operational police premises, located as close to their communities as possible. Staff are fully equipped, with good access to police vehicles.
- PDR objectives for neighbourhood team staff directly support the delivery of Neighbourhood Policing. Objectives are linked to the Neighbourhood Policing performance framework and are clearly understood by neighbourhood staff and BCU supervisors and managers.
- The force has for some time used community impact assessments effectively in response to any incidents, crimes, media events and changes in operational policing that might cause community concern or tension. A robust system is in place to ensure that these assessments, as appropriate, feature in daily briefings for BCU senior managers and chief officers, as well as in tasking and co-ordination meetings at BCU and force level.

Work in progress

- The force has recognised the importance of ensuring that members of the community who have been involved in setting local priorities, but who do not attend JAG meetings, are kept updated when priorities are finalised. However, while some checking of this feedback loop takes place, it is not yet fully matured. An engagement and communication plan to address this will form part of the next round of Neighbourhood Policing profiles.
- The existing force-wide, problem-solving database is currently being reviewed and linked into the force website, so providing a record of good practice from problem-solving plans.
- The force has acknowledged that improving the continuity of Neighbourhood Policing sergeants would benefit local communities. Although most Neighbourhood Policing sergeants currently establish medium to long-term contact with their local communities, the introduction of a minimum tenure for these posts has now been included as part of the Neighbourhood Policing project plan for the next 12 months.
- The force has recognised the need to provide training for force staff, and especially neighbourhood teams, in engaging with emerging communities, notably Eastern European migrant worker groups and some asylum-seekers such as Iraqis and Kurds. Options are currently being worked through, including how to incorporate the effectiveness of such engagement in Neighbourhood Policing performance monitoring.

Areas for improvement

- As part of the inspection process, a telephone survey of 100 residents chosen at random was carried out asking them six questions about their experience and views of how well Neighbourhood Policing is being delivered. In five of the questions, the percentage of positive answers was within, or close to, the national average. However, for the sixth question, 'From what you know, are the local police speaking to local people about tackling problems in your area?' the positive response was significantly lower than the national average. This might usefully explain the finding to assess if any lessons can be learnt.
- There is no formal programme of joint problem-solving training, although workshops attended by partners and the NPPT have been held.

Developing Practice

INSPECTION AREA: Neighbourhood Policing

TITLE: Linking 101 and Neighbourhood Policing – the Inter-agency Community Safety Bureau

PROBLEM:

To ensure that development of the 101 single non-emergency number pilot is integrated into Neighbourhood Policing.

SOLUTION:

Leicestershire Constabulary and partners were one of five Wave One pilots for the introduction of the SNEN 101. In developing its approach to the service, the Constabulary ensured that 101 was not established purely as a call-handling centre. The ASB issues being tackled through 101 are intrinsically linked to Neighbourhood Policing. Recognising this link, the force and partners agreed to establishing two ICSBs in Leicester City and at Rutland.

The Leicester City/Central Area ICSB is based at Mansfield House Police Station and consists of a manager, three analysts and two community investigators. The function of the ICSB is to receive data from 101, other police sources and local authority/external partnership databases, and to undertake analysis on this data, producing ASB profiles in problem areas. The ICSB also ensures that call-takers in the 101 project and the force headquarters call management centre (CMC) are briefed on a fortnightly basis about current ASB and its links to established neighbourhood priorities. The ICSB contributes to both daily and fortnightly tasking on BCUs. Where problem profiles are formulated, the role of the community investigator is to support the neighbourhood team in adopting a problem-solving approach to resolve the issues.

Resources in the police and local authority are tasked through a fortnightly joint management group (JMG), attended by police, local authority and external partners at a senior level. This is a tactical tasking meeting, through which problem profiles are raised and monitored.

In order to monitor performance against service level agreements (SLAs) and the adopted problem profiles, a performance board has been developed – Achieving Performance Excellence in Leicester (APEL). This multi-agency body is chaired by the local authority and is designed to improve the accountability of those responsible for service delivery.

OUTCOME(S):

The outcome of the initiative has been both to improve performance in responding to ASB through more effective intelligence-based deployment of resources, and to strengthen existing partnership working practices, responsiveness to local issues and accountability.

As a result of the ICSB, problem profiles have been completed for a number of areas in Leicester City and Rutland, leading to excellent examples of problem solving. Aylestone Leisure Centre was adopted in mid-December and, following a planned policing initiative, test purchasing activities with local off-licences and letters to parents of young people identified as under-age drinkers, calls have dropped from an average of 26 per month to 4 per month. CCTV is being upgraded, funding has been secured for a detached youth worker

October 2007

and ongoing monitoring continues. As a result of this pioneering approach, Central Area was visited by *Police Professional* magazine, resulting in the publication of a comprehensive article for the benefit of other forces.

FORCE CONTACT: Superintendent Rob Nixon, Force Community Safety Bureau – 0116 248 5903

INSPECTION AREA: Neighbourhood Policing

TITLE: Matching resources to demand in support of Neighbourhood Policing, utilising ORB

PROBLEM:

Leicestershire Constabulary has promised not to abstract neighbourhood officers. In order to meet this commitment, it is necessary to make best use of resources available. The Constabulary has collaborated with a private consultancy to develop systems and practices, using the latest technology, for real-time and retrospective mapping of resources to demand. The initial stage of this work involved the use of automatic vehicle location system technology, known as ORB. Future plans include the use of personal location devices.

SOLUTION:

A representative steering group was established to ‘design’ the solution, and subsequently location hardware technology was fitted to vehicles on one BCU. This technology reports the vehicle position every six seconds. The technology provides integrated resource/demand screens in the CMC and on BCUs, providing live mapping of resources. It also provides graphic information that demonstrates the deployment of resources to incidents. Staff were briefed and mentored on the use of the technology.

The plan is that this technology will be overlaid onto electronic maps, showing the allocation of resources in real time as well as retrospective information on neighbourhood priorities, microbeats, and deployments from NIM tasking processes. This provides accurate and meaningful management information to assist in decision making and performance management, both on BCUs and within the CMC. It will also be used to inform communities about the policing resources used to target neighbourhood priorities.

OUTCOME(S):

An operational outcome of this work has been that managers have access to valuable demand/resource analysis in real time. This enables effective deployment of resources, as shown in an immediate improvement by 7% of response to grade 1 incidents. Dispatchers value the ability to better direct resources to and during an incident, to challenge inappropriate use of call signs/deployment, and to co-ordinate the response to pursuits, alarms and firearms deployments. There was also a positive response from officers, who believed work was being distributed more equitably.

At a very local level, supervisors value being able to deploy vehicles to grade 2 and grade 3 incidents more efficiently – these are often the incidents that cause greatest concern to communities. Savings were achieved of £183 per vehicle per month, of which £150 was sustainable.

FORCE CONTACT: Superintendent Rob Nixon, Force Community Safety Bureau – 0116 248 5903 / Natalie Smith, ICSB Manager – 0116 222 2222, ext 6655

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 regime, APEX, is now thoroughly embedded within the force. The process is chaired by the Chief Constable and provides scrutiny, guidance and support where appropriate. The process is understood and welcomed by officers and staff at all levels. The force management information gateway (MIG) is equally embedded within the force, accessible via the force intranet to staff, supervisors and managers and providing accurate performance data across a range of indicators.

Strengths

- The force has included the policing performance assessment framework (PPAF) domains and HMIC key issues in its performance regime, APEX, which feeds into the MIG. These processes have been independently evaluated by the Audit Commission, which states: 'the availability of force data down to LPU level on one central website, providing up-to-date and accurate statistics, has allowed areas to focus much more quickly and closely upon issues of public concern or underperformance against targets, and thereby respond more swiftly with an appropriate reallocation of resources'. Included in the APEX process is MSF comparative data at both force and BCU level. PA members sit as observers at APEX meetings, further strengthening the governance and rigour of these meetings.
- CDRPs and the LCJB have performance regimes which are shared with the police members of the partnerships. The CSPB, a forum which enables strategic priorities to be agreed and managed jointly, is attended by executives of the strategic partners. Its objectives are to align priorities, co-ordinate county-wide community

October 2007

safety targets and provide performance measurement for all partners. The board is supported by full-time staff, including a strategic assessment intelligence officer who brings information from CDRPs into the force's strategic assessment.

- The core performance group (CPG) meets monthly and consists of members from each of the nine CDRPs (two unitary authorities and seven districts), the multi-agency prolific and priority offender management unit, the drug and alcohol action team (DAAT), the fire and rescue service, the county council research department, BCU partnership managers, CSB chief inspectors and two jointly funded analysts. Partnership performance against targets is a key element of the CPG; a range of performance data at sub-regional level and national iQuanta CDRP data are assessed by the group. Ownership of joint targets is driven by the allocation of specific actions to partners. The CPG is also able to commission projects for the CSPB.
- Leicester is a pilot site for the SNEN, 101. In support of SNEN the partners have created an ICSB with staff including a manager and analysts located in the City BCU. The staff analyse data received from the SNEN call centre and link this with police data to produce problem profiles, primarily concerning ASB. The JMG co-ordinates and monitors multi-agency tasking to promote partnership approaches to problems identified by the analysis. The ICSB also produces a tactical assessment in line with NIM principles and reports to the APEL board. The ICSB is currently seeking funding so that data held by all of the partners can be collated in a single database.
- The force has been successful in addressing conflicting targets – for example, the force initiative, which has been nationally recognised, on 'first time entrants into the criminal justice system' addresses contradicting targets for sanction detections and tries to prevent young people entering the criminal justice system.
- The local policing plan takes into account the national strategic key priorities from the national community safety plan. The plan also includes priorities set locally as a result of HMIC baseline findings. The force control strategy is linked to the one-year and three-year plans.
- A vision of the force is to be 'second to none' which is supported by 'getting personal with our communities, criminals and our people'. This is clearly and consistently articulated and promoted in all of the force's communications, messages and briefing by senior managers.
- The strategic financial planning group includes finance, information and communications technology (ICT) and HR senior managers, who have a remit to match resources to prioritised needs on a risk assessment basis. The PA directly holds the Chief Constable and finance director to account through the finance and general purposes committee and the audit committee.
- The force is committed to continuing to contribute to the development of regional level 2 intelligence and investigative assets, namely the East Midlands special operations unit. It participates in a number of regional protocols with other forces on firearms training, purchase and operations. The ACC (crime) chairs a working group dealing with both cross-border and wider regional policing demands and responses. Where appropriate, the force includes cross border-issues into the force APEX meetings.
- A project assessment planning process has been developed over the past 12

months which reports to the COG. This involves the assessment of a range of force-wide projects against a matrix measuring each project against a set of weighted criteria; these include law and national policy alignment, tackling crime, promoting community safety, satisfaction, confidence and protective services. Projects are then scored relating to the perceived ability to deliver, and any organisational risk. This will then provide a list of the five projects which are considered to be the most important.

- A recently appointed service improvement manager has developed a robust and comprehensive survey regime, both internally and externally. Four staff conduct telephone surveys between 6pm and 9pm weekly to test public satisfaction with a range of services. It has conducted a survey with its KINs as well as an online customer satisfaction survey. The force has used surveys to improve its customer satisfaction performance for victims of road traffic collisions.
- Finance has been invested in a comprehensive CRAVE survey and the force is engaged in a multi-agency approach to surveys. This is overseen by the CSPB, chaired by the Chief Constable. CRAVE has been mapped geographically to identify communities where confidence and satisfaction needs to improve.
- The force's MIG is the management information tool used by managers and supervisors to monitor performance of teams and individual staff; it enables the comparison of one staff member with another, or groups, as selected.
- A new resource and demand programme board is chaired by the ACC (operations). Its terms of reference are to optimise the use of existing resources, achieve improvements in productivity while maintaining and improving operational performance, and identify cashable and non-cashable savings. The strategic financial group, which includes PA membership, manages the budget-setting process in conjunction with budget holders and aligns resources with risk-assessed business requirements.
- The force has effective reward schemes, including commendation awards. The force also provides framed awards, presented by the Chief Constable, to officers, staff, partners and members of the public at the conclusion of its APEX meeting. This is an opportunity to recognise outstanding commitment and achievement in the less obvious areas of business.

Work in progress

- The force has a board in place to consider workforce modernisation opportunities, of which, to date, some 35 have been identified. It is also actively involved in regional collaboration to identify the range of other posts suitable, and intends to develop and implement further opportunities for workforce modernisation.

Areas for improvement

- The MIG is not updated daily on a regular basis. This makes assessment of performance across the many indicators difficult; staff need to be able to obtain accurate and up-to-date information to influence their judgements and activity in their area of business. The force may wish to review how the system is updated, to ensure it can provide accurate daily data.
- Although the force has an audit strategy and plan, the audit and inspection regime needs strengthening in key areas of vulnerability for the force, particularly in compliance and quality in the protecting vulnerable people (PVP) disciplines.

- The force needs to increase and develop its use of activity-based costing or similar techniques to assess and improve productivity, efficiency and effectiveness.

October 2007

Developing Practice

INSPECTION AREA: Performance management

TITLE: Achieving performance excellence in Leicester

PROBLEM:

Co-ordinating multi-agency tasking and problem solving.

SOLUTION:

Under the Wave One 101 pilot, the Leicester City and Rutland partnership decided to create two ICSBs to co-ordinate and monitor multi-agency tasking and promote partnership approaches to problem-solving issues arising from the analysis of data from the 101 call centre, combined with data obtained from existing police and local authority back office data systems.

In the city, the APEL board continually monitors the delivery of services under the 101 categories in the areas of community safety and ASB. By performance-managing those services, it aims to improve customer satisfaction levels for the police, local authority and partner agencies. The board is chaired by the service director of Leicester City Council responsible for community safety and the vice-chair is the Central Area BCU commander.

Using the concept of APEX within the force and the Compstat/Citystat approaches originating in New York, APEL was created in partnership with the city council to ensure that service delivery performance, satisfaction baselines measurements and SLAs form the basis of all reports generated by the ICSB. It has created a transparent approach whereby the police and partners receive the correct information about their respective department/organisation and identify solutions.

OUTCOME(S):

The APEL board receives presentations on a six-weekly basis from the community investigators in the ICSB on:

- areas of concern identified through the fortnightly ICSB tactical assessment; and
- innovative and successful work practices, schemes and interventions that have contributed towards tackling an emerging issue or problem profile, which have then been adopted by the JMG after being flagged up in the ICSB tactical assessment.

Results to date indicate that this new approach has strengthened existing partnership working practices, responsiveness to local issues and accountability. Public consultation and feedback to communities on progress and outcomes has shown improved public confidence in the commitment to tackle ASB in the city, and has encouraged individuals to ring 101 rather than always calling the police. Figures for January 2007 show that total ASB-related calls to 101 are up 28% while calls to the police are down 12%; drink and drug-related ASB calls to the police are down 87% and up a massive 273% in the 101 call centre.

FORCE CONTACT: Natalie Smith, ICSB Manager – 0116 222 2222, ext 6655

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

In January 2007 the force appointed a dedicated detective inspector, with a chain of line management through to the ACC (crime), to manage and co-ordinate a range of units which are focused on PVP. These are the public protection management team (PPMT), a multi-agency public protection co-ordination unit; a paedophile online investigation team; domestic violence specialists; vulnerable adults specialists and SOLACE, a unit which deals with serious sexual offences and human trafficking.

Strengths

- The ACC (crime) is the portfolio holder for all four PVP disciplines and chairs the multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) strategic management board (SMB). There is evidence of active involvement and delivery on structural changes in the SMB and engagement with the youth offending service (YOS), the probation service and the Leicestershire and Rutland Partnership Healthcare NHS Trust.
- The force has recently reviewed and assessed how it responds to the demands of PVP and established the PPMT, bringing together PVP disciplines under central management.
- All dedicated staff working on PVP issues receive mandatory counselling and professional welfare support.
- A monthly tasking and co-ordination group (TCG) meeting is held with the heads of

October 2007

the PVP disciplines to review crimes and incidents in accordance with the force's control strategy. There is a specific focus on crime trends and series.

Work in progress

- The four PVP disciplines will feature in the force strategic assessment to be launched in September 2007. PVP is a force priority with identified control strategy leads.

Areas for improvement

- The force should complete problem profiles for domestic violence, child abuse and public protection, and combine these with the existing missing person's problem profile. It could then be beneficial to overlay the four to identify any trends, patterns, links or hotspots which merit further development or response.
- The four disciplines are not routinely part of the fortnightly TCG meetings; there is thus scope to integrate PVP, raising awareness and monitoring tasks which may link with other business areas.

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

The child abuse investigation unit (CAIU) is centrally based and now has four response teams, allowing its staff to respond effectively and jointly with partner agencies to incidents concerning children. The unit has developed good working relations with the PPMT, aided by the specialist crime structure which brings all of the PVP disciplines together.

The specific comments in this section should be read in conjunction with those contained in the generic protecting vulnerable people section of the report.

Strengths

- The ACC (crime) is the portfolio holder for all four PVP disciplines and chairs the MAPPA SMB. There is evidence of active involvement and delivery on structural changes in the SMB and engagement with the YOS, the probation service and the Leicestershire and Rutland Partnership Healthcare NHS Trust.
- The force policing and strategic plans identify support for the LSCB in delivering the five outcomes of ‘Every Child Matters’, and support the three children’s trusts for Leicester City, Leicester County and Rutland. The strategic plan for 2005–08 sets

October 2007

the objectives: 'to increase the percentage of joint agency enquiries through restructuring of the CAIU' and 'to substantially increase the number of child abuse referrals attracting background checks at the point of receipt'.

- The case administration tracker system (CATS) is an effective management tool, accessible throughout the force. It facilitates effective research from data to inform all matters connected with children, ensuring a professional approach at all times in this sensitive area of work.
- CATS is fully integrated with all force IT systems and can be accessed 24/7 by operational staff via the force general information enquiry (GENIE) system's search engine. It is also linked directly to the Police National Computer (PNC) bureau.
- In December 2006 the force appointed four police staff to manage and attend all case conferences; this has made a significant impact. In June 2006, only 14% of initial case conferences were attended, with no attendance at review conferences. By the end of January 2007, attendance was 97% at initial case conferences and 90% at review conferences. The police staff liaise with the investigating officer and prepare relevant reports, then update them following the conference. This process is now both effective and responsive to the needs of its partner agencies and is creating more investigative time for its officers. All case conference notes are inputted to CATS and are readily accessible.
- The force has a 'one-stop shop' policy document which identifies roles and responsibilities and sets out the accountability framework. The policy is in line with ACPO guidance – it is clear and concise, directing the course of action to be followed when a referral is received and the process to be followed thereafter.
- During the inspection all of the staff interviewed were able to articulate their roles and responsibilities in line with the force policy on child protection. A selection of investigation files also confirmed that force policy was being followed.
- The CAIU has a good supervisory structure with seven sergeants overseeing 27 constables; one sergeant supervises each team and of the three remaining, one supervises the referral unit, one undertakes partnership work and one co-ordinates learning and development. These staffing levels give supervisors the ability to deliver consistent levels of support and still maintain a caseload of their own, notably in dealing with cases involving professionals – ie, allegations against a person who works with or is in contact with children in a work or care setting, including volunteers.
- All force trainee detective constables go to the CAIU on a three-month attachment, properly structured and monitored, which supplements the unit's capacity; it provides additional resilience and allows for skills learnt to be applied at BCU level.
- All CAIU staff are trained in Achieving Best Evidence (ABE) and the initial crime investigators' development programme (ICIDP), apart from new staff who are scheduled to attend future courses. New staff receive a comprehensive induction pack and are allocated a mentor for their early months in the unit. Joint training takes place regularly with the LSCB, which has an established full-time trainer to ensure consistent delivery to the partner agencies. CAIU training is included in the force training plan and places are allocated for staff to attend the national CAIU foundation course.
- Succession planning is a proactive and robust process, with a pool of suitable

October 2007

officers identified to fill projected and any unforeseen vacancies.

- The CAIU has good IT support; staff are able to access all relevant information systems on a 24/7 basis via the IT infrastructure in the unit. All staff are appropriately trained.
- Within the CAIU there is a strong emphasis on performance management. The unit collects a range of management information on 31 activities which it submits to the MIG – this feeds into APEX, the force performance regime. There is a good range of individual performance data to focus staff effort on performance and service delivery – for example, the number of live investigations, number of sanction detections and the number of CATS entries per month.
- There are effective day-to-day links between staff dealing with child abuse and related disciplines; much of this liaison relies upon information systems. All child abuse referrals are either recorded as a crime or entered in the CATS database, therefore giving all operational staff in force continuous access to information held. The computerised missing person management system (COMPACT) has set tasks directing staff to liaise with the CAIU in the case of a missing child.
- There is evident commitment to the LSCB, with joint training co-ordinated and delivered by the LSCB training officer. The LSCB also has an audit officer who reviews all inter-agency reports, identifying good practice or areas for development, and monitors actions and updates required from the agencies.

Area for improvement

- In June 2007 the force commenced a data accuracy audit of CATS against the crime information system (CIS) to establish if existing crime reports match with records on CATS. The regular force violent crime audit does identify some child abuse cases, which become subject to review, but the sample size is too small to identify or inform any credible conclusions. The force should therefore consider a specific CAIU audit, with a focus on the quality of investigations and supervisory support and involvement. HMIC acknowledges the good work that is conducted internally by staff, which audit and inspection can build upon.

Developing Practice

INSPECTION AREA: Protecting vulnerable people

TITLE: Employment of police staff to attend child protection conferences

PROBLEM:

Having taken a much more 'hands on' approach to all of the investigations, staff were managing high caseloads and as a result, were attending only a very small percentage of child protection conferences.

Chief officers were consulted on increasing the police officer strength in the CAIU, although recognising the need to balance this with competing needs on areas. Approval was not given to increase police officer posts.

SOLUTION:

Chief officers agreed the appointment of four police staff members, to be trained and dedicated to child protection conferences. The staff deal with all conferences from the point of notification to actual attendance. They complete all the police checks, compile a detailed written report which is submitted prior to conference, consult with the officer in the case to see if they wish to attend (or otherwise to be briefed), and then attend the conference. They also check the minutes, input all entries onto the case management system, CATS, and place 'history markers' onto the command and control system when a child is registered.

OUTCOME(S):

Almost 100% attendance at conferences, ensuring proper sharing of information and participation in decision making by the police.

Freeing-up of police officer time, which can then be directed towards active investigation.

Development of a more professional approach as staff gain experience from regular attendance at conferences.

FORCE CONTACT: Donna Thompson, CAIU – 0116 222 2222

October 2007

Protecting Vulnerable People – Domestic Violence

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

National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1	13	27	2

National contextual factors

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

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

As with the investigation of child abuse, responding to and investigating domestic violence is the responsibility of all police officers. Again, however, forces have dedicated staff within this area of work, although their roles vary. In some forces staff undertake a support/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

In January 2007 the force appointed a dedicated detective inspector, with a chain of line management through to the ACC (crime), to manage and co-ordinate a range of units which are focused on PVP. These are the PPMT, a multi-agency public protection co-ordination unit; a paedophile online investigation team; domestic violence specialists; vulnerable adults specialists and SOLACE, a unit which deals with serious sexual offences and human trafficking.

The force has made a considerable investment in its domestic violence investigation process. In April 2007 the force reduced from four to three BCUs, taking the opportunity to review demand and adjust the staffing levels of specialist domestic violence officers (SDVOs) on the new BCUs accordingly. All SDVOs are supervised by the CSB sergeants

October 2007

and managed by the CSB inspector. All BCUs now work to a corporate model with a major shift to being investigation-focused, but at the same time responding to and retaining victim care responsibilities.

The specific comments in this section should be read in conjunction with those contained in the generic protecting vulnerable people section of the report.

Strengths

- The ACC (crime) is the portfolio holder for all four PVP disciplines and chairs the MAPPA SMB. There is evidence of active involvement and delivery on structural changes in the SMB and engagement with the YOS, the probation service and the Leicestershire and Rutland Partnership Healthcare NHS Trust.
- The force uses its CIS to manage all domestic violence cases. This is a robust approach in that all operational staff have access to the system, which allows research to identify repeat calls to premises or repeat victims. The GENIE system also allows staff to search and retrieve relevant information.
- An audit of domestic violence data quality issues in December 2006 by the Audit Commission concluded that 100% of domestic violence cases were accurately recorded as such. The force conducts a bi-monthly domestic violence audit to ensure compliance with the national standards for incident recording (NSIR) and national crime recording standards. It also audits on a monthly basis submissions of the risk assessment form completed by officers attending incidents. The existing high level of audit activity is to be further enhanced by a quality check and review of the risk assessment by SDVOs and the level of victim contact received. A regular quarterly crime audit includes violent crime, examining a proportion of domestic violence cases, which further strengthens scrutiny.
- A domestic violence audit by HMIC in April 2007 graded the force as Good (achieving 90–95%) for data compliance management arrangements (this concurs with the City BCU's own audit) and Excellent (95–100%) for SPI18, the percentage of domestic violence incidents where an arrest was made related to the incident.
- Leicester City BCU has secured funding from the Government Office East Midlands (as part of the Tackling Violent Crime programme) to purchase image-recording equipment and piloted the use of this equipment at incidents of domestic violence. Known as the 'headcam project', this allows officers to capture live images of injuries, impact on victims and any other aggravating circumstances such as damage to property. The project has been used to date in 29 prosecution cases; to date, 18 (62%) are recorded as offences brought to justice with guilty outcomes. This is a high-impact initiative which is realising benefits; as far as practicable, the force should consider mainstreaming this initiative to realise its full potential.
- A revised force policy on domestic violence in line with ACPO guidance was implemented in April 2007. It has a clear accountability framework which assigns defined responsibilities to a variety of officers, specifically supervisors, ranging from the initial call-taker to the Head of Crime Support. The policy gives clear direction to staff on how they should deal with domestic violence – ie, what action to take. All staff in the force have received citizen focus training on domestic violence and there is wide understanding and appreciation of the need for priority action to be taken once an incident has been reported.
- Staff in the CMC have workbooks containing a wide range of pertinent questions to

October 2007

ask callers about domestic violence, to support both victim care and the needs of the investigation. Staff also recognise the importance of researching all accessible intelligence systems to give accurate information to officers attending incidents.

- The force has robust processes for managing risk in domestic violence cases. All officers attending incidents must complete a risk assessment form, which is reviewed by SDVOs, who then complete a nationally recognised risk identification form. The force homicide prevention strategy clearly articulates the risk factors in domestic violence cases.
- Good working relationships are evident between the CAIU and SDVOs; both groups understand each other's disciplines and recognise the need to work together for the protection of victims. All SDVOs have access to the CATS database and CAIU staff can access the CIS and GENIE systems if required.
- The City BCU is involved in a number of initiatives which exploit its strong enforcement capability and its focus on investigation as well as victim care. The force would benefit from implementing this model on the other BCUs.
- All staff working in the domestic violence discipline have accurate, relevant, and up-to-date job descriptions.
- The SDVOs have developed a range of contacts with other agencies such as Women's Aid, social services and the probation service. SDVOs delivered a presentation to local hospital staff with triage roles to raise awareness about the police role in tackling domestic violence. Other initiatives include a domestic violence surgery on an estate to identify needs and provide support to victims. The detective inspector in the PPMT chairs the Leicester domestic violence forum which is attended by a range of partners to oversee and develop domestic violence initiatives.
- Crime Support gathers data on a number of domestic violence indicators which are contained within the MIG and monitored at the force APEX performance meeting, allowing senior managers to review and assess performance.

Work in progress

- The force has a domestic violence training plan and has identified specialist domestic violence and ICIDP courses for as yet untrained officers through to March 2008. The force should ensure this training is delivered within the suggested time frame. It is noted that, of 19 SDVOs, only three have undergone the ICIDP for investigators.

Areas for improvement

- An internal audit identified that some officers were not correctly completing the crime report, failing to flag that domestic violence was a factor during an incident. In such cases, the crime recording bureau (CRB) does not flag the incident as domestic violence, and thus the incidents do not appear on the domestic violence 'queues' for SDVOs to assess. CDRPs have targets to increase domestic violence reporting but the audit findings indicate that recorded domestic violence figures are misleading, and thus opportunities to achieve targets may be being missed. The force could strengthen its commitment to tackling domestic violence by including more explicit reference in its policing plan to objectives such as reducing repeat victimisation and increasing reporting.

October 2007

- One area of the new policy on domestic violence which could be improved is to clarify how risk assessment forms should be supervised. The force should consider amending the policy so that sergeants sign all risk assessment forms, confirming that they agree with the assessment or, alternatively, revising it. This would provide reassurance that decisions are based on sound judgement and thus minimise future risks to a victim.
- Although issues of repeat victimisation are included in the revised domestic violence policy and the recently published reducing homicide policy, this could be strengthened by identifying specifically what constitutes a repeat victim, and what action or response will be offered to these victims.

Protecting Vulnerable People – Public Protection

GRADE	POOR
-------	------

National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
2	16	23	2

National contextual factors

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

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

Category 1 – Registered Sex Offenders (RSOs)

Category 2 – violent and other sex offenders

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

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

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

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

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

October 2007

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

Contextual factors

The review of the PPMT resulted in a programme to increase staffing by four posts (administrative support) and four public protection co-ordinators, who were all in place by 1 June 2007. These additional staff will provide resilience and enhance BCU capability to manage the RSOs living in the county.

There were two areas for improvement identified in the HMIC baseline assessment for 2006. The first concerned maximising the population of the Violent and Sex Offenders Register (ViSOR), which has now been fully addressed. The second and more significant issue was how to resource home visits for medium- and low-risk RSOs. The force has conducted a review and decided to use its tactical support group (TSG) to carry out the home visits for low- and medium-risk RSOs. Nonetheless, as this report makes clear, the backlog of visits to medium and low-risk offenders continues to represent a significant risk and has to be reflected in a grade of Poor. HMIC acknowledges that the force is in a difficult budgetary situation, and investing resources in public protection is likely to require hard decisions about which aspect of force activity will need to be scaled back to accommodate this rebalancing.

The specific comments in this section should be read in conjunction with those contained in the generic protecting vulnerable people section of the report.

Strengths

- The ACC (crime) is the portfolio holder for all four PVP disciplines and chairs the MAPPA SMB. There is evidence of active involvement and delivery on structural changes in the SMB and engagement with the YOS, the probation service and the Leicestershire and Rutland Partnership Healthcare NHS Trust.
- ViSOR is accessible on a 24/7 basis via the force PNC bureau, with additional access on each BCU CSB. These facilities have recently been marketed and signposted to force staff.
- Records have been created on ViSOR for all risk levels for RSO initial home visits. ViSOR entries for high and very high risk offenders have full completion of the main fields, including risk assessment plans and partner agencies. Administrative support for ViSOR has been increased in the PPMT to four police staff.
- The PPMT works jointly with the MAPPA manager, a seconded probation service officer, to sustain effective links between partners. There is strong commitment and regular police attendance at a senior level at MAPPA level 2 and 3 meetings.
- The force has developed a public protection policy which identifies roles and responsibilities and takes into consideration the draft ACPO manual of guidance.

October 2007

The policy includes a section on identifying and dealing with potentially dangerous persons (PDPs); the new area MAPPAs co-ordinator will take the lead on PDPs.

- Intelligence on high-risk RSOs is communicated to BCUs by PPMT staff, specifically to field intelligence officers who then ensure that details are included in LPU briefings.
- The PPMT supervisor, a detective sergeant, chairs all risk assessment meetings and reviews all risk levels and management plans. All very high and high risks minuted at the meetings are recorded on ViSOR within the PPMT, and all low and medium risks are entered onto ViSOR by the BCU MAPPAs co-ordinators.
- The force has invested in additional resources for public protection which will provide additional staff, namely, four new MAPPAs BCU co-ordinators, two additional detective constables in the PPMT and an analyst. Together with the existing sergeant and four detective constables in the PPMT, supported by the TSG resources, these provide sufficient resources to manage RSOs effectively once all visits are up to date. The policy identifies a structure and process for all staff for reporting on RSOs.
- All staff within the public protection discipline have accurate, relevant job descriptions following a review for the recent recruitment process.
- All staff within the PPMT have recently been risk-assessed trained in RM 2000 (risk matrix process).
- A range of performance indicators for the new home visit arrangements have been developed and articulated in the SLA between the PPMT and the TSG. They cover overall management of RSOs, with a specific focus on numbers of home visits, and have been monitored since June 2007 at the force APEX performance meeting, chaired by the Chief Constable with the ACC (crime) strategic lead present.
- All public protection staff have been vetted to security clearance level.

Work in progress

- A training needs analysis has been conducted for all PPMT staff for requirements in addition to RM 2000. Training is planned for the next financial year, which should enable all staff to receive the appropriate training.
- The force is currently working with the mapping company ESRI (UK) to overlay crime and offender locations geographically. This has delivered positive and high impact findings with considerable potential, and the force should consider whether this system could be usefully applied to public protection.
- A detailed SLA has been put in place to manage and monitor the completion of home visits by the TSG. The SLA provides for the completion of a review after three months.

Areas for improvement

- All of the RSOs categorised as high and very high risk are managed through MAPPAs level 2 and 3 meetings. The force had designated all 423 medium- and low-risk

October 2007

offenders as MAPPA level 1. The force needs to be mindful that, without regular reviews of risk for the medium- and low-risk offenders, it cannot be certain they are being appropriately managed through the MAPPA process. In addition, levels of risk management do not necessarily equate directly to levels of risk and how it can be managed; and, in particular, whether the offender can safely be managed by a single agency or whether the active involvement of more than one agency is required. It is therefore unsafe, in terms of defensible decision making, to automatically designate all low- and medium-risk offenders for management at MAPPA level 1.

- The very high-risk RSOs visits are all up to date, as are 90% of the high-risk visits. In June 2007, the TSG commenced home visits to low- and medium-risk RSOs, with a target to complete a minimum of 50 per month, to address the 423 RSOs whose home visits are not up to date. To date, home visit questionnaires have been completed very professionally and comprehensively, officers have received a detailed two-day training input and a helpline to the PPMT has been established. However, the purpose of the home visit is to gather intelligence to inform risk assessment, and at present there is a clear gap in knowledge and information about the majority of the medium- and low-risk RSOs. This is an area the force must progress urgently, completing all of the visits to allow effective review of risk assessment and management of any potential risk.

RECOMMENDATION 1

HMIC acknowledges that the force has a project plan to deal with home visits to low- and medium-risk registered sex offenders (RSOs), which is closely monitored by the assistant chief constable (crime) and that performance data now feeds directly into the force APEX (Achieving Policing Excellence) performance regime. However, the significant backlog of visits to a large number of low- and medium-risk RSOs presents a worrying degree of vulnerability, especially as evidence shows that the majority of repeat offenders fall into these two categories. The force should consider, as a matter of urgency, how this backlog can be reduced so that risk assessments can be updated.

- The force has developed a matrix to establish which of the 423 RSOs need visiting in order of priority; the matrix incorporates factors such as length of time since the last visit, details of the offences committed and any other risk factors. The aim of the force is to complete home visits and those with the most risk – and at least 250 – by the end of October 2007. Even if this is achieved, there remains a potential risk to the force with 173 still outstanding by the end of October, as there is no reassurance that an individual yet to be visited does not present a risk of harm to the public.
- A long-term process and system needs to be identified by the force to ensure that home visits to low- and medium-risk RSOs are kept up to date and backlogs do not reappear. The staff and resources committed to this area of work need to be sustainable in the longer term. For example, should the TSG be committed to support a number of major and critical incidents a contingency needs to be in place to sustain the medium- and low-risk visit regime.
- There is no audit and quality control of public protection work. Without some form of audit, the force is hampered in monitoring or improving performance. HMIC notes that a ViSOR audit was scheduled to commence in May 2007, but has been delayed. This should be conducted urgently.

RECOMMENDATION 2

A robust formal audit and quality control check should be conducted immediately, specifically around the public protection management team (PPMT). The audit of the Violent and Sex Offenders Register due to commence in May 2007 should be a priority and linked to the quality control checks of the PPMT.

- Not all risk management plans are being completed on ViSOR. The force needs to ensure that all such plans are inputted on ViSOR and used to manage RSOs.
- TSG staff are not mandatorily referred for counselling or welfare support to give them parity with the PPMT staff.

Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons

GRADE	EXCELLENT
-------	-----------

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

Strong leadership is evident at a senior level, with a superintendent as the strategic lead chairing the national COMPACT group and participating in the ACPO missing persons group. This helps to keep the force at the forefront of developments and good practice.

HMIC commends the force's comprehensive and robust strategy, policy, procedures and mature inter-agency work concerning missing persons. The force recognises the potential for a missing person enquiry to escalate quickly into a critical incident. It has strong supervision and management structures to detect and professionally manage aggravating situations at an early stage, minimising risk and vulnerability.

The specific comments in this section should be read in conjunction with those contained in the generic protecting vulnerable people section of the report.

Strengths

- The ACC (crime) is the portfolio holder for all four PVP disciplines and chairs the MAPPA SMB. There is evidence of active involvement and delivery on structural changes in the SMB and engagement with the YOS, the probation service and the Leicestershire and Rutland Partnership Healthcare NHS Trust.
- The force was the third in the country to install and use the COMPACT system. It was also a pioneer for introducing Child Rescue Alert, which promotes effective use of the media in publicising cases of child abduction. This leading edge performance has attracted visits both regionally and nationally from other forces.

October 2007

- Missing persons are included in the force APEX process and as such are subject to scrutiny and review by chief officers, BCU commanders and senior managers.
- An audit was completed to test COMPACT data consistency with that of the PNC and demonstrated a high level of compliance.
- The review and good practice unit has scrutinised two recent complex missing person cases and presented the findings to senior managers. The ACC (crime) chaired the review panel meeting for one of the cases, which resulted in recommendations to re-issue guidance regarding the completion of COMPACT entries by staff.
- The force regularly reviews the COMPACT system; it conducted a review in spring 2007 to test compliance with its policy and procedures, which it intends to repeat in autumn 2007. The review has helped to identify and address user issues.
- In September 2007 the force was selected to present a missing person case at the National Missing from Home Conference, because it was felt other forces would obtain significant benefit from an overview of a complex case.
- In May 2005 protocols were introduced with multi-agency partners, one of which – ‘Missing from Local Authority Care’ – has produced significant benefits to the force. For example, between July 2005 and June 2006 a total of 569 reports of persons missing from social care were recorded; for the year ending June 2007 this was reduced significantly to 286. Over the same period a similar reduction in persons missing from hospital premises was reported. Regular joint agency meetings are held to discuss performance of the protocols and the top ten most frequent missing persons reports across the force area, to develop joint agency preventative responses to missing persons.
- In January 2007 the force launched a protocol with its partners in the local mental health trusts, which is designed to enhance understanding by both agencies and thus create a more professional approach to the reporting and investigation of mental health missing persons cases. The launch was attended by the chief executive of the Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust. The force is also working with the Crown Prosecution Service to ensure that there is an effective joint approach to the use of legislation, which assists in preventing runaways from persistently going to the same address.
- COMPACT is used by the force to record and manage missing persons enquiries, which aids active supervision and effective management. The system is integrated, with other force IT systems signposting enquiries to COMPACT. All operational police officers have access to the system. All force supervisors have received generic risk assessment training, and the system includes a robust review mechanism.
- The force has intrusive accountability processes, beginning with active supervision of all calls received concerning missing persons in the CMC. This is replicated at every stage and level of the investigation, with a clear framework of accountability and responsibility. At LPU level both commanders and operational command inspectors have permanent responsibility for all missing person enquiries.
- An informative and easy-to-use force policy is fully compliant with ACPO guidance and is readily available to staff on the force intranet. It has numerous hyperlinks that direct staff to informative guidance and related issues, both internally and externally.

October 2007

A structured review process is in place for all risk levels, which features at all the key stages of investigation. All serious and urgent issues are referred immediately to the force on-call senior officer.

- The force has a number of LPU-level joint agency plans regarding repeat missing persons, including the use of multi-agency panels where appropriate. Joint protocols have been agreed with children's homes regarding repeat missing persons, which are designed to reduce the number of incidents requiring police response/investigation.
- All missing persons enquiries feature in daily tasking and co-ordination processes at LPU level.
- The force has completed a NIM problem profile for missing persons; this identifies how many missing person reports it receives, their frequency and geographic distribution over a 12-month period.

Area for improvement

- Although some PCSOs evidently do have access to COMPACT, others do not. There are occasions when a PCSO working alone would have to rely on regular officers to access COMPACT, either to obtain information or to update any enquiry. The force should consider affording access to and training in COMPACT to all PCSOs, particularly those working in the more rural, remote areas of the force.

Appendix: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

A

ABE	Achieving Best Evidence
ACC	assistant chief constable
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
APA	Association of Police Authorities
APEL	Achieving Performance Excellence in Leicester
APEX	Achieving Policing Excellence
ASB	anti-social behaviour

B

BCU	basic command unit
-----	--------------------

C

CAIU	child abuse investigation unit
CATS	case administration tracker system
CDRP	crime and disorder reduction partnership
CIS	crime information system
CMC	call management centre
COG	chief officer group
COMPACT	computerised missing person management system
CPG	core performance group
CRAVE	confidence, reassurance, accessibility and visibility evaluation survey
CRB	crime recording bureau
CSB	community safety bureau
CSPB	community safety programme board

D

DAAT drug and alcohol action team

G

GENIE general information enquiry system

H

HMIC Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

HMI Her Majesty's Inspector

HR human resources

I

IAG independent advisory group

ICIDP initial crime investigators' development programme

ICSB inter-agency community safety bureau

ICT information and communications technology

iQuanta a web-based tool for policing performance information and analysis, developed by the police standards unit of the Home Office

J

JAG joint action group

JMG joint management group

K

KIN key individual network

KSI killed or seriously injured

L

LCJB local criminal justice board

LPU local policing unit

LSCB local safeguarding children board

M

MAPPA	multi-agency public protection arrangements
MIG	management information gateway
MSF	most similar force(s)

N

NCPE	National Centre for Policing Excellence
NIM	national intelligence model
NPIA	national police improvement agency
NPPT	Neighbourhood Policing programme team
NSIR	national standards for incident recording
NSPIS	national strategy for police information systems

O

ORB	automatic vehicle location system
-----	-----------------------------------

P

PA	police authority
PCSO	police community support officer
PDP	potentially dangerous person
PDR	personal development review
PNC	police national computer
PPAF	policing performance assessment framework
PPMT	public protection management team
PVP	protecting vulnerable people

R

RM 2000	Risk matrix process
RSO	registered sex offender

S

SDVO	specialist domestic violence officers
SGC	specific grading criteria
SLA	service level agreement
SMB	strategic management board
SNEN	single non-emergency number
SOCO	scene of crime officer
SOCRATES	forensic management system
SOCweb	scene of crime website
SPI	strategic performance indicator
SSU	scientific support unit

T

TCG	tasking and co-ordination group
TSG	tactical support group

V

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

Y

YOS	youth offending service
-----	-------------------------