



## HMIC Inspection Report

Surrey Police

October 2007



**ISBN: 978-1-84726-479-4**

**CROWN COPYRIGHT**

**FIRST PUBLISHED 2007**

## **Contents**

### **Introduction to HMIC Inspections**

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

### **Force Overview and Context**

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

## **Findings**

### **National summary of judgements**

### **Force summary of judgements**

### **Neighbourhood Policing**

### **Performance Management**

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

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

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

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

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

## **Recommendations**

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

October 2007

## Introduction to HMIC Inspections

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

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

In 2006, HMIC conducted a broad assessment of all 43 Home Office police forces in England and Wales, examining 23 areas of activity. This baseline assessment had followed a similar process in 2005 and has thus created a rich evidence base of strengths and weaknesses across the country.

However, it is now necessary for HMIC to focus its inspection effort on those areas of policing that are not data-rich and where qualitative assessment is the only feasible way of judging both current performance and the prospects for improvement.

This, together with the critical factor that HMIC should concentrate its scrutiny on high-risk areas of policing – in terms of risk both to the public and to the service's reputation – pointed inexorably to a focus on what are known collectively as 'protective services'. In addition, there is a need to apply professional judgement to some key aspects of leadership and governance, where some quantitative measures exist but a more rounded assessment is appropriate.

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

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

### Programmed frameworks

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

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

Neighbourhood Policing has been inspected not only because it is a key government priority but also, and more importantly, because it addresses a fundamental need for a style of policing that is rooted in and responds to local concerns.

October 2007

The police service must, of course, offer protection from high-level threats such as terrorism and organised criminality, but it also has a key role in tackling the unacceptable behaviour of the minority of people who threaten the quality of life of law-abiding citizens.

Performance management is an activity largely hidden from public view, although members of the public are directly affected by poor performance on the part of their local force. This inspection has focused on the need for forces to maximise the opportunities for performance improvement. It also posed questions as to whether forces have an accurate picture of how they are doing and 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.

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

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

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

October 2007

## The grading process

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

### *Excellent*

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

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

### *Good*

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

### *Fair*

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

### *Poor*

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

## Developing practice

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

October 2007

## Future HMIC inspection activity

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

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

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

October 2007

## Force Overview and Context

### Geographical description of force area

The county of Surrey is situated in the heart of the South East of England, and is one of the most urbanised counties in England. About 85% of Surrey residents live within the urban areas. Surrey lies to the south of London and is bordered by the counties of Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Hampshire, Kent, and East and West Sussex, and importantly by the Greater London Authority area. It also sits between two major international airports (Heathrow and Gatwick) and covers some of the busiest stretches of motorway in Europe. The soon-to-be-opened Terminal 5 at Heathrow will add to motorway congestion.

Analysis has shown that 15% of crime is committed by 8% of criminals, who are resident in London. The mixture of urban and rural areas in Surrey provides widely differing contexts to policing services. Broadly, the north and west of the county have a high density of urban and commercial areas, with the south and east being more rural.

### Demographic profile of force area

Policing services are provided to a population of 1,059,015 (Census 2001). Since 2001, however, there has been significant housing expansion in the north and west of the county. The total area of the county is 645 square miles, with 445,339 dwellings. The latest figures (Census 2001) indicate a population density of 1,642 people/square mile, almost twice the national average.

The county has 61.3 miles of motorway (M25, M3, M23), which is a high figure for its size and population density. The strategic road network includes other major roads: the A3, A31 and A331. With approximately equal numbers of commuters travelling into and out of the county (300,000 each way), and 300,000 internal journeys, about 900,000 commuter journeys take place twice a day by road and rail.

Woking and Guildford are the main hubs of the rail network and services to and from London are heavily used by commuters. The county is also extremely dependent on the road network, with traffic flow densities twice the national average. It is estimated that Surrey's economy loses £500 million each year through traffic delays.

Unemployment is very low at 0.9%. The percentage of the workforce engaged in entrepreneurial activity or employed in professional or management roles is higher than the national average, and the percentage of the population with degrees is also high.

Census 2001 indicates that 95% of residents describe themselves as white, compared with 97% in 1991. The largest ethnic minority group in Surrey is self defined as Indian (1% of the population). The main centres with ethnic minority communities are the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Woking.

Surrey has an ageing population, in line with the rest of the UK. Coupled with this is the significant decrease in the young adult population, from 15.9% in 1991 to 9.8% in 2001, even though there are large communities of university students in the boroughs of Guildford and Runnymede.

There were an estimated 56,000 businesses in Surrey in 2002, and in that year the Surrey contribution to the national economy was valued at £16.5 billion. Typically, the output of Surrey has grown at about 3.8% per annum, compared to the average UK growth rate of 2.5% per annum.

Of the 445,339 houses in the county, 34% are detached houses, significantly higher than the national average. This contributes to the high cost of housing in Surrey, where the average price of a house is now over £357,000.

October 2007

## Strategic priorities

The overall strategic vision of the force and the Chief Constable is for the people of Surrey to feel safe and to be safe – to be achieved through:

- public confidence;
- public satisfaction; and
- performance.

This vision is to be delivered through the four strategic priorities of:

- **customer service** – providing a clearly defined quality of service focused on public needs;
- **control of crime** – maintaining low levels of crime and disorder so that people are less likely to be victims of crime, and bringing more offenders to justice;
- **confident communities** – listening to the public and supporting communities so that people feel safer; and
- **capable, supported staff** – building a confident, modern workforce able to deliver a professional service, especially to victims of crime.

## Force developments since 2006

Surrey is the safest county in England and the second safest county in England and Wales and has the lowest crime rate for violent crime. In the latest British Crime Survey (BCS), public confidence in Surrey Police was rated as the highest of any force in England and Wales.

At the end of the third quarter of 2006/07 the force was on course to achieve 13 of the 18 headline policing plan targets. By the end of the year, the force had provisionally achieved 16 out of the 18 targets (subject to audit and subject in one case to other forces' results), surpassing performance against policing plan targets in any previous year.

Due to focused activity led by the deputy chief constable (DCC) the force sanction detection rate has significantly increased, from 22.6% to 29%, over the past 12 months.

In addition there has been a significant improvement in customer service targets. Specifically, improvements recorded towards the end of 2005/06, consistent with the force's initiative to improve service to hate crime victims, have continued into 2006/07, with the result that the gap between the satisfaction rate for all victims and that for victims of racist incidents has closed from over 21 percentage points in 2005/06, to less than 3 percentage points.

Neighbourhood Policing is also making its mark, with 2,159 neighbourhood priorities having been identified and tackled, an increase of 25%. Surrey has beaten the target for people who know their local officer, which stands now at 19% county-wide.

The roll-out of Neighbourhood Policing is continuing, with particular emphasis on community engagement and problem solving. Neighbourhood Policing is at the heart of Surrey's approach to policing and the force continues to work with residents and partner organisations to identify and tackle those issues of greatest concern to local communities.

The main challenge for the force and its police authority this year is to continue to improve performance and the service provided to local people with limited financial resources. In each of the seven years up to and including 2005/06, Surrey Police has achieved or exceeded the 3% efficiency gains target.

October 2007

The efficiency gains for 2006/07 were 7.4% and those for 2007/08 are forecast to reach 9.4%, again significantly above the target. However, the combination of an expected government grant increase of only 2% and the prospect of specific grants being included within the formula grant – ie grants to fund police community support officers (PCSOs) and Additional Rule 2 – will result in a financial shortfall of £5.8 million in the funding needed merely in order for the force to stand still in 2008/09.

If the challenges of delivering both protective services and Neighbourhood Policing are to be met, this figure could rise from £5.8 million to as much as £11 million, depending on the level of investment required. Making difficult choices and savings in one part of the organisation is the only way the force and its police authority can invest elsewhere to ensure there are resources available to perform against the targets set by the Government and the ambitions of local people. This approach will also enable Surrey to continue to invest in areas like Neighbourhood Policing and the investigation of crime.

A review of back-office support has been commissioned by the force and its police authority. The review, entitled the Organisational Support Review, is intended to identify business improvements and efficiencies which will over two years help to save 10–20% of the £25.6 million projected spend on support services, while protecting the force's ability to deliver the force strategy and vision. The first departments to be reviewed in phase one will be human resources (HR), Finance & Services, the Strategic Support Directorate and Support Services. The aim is for any changes to come into effect from April 2008.

Surrey Police has been an enthusiastic participant in the national Workforce Modernisation Programme (as detailed below), to significant effect. A successful two-year pilot in West Surrey finished in November 2006, and an independent evaluation concluded that by using an appropriate mix of staff a greater proportion of investigations could be solved more quickly and with fewer staff. In fact the detection rate went up by 30%, while the speed of investigations also increased by 30%.

The force has now expanded its workforce modernisation project to cover the entire North Surrey BCU. The project is designed to enhance crime investigations and benefits, including the speeding up of the investigation process, while maintaining and improving detection rates. There is a heavy emphasis on the development of the investigative skills of our police staff to provide the desired mix of skills required in the workforce. Most recently North Surrey Division has been awarded demonstration site status for the national Workforce Modernisation Programme.

In March 2007 Surrey Police participated in a major joint counter-terrorism exercise, Lions Keep, with Sussex Police and a wide range of emergency services, the purpose of which was to train and prepare staff for a real-life terrorist incident, should one occur. Approximately 4,000 people were involved with 1,000 involved in role-plays. The exercise had been designed to allow Surrey Police and Sussex Police to test interoperability in managing a 'crime in action' live play event. It was a good test of response to pressure from critical threats as well as to procedural, legal and resource challenges, requiring a significant commitment to its extensive preparations.

A great deal of work has been undertaken to improve force resilience in the protective services area, while maintaining a strong response to serious and organised crime and counter-terrorist threats. Surrey Police and Sussex Police are exploring the potential for collaboration, to include the areas of counter-terrorism, major crime investigation and operational support, under an integrated specialist operations command structure.

There is great stability within the command team, with no changes to chief officers or directors. The final significant challenge for the force and its police authority continues to be the retention of police officers, particularly in the face of aggressive Metropolitan Police Service recruitment campaigns.

October 2007

## Findings

### National summary of judgements

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

### Force summary of judgements

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

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

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

### Contextual factors

The aim of Neighbourhood Policing is to increase satisfaction and confidence, reduce the fear of crime and resolve local problems of crime and anti-social behaviour. Since April 2007 every area within Surrey has had a Neighbourhood Policing presence. This means every community has:

- seen increased numbers of PCSOs patrolling their streets, addressing anti-social behaviour issues and building relationships with local people;
- had information about how their local police force will be policing the local community, and a point of contact for their Neighbourhood Policing team; and
- had the ability to tell the police about the issues which are causing them concern and help shape the response to those issues.

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

Surrey Police has been at the vanguard of the development of Neighbourhood Policing. The previous Chief Constable instigated the signal crimes research that led to the National Reassurance Policing Programme, which included two pilot sites in Surrey. A Surrey assistant chief constable (ACC) sits on the national programme board and the work

October 2007

programme is led by a former Surrey basic command unit (BCU) commander. The Chief Constable has agreed to join the performance board.

The Chief Constable is also the national lead for workforce modernisation and the force is trialling a 'mixed economy' neighbourhood team.

The investment by the force and the Surrey Police Authority (SPA) in visible, accessible Neighbourhood Policing teams, that genuinely engage with communities to tackle the crime and disorder problems that matter most to local people, has produced results. As measured by the BCS, confidence in local policing has risen steadily and is above the most similar forces (MSF) group average. Satisfaction surveys for all users are at the MSF group average and noticeable reductions in the fear of crime across the county has risen above MSF averages.

## Strengths

Surrey Police has utilised to best effect the expertise of the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) National Neighbourhood Policing Team (NNPT) ([www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk](http://www.neighbourhoodpolicing.co.uk)), engaging in regular assessments to facilitate self-improvement (the latest being in January 2007). The Neighbourhood Policing directorate has undertaken visits to Lancashire Constabulary to learn from a police force that was graded Excellent for Neighbourhood Policing last year. The Neighbourhood Policing directorate undertook a 'gap analysis' as soon as the specific grading criteria for Neighbourhood Policing were published by HMIC (<http://inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/methodologies>) and was addressing issues and making improvements before the fieldwork of this inspection was conducted.

The Neighbourhood Policing directorate has fielded visits from 21 police forces and telephone contact from a further 20 forces within Great Britain, as well as the Police Service of Northern Ireland, and is regularly cited as a beacon for best practice at regional Neighbourhood Policing meetings. Team members now set aside a full working day each month to accommodate such visits as well as providing support and guidance to partner agencies. Much of this work is unrecognised but clearly significant in promoting best practice throughout the police service.

Surrey Police has consistently engaged in cutting-edge innovation, much of which is linked to Neighbourhood Policing – from providing key staff to programme-manage and support the National Reassurance Policing Programme, to the Chief Constable being the ACPO lead for business and workforce modernisation (see 'Contextual factors' above, the Performance Management section below, and [www.surrey.police.uk/news\\_item.asp?artid=5050](http://www.surrey.police.uk/news_item.asp?artid=5050)). The force has made a considerable investment in the national Workforce Modernisation Programme, with key members of the chief officer group either seconded or providing strategic support. In addition North Surrey Division is a demonstration site within the national programme.

The force has been at the forefront of developing the 'mixed economy of policing' approach. The Home Office-funded pilot site in the borough of Waverley has been visited by nearly every force in England and Wales, with many visiting more than once ([www.surrey.police.uk/news\\_item.asp?artid=7737](http://www.surrey.police.uk/news_item.asp?artid=7737)). The pilot has attracted close ministerial interest, and many of its good practices are beginning to be adopted by other police forces. The pilot has a strong emphasis on developing effective Neighbourhood Policing teams comprising police staff members, including PCSOs guided and supported by police officer

October 2007

team leaders, thereby enhancing the status of the neighbourhood specialist officers (NSOs) and making much more effective use of the wider policing family. Furthermore representatives of the Neighbourhood Policing and HR departments have been invited as guest speakers at regional workshops to explain how they have developed Neighbourhood Policing and introduced workforce modernisation into the Neighbourhood Policing arena, and to detail their successes and the challenges they have faced.

The NNPT is satisfied that Surrey Police, having submitted its tracking data, has achieved full implementation and coverage across every BCU. The revised target to recruit and train 222 PCSOs was reached in January 2007 and currently the force is over its establishment. There are some 86 'Safer Neighbourhoods', 126 NSOs, 11 community safety teams and 383 volunteers, including special constables (see [www.surrey.police.uk/compol.asp](http://www.surrey.police.uk/compol.asp)). A matrix for intelligence-led deployment of the neighbourhood policing fund PCSOs has been developed to make sure that they are deployed appropriately, and Neighbourhood Policing team (NPT) supervisors ensure this. Furthermore, it is evident from interviews with call handlers that they understand the correct deployment and powers of PCSOs.

Surrey Police has taken a proactive and innovative approach in the development of 'dials and levers' analysis, led by the Chief Constable, for the safer and stronger communities partnership board (SSCPB), promoting partnership accountability, for BCS comparator crime reduction performance.

Further information can be obtained at;

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/scsu/scsuwebsite.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE\\_RTf/Safer+and+Stronger+Communities+Partnership+Board?opendocument](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/scsu/scsuwebsite.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE_RTf/Safer+and+Stronger+Communities+Partnership+Board?opendocument)).

This process examines the socio-economic cost of crime, and Surrey Police presents a compelling argument to its partners for the reduction of crime and has received strong commendation from the Deputy Regional Director, Safer and Stronger Communities at the Government Office for the South East. The 'dials and levers' process also addresses partnership reluctance where it has existed in the past. Further details are contained in the Developing Practice boxes below and in the section on Performance Management.

The targeted Neighbourhood Policing (TNP) model is founded upon the integrated delivery of Neighbourhood Policing. There is clear evidence that response, call handling and other customer-facing functions are well integrated with the citizen focus agenda and consistent with the quality of service commitment (QoS): for example, all officers and staff have undertaken customer service training, delivery of which is founded upon the LISTEN principles, and customer service officers are based on each BCU to reinforce this ethos. Targeted patrol teams (TPTs) who provide the 24/7 immediate response function are an integral part of the Neighbourhood Policing philosophy in Surrey.

Systems and processes have been adjusted to support Neighbourhood Policing. The call handling functions have been adapted to provide a more tailored response to the community: for example, operators can access the NSO/PCSO web pages with one click when a caller reports an incident or crime, and a bespoke deployment can be made according to the priorities of that neighbourhood (see the Developing Practice boxes below). Furthermore, caller post codes can be entered onto the command and control system by call handlers to identify the correct neighbourhood and NPT.

Members of the community can also access the Surrey Police web page 'Helicopter over my house' should they have queries about the deployment of the air support unit helicopter, and they can access documents which detail the unit's deployments

October 2007

([www.surrey.police.uk/air.asp#overmyhouse](http://www.surrey.police.uk/air.asp#overmyhouse)). Surrey Police adopted the QoSC early on and played a leading role in the development of policing summaries distributed to all households; for 2007/08 a bespoke version will contain more local information.

Neighbourhood Policing and its predecessor (in Surrey) represent a philosophy that has been running through the force for some years. TNP is at the heart of policing in the county and is central to the SPA's annual policing plan (APP), as evidenced in the 2006/07 and 2007/08 plans ([www.surreypa.gov.uk/policing\\_plan\\_0708.asp](http://www.surreypa.gov.uk/policing_plan_0708.asp)). The costed improvement plan process presented to the SPA has enabled additional resource to be dedicated to Neighbourhood Policing: for example, each BCU has a Neighbourhood Policing superintendent, an inspector (implementation manager) and a Neighbourhood Policing communications manager (in addition to the BCU media officer).

There is absolute clarity about the commitment of the force to Neighbourhood Policing. This commitment is led by the Chief Constable and driven by the Assistant Chief Constable (territorial operations) (ACC (TO)) at a corporate level. There is a Neighbourhood Policing directorate, led by an experienced superintendent who manages the project on behalf of the force; and on each BCU the Neighbourhood Policing superintendent and the inspector (implementation manager) ensure corporate delivery at a local level. There is also sufficient flexibility to allow for local innovation. The Neighbourhood Policing directorate also has its own trainer and communications manager. Interviews with officers and staff confirm that the Neighbourhood Policing philosophy is embedded and that across the force, and there is a wide understanding of its role, for example among; call handlers, TPT response officers and major crime investigators.

There is a multi-agency Neighbourhood Policing steering group chaired by the ACC (TO) which meets every six weeks to discuss, among other things, progress against the implementation plan. The aim of this group is to capture strategic priorities across a range of partners, agencies and groups, including the independent advisory group and the SPA. There is confirmation from partners (following interviews) that they have influenced policing priorities in relation to Neighbourhood Policing and have been involved in the drafting of the strategic assessment (see 'Areas for improvement' below).

There is clear recognition that the roles within NPTs (inspector, sergeant, NSO and PCSO) are specialisms, and these are made public via [www.surrey.police.uk/areaitem.asp?artid=1722](http://www.surrey.police.uk/areaitem.asp?artid=1722). NSOs are in receipt of special priority payments; their posts are subject to a two-year tenure period to ensure continuity and there are succession planning arrangements in place. Interviews with groups and individuals show that there is widespread recognition by major crime investigation team (MCIT) senior investigating officers (SIOs) and others of the valuable part that the NPTs can play in major crime investigation and in forging links with the community. The innovative workforce modernisation project pioneered by Surrey is exploring the development of a career structure for PCSOs and other police staff.

Force-level deployments are managed by utilising the command and control system, ICAD, concerning local priorities, as detailed above. Local demand is managed using a subset of this system (LDM), enhanced by qualitative information from the Crime Information technology System (CIS), which holds intelligence, investigative and problem-solving information.

CIS is the mechanism used to capture priorities identified through neighbourhood panels, surgeries, joint action groups (JAGs), community incident action groups (CIAGs) and

October 2007

tasking and co-ordination groups (T&CGs); it is also used to manage the Enforcement, Prevention, Intelligence and Communication – Police, Public, Partners (EPIC PPP) process.

Following roll-out of Neighbourhood Policing, its delivery, refinement and review (an iterative process in Surrey) are overseen by the Neighbourhood Policing directorate. This team is dedicated to managing the requirements of the implementation of Neighbourhood Policing, and there is an effective and detailed project management system in place which draws upon Projects in Controlled Environments 2 (PRINCE2) methodology. There is a comprehensive work plan in place which has been developed in conjunction with partners engaged in the multi-agency Neighbourhood Policing steering group detailed above. The force inspectorate undertakes dip checks and mystery shopping on behalf of the steering group to ensure that there is comprehensive and effective implementation. Furthermore, the SPA is well sighted on progress through member/officer attendance at the Neighbourhood Policing steering group and Neighbourhood Policing panel meetings, and through updates made to the SPA panel meeting structure.

Engagement with partners in joint intelligence gathering and action against crime and anti-social behaviour is well established in Surrey. Borough-based CIAGs focus on individual targets and JAGs primarily identify and target problem locations. In both cases the structures and processes have strong links with the tasking and co-ordination systems. The EPIC PPP process ensures that neighbourhood priorities and community issues are captured in a consistent and retrievable fashion using the crime coding, and it is aligned to standard input that complements the National Intelligence Model (NIM). Interviews with partners have provided comprehensive detail on how this process works and have provided many examples (see 'Areas for improvement' below).

An effective community engagement strategy is in place, including Neighbourhood Policing panels and surgeries; most recently the Neighbourhood Policing pathfinder piloted a 'face the people' session ('Tune In' at Goldsworth Park), engaging police and strategic partners to enable local people to influence strategic planning. Dedicated neighbourhood teams provide tactical level engagement with local people to build relationships and knowledge so as to address local issues jointly through neighbourhood policing panels (as mentioned above). Innovation is demonstrated in the use of magnetic contact cards which bear the photographs and specific contact details of Neighbourhood Policing team members (see Developing Practice boxes below). There has also been effective exploitation of the force website to promote community engagement (see [www.surrey.police.uk/compol.asp](http://www.surrey.police.uk/compol.asp)).

There are specific local action plans to progress work in relation to local community engagement, including areas for improvement identified in the baseline assessment 2005/06, as well as workshop activity with local and county partners to establish joint activities designed to formalise structures, systems and processes (see 'Areas for improvement' below). The force has undertaken an innovative training package for community leaders which provides opportunities for police, partners and the community to develop complementary leadership and technical skills, encouraging effective neighbourhood management and thus promoting engagement. There is also a monthly Neighbourhood Policing survey, which over a 12-month period surveys over 6,600 people informing Neighbourhood Policing activity.

As already mentioned, CIAGs focus on individual targets while JAGs primarily identify and target problem locations. Neighbourhood panels provide a structured approach to identifying and resolving neighbourhood issues. Police, partners and the community are routinely involved in these panels and a systematic approach is taken to managing and reporting on identified issues using CIS. The replacement system for CIS (Project Enterprise) will allow

October 2007

greater partner access. While there has been some joint problem-solving training with community safety managers, further training for all partners will take place later in 2007 (see 'Work in progress' and 'Areas for improvement' below).

For some time partner and public data has been used to inform the force strategic intelligence assessment at both BCU and force level. Surrey Police are at an advanced stage in this process together with partners across the county: the Chief Constable in his role as chair of the SSCPb has ensured that all Surrey crime and disorder reduction partnerships (CDRPs) are required to produce completed strategic assessments by October 2007. Strategic assessments (SAs) are emerging across the force and are being used to inform local area agreement (LAA) priorities. There is clear evidence of the force working closely with partners at a CDRP level to facilitate this. Neighbourhood issues are being raised and tasked at a strategic level (see the discussion above of the 'face the people' session at Goldsworth Park and the 'dials and levers' analysis of partnership response).

Neighbourhood policing teams comprise officers and police staff from a diverse range of minority groups, and there is recognition of the importance of cultural experience and insight, ethnicity and gender, along with other characteristics. This provides NPTs with a team that is capable and competent to deliver a local and responsive service (see [www.surrey.police.uk/borough\\_nso.asp?boroughinsp=5&nsoid=2120](http://www.surrey.police.uk/borough_nso.asp?boroughinsp=5&nsoid=2120)).

As detailed earlier in this section, a matrix for intelligence-led deployment of the Neighbourhood Policing fund PCSOs has been developed to ensure they are deployed appropriately. Neighbourhood teams are deployed in accordance with geographic profiling that includes demographic, socio-economic and crime data.

Comment has already been made about the tenure arrangements for NSOs. Neighbourhood Policing superintendents and inspectors are also subject to tenure to ensure continuity. Surveys within the community have found that knowledge of who the local NSO and PCSO are within communities has risen from 17% to 31% across the 11 boroughs in the county during the survey period.

Work on the training needs and operating requirements of NPTs and of each role within the teams has been completed. The HR strategy specifies the requirements for Neighbourhood Policing, and the HR department is reviewing selection, promotion and training criteria to ensure that these effectively reflect those requirements.

The Neighbourhood Policing project team has its own training manager, and also has links with the force training manager to ensure adequate training provision. The force training plan includes comprehensive details of the training taking place for the implementation and development of Neighbourhood Policing across the force. The plan includes community leadership training (described above) that encompasses community engagement and problem solving. Phase 2 of Neighbourhood Policing training will include joint training for officers, police staff and partners in community intelligence gathering, and it is noteworthy that Woking Borough Council is sending staff on the next Surrey Police PCSO course.

Community safety managers have received training in intelligence gathering and in some boroughs council staff have received training in the gathering and submission of intelligence – for example, Guildford Borough refuse collectors have been trained in gathering and submitting intelligence using 5x5x5 intelligence forms. The Surrey CSU provides intelligence-gathering training across the county .

October 2007

The training manager within the Neighbourhood Policing directorate ensures that the evaluation of training is a regular part of training delivery, to make sure that value for money is achieved. Furthermore, he plays an important role in meeting with BCU implementation managers to identify and meet the learning needs and operating requirements of NPTs.

BCU intelligence units have been restructured to align with the 11 boroughs and provide a bespoke service to NPTs. Their analytical and research capabilities are sufficient to support Neighbourhood Policing. The force has purchased the I2 analytical software package, and is accredited to train its own staff in its use and linkages with existing force IT systems. A neighbourhood mapping tool has also been devised (see the Developing Practice boxes below), the primary outcome of which has been an enhanced capability within a force-based system to identify and map incidents and crimes that are reported across a neighbourhood, and to use this information to confirm developing trends and to triangulate it with community information, especially identified and agreed neighbourhood priority issues that emerge from community engagement.

Joint training for community intelligence has been mentioned above. All Neighbourhood Policing staff are trained to collect, record and disseminate community intelligence. There are neighbourhood-based intelligence desks on each BCU. The local intelligence officer, analyst and researcher all work towards solving neighbourhood issues. The knowledge of NSOs and PCSOs has been used to good effect by MCIT SIOs in recent homicide investigations, such as Operation Lavender – and the neighbourhood inspectors (informed by the NSOs and PCSOs) provide dynamic community impact assessments following such crimes. Personal performance indicators include the number of intelligence submissions made by each officer and member of staff (see the Performance Management section below).

Strategic intelligence requirements are managed through an established NIM infrastructure (recently reviewed by the NPIA NIM team) that enables tasking and co-ordination at strategic and tactical levels, including the deployment of NPTs. There are engagement days with NPTs, partners and Special Branch. Information and knowledge in this arena forms part of the 'richer picture' being developed.

There is a long history within Surrey Police of using the scanning, analysis, response and assessment (SARA) problem-solving model. The response element of the model is actioned through EPIC PPP and this process complements the strategic intelligence assessment which utilises problem analysis triangles (PATs) to profile issues by victim, offender and location, with problem-solving activity being directed to one or more of the three sides of the PAT. Partners are encouraged to use the SARA model (see 'Areas for improvement' below) and joint problem solving is a key element to the JAG and CIAG meetings.

There is a very strong performance culture within Surrey Police, led by the DCC. The focus includes Neighbourhood Policing as a key element of the performance management framework, and it is reported on monthly at the Surrey performance evaluation of computerised statistics (SPECS) performance forum. Every member of each NPT is held accountable for performance.

Tactical performance management is achieved through the performance development review (PDR) process, which is supplemented by regular meetings between the Neighbourhood Policing superintendent and the various NPTs (see the Performance Management section below).

October 2007

The wider performance framework supports a broad range of performance measures, including abstraction levels, anti-social behaviour incident data and performance against agreed priorities. As part of the national performance pilot, the force has developed metrics to measure the success of interventions (activity) in neighbourhoods against BCS crime data (performance) and public satisfaction survey data (outcomes). This activity is linked to the local policing plan. Furthermore the force is emphasising the socio-economic cost of crime as part of its 'dials and levers' process to influence partners (see the Developing Practice boxes and the Performance Management section below).

A clear and robust communication strategy, delivered by both central and BCU communications and marketing specialists, has been effective in promoting Neighbourhood Policing. There is a communications manager within the Neighbourhood Policing directorate and there is a post on each BCU responsible for internal and external communication of Neighbourhood Policing, as well as developing media relationships. A system for measuring media impact down to neighbourhood level is well established. This approach has clearly encouraged staff at all levels to forge good relationships with local media and to seize opportunities for promoting positive news reports. The force won an external award for its evaluation of public communication. There was clear evidence supplied by the force of how it interacts with the community.

Policing plan surveys indicate that the most effective method is by leaflet drop; however, communication continues in a variety of ways to promote Neighbourhood Policing. There has been a 'piggy-backing' into existing local authority and community publications (the Neighbourhood Policing communications manager has mapped all of these to ensure 100% coverage). There has also been innovative work to publicise NSOs and PCSOs (see the Developing Practice boxes below), including fridge magnets and collectable cards. The force has also branded Neighbourhood Policing as 'Safer Neighbourhoods' and the community can access comprehensive detail on Neighbourhood Policing and their neighbourhood by inputting their postcode or by borough – see [www.surrey.police.uk/compol.asp](http://www.surrey.police.uk/compol.asp).

There is clarity as to how the HR strategy specifies role definition, integration and training, all of which are contained in Annex C to that strategy. There are costed HR and training strategies in place, both of which support Neighbourhood Policing. Comment has been made earlier in the text about training and training needs analysis. Special constables are part of an NPT until they are ready for independent patrol, after which they can choose which stream they wish to be in: NPT, TPT or roads policing.

Having learnt from the National Reassurance Policing Programme, the force reviewed its configuration and following extensive consultation (which included partners – see 'Areas for improvement' below) established 665 natural neighbourhoods which together make up the 86 'Safer Neighbourhoods' (see above) and represent 100% coverage of the force area. The definition of neighbourhoods has a documented process and uses PRINCE2 methodology) that is consistent with NCPE guidance and government requirements for PCSOs (see 'Areas for improvement' below).

Neighbourhood profiles have been created using a variety of data, and are utilised to inform the deployment of resources on neighbourhoods and in accordance with the T&CG processes across the force. Surrey has been a lead force in using this kind of data to inform its decision making (see comments above). There is clarity of roles for NSOs and PCSOs and they understand the importance of the neighbourhood profiles and their maintenance.

October 2007

Investigative workloads for NSOs are limited and monitored by neighbourhood supervisors. There is a policy in place to manage the deployment of NSOs and PCSOs, which is strictly controlled by incident handlers.

Accommodation and equipment of neighbourhood teams appear from the fieldwork to be fit for purpose and no issues were raised during group interviews.

Each member of the NPTs has objectives in their PDRs relating to Neighbourhood Policing, engagement and problem solving. Further comment about the use of the PDR process is made in the Performance Management section below.

Comment is made in detail in the Performance Management section about the innovative and robust approach to customer service and continuous improvement. Following consultation with the SPA, panels, external partners and the diversity directorate, the Surrey Police Charter was published in May 2006, well in advance of the national deadline, setting out the commitment to exceeding the requirements of the national QoS. In parallel there is an integrated response to delivering the requirements of the Victims' Code, which has included specific training for key roles, awareness briefings for senior managers and a detailed internal/external communications strategy for all staff and customers. This is supported by the Surrey Police Standard that deals with values, conduct and service of all staff and that has been championed by the Chief Constable. Over 9,000 calls have been made to the victims of crime to check performance and customer service. The feedback obtained contributes to personal appraisals and informs training. The extension of customer satisfaction surveys to a monthly format and down to borough level will further enhance quality assurance mechanisms. NPTs play an important part in providing reassurance to repeat victims and victims of hate crime.

### **Work in progress**

A strategic collaboration is in progress between Surrey Police, Surrey County Council and key partner agencies, designed to embed collaborative working further and to move the partners towards a position of effective multi-agency neighbourhood management. It is called the Communities and Neighbourhood Policing Integration Project, and Surrey Police has seconded a highly experienced member of its Neighbourhood Policing directorate to support the project team, which reports to a project board including the police, county, district and borough councils, statutory and non-governmental organisations, an SPA member and an elected local authority member.

The project has seven key objectives, including: the launch of a survey conducted jointly by the police and county council to revolutionise the current process (see below); the development of common mapped boundaries by all agencies; enhanced community and neighbourhood engagement; the development of a menu of county services that local communities can directly influence; the enhancement of single or integrated points of contact for communities; joint training for all partners; and greater transparency in joint decision-making mechanisms between authorities.

A specific piece of work is being conducted to draw together the currently separate surveys carried out by Surrey County Council and Surrey Police. A joint working group has reviewed the question sets of both survey instruments and produced a joint questionnaire. It is anticipated that the first joint communities and neighbourhood survey will take place in April 2008.

October 2007

In response to an area for improvement highlighted by the NNPT, Surrey Police and Surrey County Council are producing a joint training plan. A training needs analysis is being conducted, with a cross-partnership working group reviewing current training and assessing the areas where common issues (eg problem solving and intelligence) can continue to be the focus through joint training (see 'Areas for improvement' below).

Notwithstanding the positive comments in the 'Strengths' section above there are still small pockets within the force yet to realise the benefits of Neighbourhood Policing. The force has identified these – eg parts of the TPTs, the criminal investigation department and some central support functions such as HR, information and communications technology (ICT) and finance – and is working on phase 2 of its communications programme to address these gaps.

Work continues in the force to identify a system to replace Surrey County Councils partnership database; alternative systems are being assessed jointly with Greater Manchester Police, and a pilot is being run on the North West Surrey Division using a system called Caseworks.

There is a robust abstraction policy in place on each BCU and an overarching force policy. The ACC (TO) is responsible for their application and it is evident from interviews that they are being adhered to. There is now a need to ensure BCU compliance with force policy, and this was being addressed at the time of the inspection fieldwork.

While there have been long-standing information-sharing protocols since the advent of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

See; [www.surreycc.gov.uk/scsu/scsuwebsite.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE\\_RTF/Surrey+Information+Sharing+Protocol?opendocument](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/scsu/scsuwebsite.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE_RTF/Surrey+Information+Sharing+Protocol?opendocument)), These are being refreshed to make them more appropriate for contemporary information sharing.

### **Areas for improvement**

Notwithstanding the positive comments in the 'Strengths' section above, there was some negative feedback from partners, both about the speed of implementation of Neighbourhood Policing and about their feeling that much had been decided before they were consulted – for example the definition and scope of a neighbourhood, and the location of neighbourhoods. Further enquires revealed organisational process and cultural differences which inhibit fast-time decision making within partner agencies.

While there are numerous examples of how well the JAG and CIAG processes work, partners expressed frustration about the short timescales in which they have to react and the apparent lack of appreciation by police of the procedures that they have to go through in order to progress issues. It is therefore suggested that those police officers involved in the JAG and CIAG processes be made aware of the operational constraints that partners are faced with and adapt accordingly.

There was some feedback from borough council-based community safety officers about the use of the SARA problem-solving model by Surrey Police and partners: they said that they would welcome a discussion of alternative problem-solving models for use when tackling community issues.

October 2007

The force is therefore urged to utilise the cross-partnership working group (described under 'Work in progress' above) to review current training and assess the areas where there are common issues (eg problem solving and intelligence work) so as to identify an alternative problem-solving process that is acceptable to all without losing the momentum already achieved in tackling problems jointly.

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** Surrey Police are keen to move as fast as possible to embed neighbourhood policing. HMIC recognise the forces commitment to this objective, however we recommend that the force reviews its NP communication and training strategies in relation to key partner agencies in order to improve notification, consultation and gain a wider understanding of external inhibitors to fast change processes.

## Developing Practice

**INSPECTION AREA:** Neighbourhood Policing

**TITLE:** Neighbourhood mapping tool

**PROBLEM:**

Individual officers (both NSOs and PCSOs) within NPTs were investing significant time in researching relevant reported crimes and incidents which had occurred within their defined neighbourhood area and/or adjoining neighbourhoods.

Divisional intelligence units were also trying to find an efficient method of profiling data across neighbourhoods in support of the ambitions of Neighbourhood Policing.

Not all incidents were deployed to, particularly where neighbourhood issues were concerned, and a need was identified for a single point of reference to be developed so as to ensure that all relevant incidents and crimes were brought to the attention of the NPTs.

**SOLUTION:**

A working group of interested parties was set up and it was agreed that an electronic mapping solution would be piloted, with phase 1 being focused on incidents and crimes of types which, from the experience of the reassurance programme, were of disproportionate effect across neighbourhoods.

The pilot maps were developed on the basis of these agreed categories, but with the scope to review and change them if agreed.

Throughout the development key users (NSOs, PCSs and colleagues from intelligence units) were consulted to quality assure the neighbourhood mapping tool (NMT). Messages were drafted and communicated, and milestones managed through the Neighbourhood Policing and partnership directorate project plan.

It was agreed that access to the NMT should be through the operational page of the force intranet, which would enable eventual access to a wider user group.

The phase 1 pilot (use restricted to NPTs) has received extremely positive feedback from the NPTs and the expansion of access to other colleagues has begun.

October 2007

**OUTCOME(S):**

The primary outcome has been an enhanced capability within a force-based system to identify and map incidents and crimes that are reported across a neighbourhood, to use this information to confirm developing trends, and to triangulate it with community information, especially identified and agreed neighbourhood priority issues that emerge from community engagement.

A secondary positive outcome of the initial pilot across NPTs is that the NMT has been extremely well received by NPT staff. Work is continuing to develop the product further and to test its resilience, with the aim of making it accessible to all staff, and of running a further pilot to allow partners access and to include partner information on it over time (and possibly through the Neighbourhood Priority Issues: Surrey's Problem Solving Process system, which is managed on the force's crime system).

Other outcomes include:

- key staff better informed of activity (crimes and incidents) across neighbourhoods in the force area;
- creation of a credible source of data for wider use (both within Surrey Police and by partners and the public);
- a framework which recognises refined geographical boundaries agreed with partners and the public as Safer Neighbourhood areas, with unique references;
- the ability to record and assess other sources of data and activity (eg interventions, performance measures) as well as other information or points of interest (e.g. locations of neighbourhood priority issues);
- a reduction in time spent researching issues, and
- the ability to overlay with other data sets, partner data etc.

**FORCE CONTACT:** Julia Buchan, Neighbourhood Policing – 01483 482050; mobile – 07967 988011

October 2007

**INSPECTION AREA:** Neighbourhood Policing**TITLE:** Community engagement: use of fridge magnets**PROBLEM:**

A relatively small percentage of the public knew their local officers and how to contact them. Traditional communication has included email contacts, force website pages and local newsletters and magazines. These methods are legitimate and effective means of communications, but the force needed something innovative to capture people's imagination, which they could keep in a visible place in their home or workplace. The force needed to find an enduring and novel approach to publicising the NPTs and their contact details.

**SOLUTION:**

The solution took the form of magnetic contact cards. The Guildford NPT produced 5,000 A5 cards bearing the photographs of the team together with their individual contact details. The cards were then distributed by the NPT staff providing another opportunity to engage with their public.

Although commonly termed 'fridge magnets', the contact cards will adhere to other metal surfaces such as lights or filing cabinets. With a sturdy support, the cards do not have to be stuck to anything and can be left by the front door.

They provide an ideal way to have the contact details of the local NPT on hand in the home.

**OUTCOME(S):**

In an evaluation of the fridge magnet scheme, over 90% of those questioned said they found the magnets useful and would retain them.

The contact cards are a very durable, cost-effective way of promoting the identity and contact information of the local NPT.

The ongoing success of this initiative is being monitored through a special question in the enhanced local policing plan, and this will be reported on each quarter.

Based on research the force predicts that on average fridge magnets will remain in households for up to two years.

**FORCE CONTACT:** Chief Inspector Dave Kelley – 07967 988783

October 2007

<b>INSPECTION AREA:</b> Neighbourhood Policing
<b>TITLE:</b> Performance management and measurement
<p><b>PROBLEM:</b></p> <p>Performance measurement has historically been conducted quantitatively against recognised crime targets. The challenge remains of finding a mechanism which migrates from emphasis and of developing a meaningful process which recognises the importance of retaining these with the balance and contribution of quantitative and relevant interventions and qualitative outcomes. The need to capture perception of activity is recognised as 'reassurance measures' and 'trust and confidence' can not be quantified but must be qualified through instruments that are statistically robust (eg BCS, surveys etc). (This is recognised nationally as a need and is illustrated by both the National Reassurance Policing Programme &amp; the NNPP through the 'reinvention cycle'.)</p>
<p><b>SOLUTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core activity measures were identified.</li> <li>• These were reviewed in the context of 'physical disorder', 'social disorder' and 'significant events'.</li> <li>• The governance of recording was standardised by the introduction of 'counting rules'.</li> <li>• Increased prominence was given at SPECS to ACPO and divisional commanders.</li> <li>• The principal force survey instrument was reviewed and significantly enhanced (both in quantity – 600 surveys per annum in each borough, or 50 per month, totalling 6,600 per annum force-wide) to make it more dynamic, collecting monthly confidence data and reporting on this quarterly.</li> <li>• From April 2007 the force will be able to map interventions against BCS performance and quarterly public confidence results – creating a 'complete journey' map.</li> <li>• Correlative relationships and causal measures between neighbourhood interventions, BCS comparator crime performance activity and public confidence have been refined.</li> </ul>
<p><b>OUTCOME(S):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide a causal link between neighbourhood management activity (interventions) and outcome measures (BCS comparator crime, public confidence levels).</li> <li>• To provide a tactical recording framework of activity within neighbourhoods and linkages to personal performance indicators.</li> <li>• To provide borough-level diagnostic product through SPECS in order to benchmark corporate activity and flexibility, measuring specific initiatives undertaken to respond to identified and agreed neighbourhood priority Issues at this more granular level.</li> <li>• To map interventions against BCS performance and quarterly public confidence results, creating a 'complete journey' map.</li> </ul>
<p><b>FORCE CONTACT:</b> Superintendent Charlie Doyle, Neighbourhood Policing – 01483 482553; mobile – 07967 987232</p>

October 2007

**INSPECTION AREA:** Neighbourhood Policing**TITLE:** Performance management and monitoring – performance monitoring within the SPECS regime**PROBLEM:**

It has proved difficult to establish how activity (interventions) conducted by the force, in particular NPT activity, affects both outputs (disorder and crime incidents) and outcomes (public perceptions). While it has been possible to record data on activity, using the data effectively to prove causal links between activity and its effect upon communities' feelings of security has been challenging. This has been identified as a key issue if effective practices are to be developed to ensure constant improvement in Neighbourhood Policing activities and gains in public confidence and satisfaction are to be maintained.

**SOLUTION:**

The Neighbourhood Policing and partnership directorate and corporate development set up a Neighbourhood Policing performance subgroup (reporting to ACPO officers) in order to design and develop a workable framework to allow effective performance management. The subgroup's membership is wide-ranging and includes many disciplines.

The initial suite of activities was examined and a counting rules doctrine was written and adopted. Several new interventions were added, others dropped. An inspection regime was initiated to ensure adherence to rules.

A suite of output measures was considered and adopted, consisting of 11 crime and incident types that were seen to affect public confidence (rates of public disorder, criminal damage etc).

Finally, an enhanced public survey was developed and implemented across the force, focused upon Neighbourhood Policing issues and providing regular public perception data.

**OUTCOME(S):**

The above activity enabled a mapping/causality process to take place, allowing several monitoring and performance measurement outcomes. The levels of activity (eg how many penalty notices for disorder (PNDs) were issued; how many Acceptable Behaviour Contracts were in place etc) could be seen down to (initially) borough team level. The process also measured:

- how activity affected the level of incidents (eg did an increase in the level of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts affect levels of criminal damage or public disorder?);
- how the level of activity affected the perceptions of the community; and
- if levels of activity around PNDs for drunkenness in a town centre were increased, whether this corresponded led to a decrease over time in incidents of damage or disorder, and whether this then resulted in residents feeling and being safer; or whether the presence of officers in great numbers carrying out a particular activity was destabilising to the community's feelings of security.

Graphical representations provided by this process have proved striking and have very high potential in identifying what works and why. The products produced are examined at the

October 2007

highest level in the force to allow strategic consideration and direction.

It should not be underestimated how important this process is likely to become in getting the right people in the right places doing the right things.

However, this is a developing piece of work that will take time to perfect. Once fine-tuned, it is likely to provide ground-breaking opportunities.

**FORCE CONTACT:** Matthew Goodridge, Neighbourhood Policing – 01483 482739; mobile – 07967 987229

October 2007

## Performance Management

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

### 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

A robust and integrated performance management process has been developed that includes shared targets, a good example being the LAA. Performance management and business processes are NIM-compliant and link performance to risk and to control strategies. The performance of the force is analysed and compared against national and local indicators and datasets. Senior managers are challenged robustly but constructively at the monthly SPECS meeting chaired by the DCC and recently witnessed by HMIC.

The budget-setting process is now more sophisticated, performance-driven, and aligned to strategic priorities and targets. It is serviced by a joint SPA/force subgroup. This innovative approach has been commended as good practice by the Audit Commission.

Activity-based costing (ABC) has been used productively to improve effectiveness and efficiency. For example, the crime management ABC pilot has demonstrated that, by employing police staff to provide administrative support in the MCIT, a further 25% surveillance capacity can be created.

The provision of roads policing PCSOs has extended roads policing officer resilience and allowed the professional teams to target anti-social driving in neighbourhoods, highlighted as a problem by local people. The catalyst for business and workforce modernisation is the Staying Ahead 3 programme, managed by a dedicated superintendent, with the ACC (special operations) (ACC (SO)) as the strategic lead.

October 2007

There is absolute clarity concerning the roles and responsibilities of the SPA and the force on performance matters. A joint authority/force calendar provides a route map for performance and target setting agendas. The authority regularly monitors force performance at the finance and performance panel, and all SPA members have unrestricted access to the SPECS site, in order to be fully informed about performance on a quarterly basis.

By the end of 2006/07, some 16 of the 18 policing plan targets had been achieved. These are divided into four categories which reflect the key strategic aims of customer service, control of crime, confident communities and capable, supported staff (the four Cs). The only two policing plan targets that were not achieved were vehicle crime reduction and road casualty reduction. Complete results of the 2006/07 APP can be obtained at [www.surreypa.gov.uk/ourperf\\_currentperf.asp](http://www.surreypa.gov.uk/ourperf_currentperf.asp).

## **Strengths**

Surrey Police, led by the Chief Constable, has taken a proactive and innovative approach in the development of 'dials and levers' analysis for the SSCPb, holding partners to account for BCS comparator crime reduction performance. This process examines the socio-economic cost of crime, and the force presents a compelling argument to its partners for the reduction of crime. This joint accountability framework has received strong commendation from the deputy regional director, Safer and Stronger Communities at the Government Office for the South East (see the Developing Practice boxes below).

The ACC (TO) chairs the Local Criminal Justice Board subgroup, in which the force provides supporting analysis to hold partners to account for their part in offences brought to justice performance targets, as well as sharing good practice. The force is also actively involved in the LAA neighbourhood management board, which acts as the strategic level partnership board (for details of the Surrey LAA see [www.surreycc.gov.uk/SCCWebsite/sccwspages.nsf/searchresults/8aaee352a8a621c6802572b10031c268?OpenDocument](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/SCCWebsite/sccwspages.nsf/searchresults/8aaee352a8a621c6802572b10031c268?OpenDocument)). Further comment is made in the Neighbourhood Policing section above.

The force has a long history of innovation; over the past few years it has led on challenging approaches to the delivery of policing – e.g. PCSOs and workforce modernisation – and it is the demonstrator site for BCU workforce modernisation. It is well advanced in collaborative work with Sussex Police to provide joint protective services, for example counter-terrorism and the policing of serious and organised crime.

Furthermore, the director of the strategic support department (SSD) (formerly corporate development) is the programme director for the South East Collaboration. Surrey Police is the pilot force for Neighbourhood Policing and the move towards neighbourhood management. Recently it appointed an organisational learning co-ordinator whose role is to draw together all learning strands from a variety of disciplines across the force and ensure that the force is 'match fit' and not exposed to unnecessary risk.

Since 2006 the force has been conducting a daily ABC analysis pilot with all strands of its crime management department (CMD) (ie MCIT, surveillance, and serious and organised crime investigation) and this is used for the costing of investigations and for resourcing units. This pilot has been extended to one BCU for testing. ABC has also been used at the workforce modernisation pilot site, linking with personal performance indicators (PPIs) (see the Developing Practice boxes below) to provide more focus on unit-based costings.

October 2007

The SPECS strategic performance meetings make good use of iQuanta data and the quarterly banding analysis produced for the police performance steering group, along with a diagrammatical explanation of performance known as 'the shapes and ladders', to inform the performance management process. Performance against BCU and force MSFs is reviewed by management information analysts aligned to BCUs, and is available via the SPECS intranet site (product CO1). Members and officers of the SPA attend the SPECS meeting on a monthly basis. Furthermore, SPA members and officers are able to access iQuanta and do so on a regular basis. Other developments include a bespoke harm reduction scorecard for the CMD, and the Neighbourhood Policing interventions linked to outcomes as described in the Neighbourhood Policing section above. There is also a monthly survey for Neighbourhood Policing, which over a 12-month period will survey over 8,000 people and will inform Neighbourhood Policing strategy and activity.

The SA process is maturing in step with the national process; it has involved CDRP partners and has a citizen focus element to its processes in the form of PATs. The SA is produced from two strands of activity – intelligence based analysis of crime, and strategic analysis of organisational and environmental issues – with joint working by CMD and SSD staff (the head of intelligence analysis and the head of strategic planning both sit on the NIM management board). The restructuring of corporate development into SSD (plan–do–review) adheres to NIM principles. The resulting SA is used to inform the APP. The control strategy is drawn from the SA and specifically requires analysis of victims, locations and offenders. The intelligence requirement then identifies the need for information in the same areas. The control strategy is a standing item at the SPECS meeting and close links are being established between performance management and the NIM processes through the control strategy.

There is a clearly articulated vision and strategy for Surrey Police. The four key priorities at the heart of the strategy are customer service, control of crime, confident communities and capable, supported staff (the four Cs). Each officer and member of staff has a pocket-sized copy of the APP, detailing the four Cs as well as the Surrey Police Standard (which sets out organisational expectations of officers and staff), the LISTEN customer service principles, and the PDR process. In addition, all are expected to aspire to the Surrey Seven Leadership Principles.

There is a long-standing and robust APP process, with strong links between the SSD and the SPA. There is evidence of congruence with LAA targets and of local and national priorities being woven into the APP – for example the Neighbourhood Policing survey and the national community safety plan. There is an active, open and transparent relationship with and involvement of the SPA through the revised panel structure that reflects the four Cs, which is seen as both supportive and challenging. The Chief Constable is the chair of the county-wide SSCPB, at which partners are held to account for joint targets under the Safer and Stronger element of the LAA using the 'dials and levers' process (see the Developing Practice boxes below). All force-level targets are assigned to chief officer portfolios. Managers at all levels have SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely) targets in their PDRs (see 'Areas for improvement' below). The SPA provides formal scrutiny through its panel process.

There is evidence of integration of finance, HR and ICT strategies through the budget and performance workshops – (CIP2, chief officer group and SPA). All directors of these areas of business are members of the chief officer group. The PPCB oversees all programmes of work in force to ensure they are consistent and support the strategic aims of the force. The SPA has been active in ensuring that money in these areas is well spent; it also receives regular updates through the panel structure.

October 2007

Comment has been made above about how the force intends to meet policing demands beyond the county boundary and the regional collaboration project. Furthermore, the joint working with Sussex Police will address terrorism and serious and organised crime, with a joint command at ACC level. Both forces recently undertook a counter-terrorism exercise (Lions Keep) which tested current systems, processes and arrangements, and the learning from that exercise is being progressed. Surrey Police is able (using ABC, as detailed above) to cost activity undertaken by the CMD, which includes counter-terrorism, major crime, serious and organised crime and surveillance.

The strategic planning process within the force and the SPA is very sound and joined-up. Comment has already been made about how the APP takes into consideration both local neighbourhood issues and those contained in the national community safety plan. There is clear evidence of joint working between the force and the SPA in the compilation of its strategic and annual plans. For 2007/08 there are for the first time four measurable objectives that specifically relate to protective services. There is a NIM board chaired by the ACC (TO) which meets every six weeks, providing a strategic overview of NIM processes and ensuring that they are kept up-to-date. A detective inspector owns the NIM action plan and is developing NIM products. The force inspectorate undertook a compliance inspection of NIM in 2006 and at the time of this inspection the NPIA NIM team was undertaking a compliance review of the force.

Each BCU has an SPA member assigned to it and SPA members meet with BCU commanders on a regular basis to discuss performance. The deputy director of strategic support (who leads on performance) attends the finance and performance panel on a regular basis, and SPA members report that they have ready and unrestricted access to performance management data and information.

Customer service linked to performance and innovation has been a key plank in recent success. The Surrey Police Standard, effective internal communication and a series of Chief Constable's roadshows have allowed the strategic vision, and the part that individuals play in delivering it, to be communicated across the force. The strategic planning and target-setting process is effectively supported by extensive joint force/SPA consultation. In addition to the APP survey there are now monthly surveys at borough level (see the Neighbourhood Policing section above) which provide regular and informative data. The Neighbourhood Policing section details the interaction the force has with its partners and the community, and the way in which these influence policy and targets.

There is clear accountability for performance, which includes both BCU commanders and departmental heads. The DCC robustly pursues areas of weak performance, for example by establishing the detections programme board. The SPECS and corporate governance scorecards provide clear and accurate information on the force's performance against its objectives. They utilise a 'traffic light' risk assessment coding so that colleagues can readily identify where performance is on target or close to achieving the target, or where targets are not being met.

A comprehensive risk management process has been established. It captures business risk intelligence through both formal and informal networks, including (when appropriate) the use of risk consultants (who are members of police staff trained in this discipline as a secondary skill). It provides a formal rating of risks to performance, finance, reputation, safety and compliance. The whole process is overseen by a senior-level joint force/SPA board. The resulting force-level and portfolio-level risk profiles are used to inform the force strategic assessment (ensuring NIM2 compliance), planning and budgeting processes, and the ongoing prioritisation of resources.

October 2007

BCUs have established their own SPECS process which brings accountability below BCU command level. A data warehouse has been developed internally by the SSD and ICT departments. It complies with the National Management Information System but is more flexible in terms of meeting local analytical requirements, and PPIs can be drawn from it (see the Developing Practice boxes below). The SSD is piloting a new piece of software (Performance Softs Views), developed in house, which provides a pictorial representation of performance that can be drilled down from force to BCU to borough to NPT and individual level. Comment has already been made above about the Surrey Police Standard which is supported by Seven key Leadership Principles.

The unsatisfactory performance procedure is in use and supported by BCUs and central HR; the PPIs (described above) are used to inform the process (see 'Areas for improvement' below).

Each BCU and forward-facing department has customer service managers with a professional lead based at headquarters. Surrey Police is very advanced in learning from previous activities. Areas for improvement from HMIC and other external assessments are used as an effective mechanism to trigger individual performance objectives for senior police officers and police staff. The force has taken an innovative approach to self-improvement by appointing a learning and development co-ordinator who is a member of the SSD senior management team and whose role is to 'design, implement and deliver an innovative approach to organisational learning leading to real, positive change and improvement in performance, key processes, organisational culture, leadership and team working throughout the force'.

A comprehensive three-year HR strategy incorporates a costed HR plan and complies with national People Matters guidance. A performance-led budget-setting process was in place for 2006/07, linking resources directly to performance aspirations (Policing Performance Assessment Framework domains). In adopting this strategy it has specifically identified the performance gains achievable from any investment. This is a key development which supports the performance management framework, but the force and SPA now need to look at improving the transparency of the linkage between the overall allocation of resources in the budget process and continuous performance improvement. Resource management is closely monitored by both the force and the SPA – both centrally and locally. Regular workshops are held to consider both short- and medium-term financial planning and to consider how decisions will impact on performance. Enhancements have been made to the budget-making processes by introducing a rolling zero-based budget mechanism. The force has achieved substantial efficiency gains over recent years and this new mechanism (which will be further extended for 2007/08) will continue to contribute towards efficiency gains.

There are robust accountability mechanisms in place and the established internal inspectorate (part of the SSD) helps to ensure compliance through audit, inspection and mystery shopper visits (see the Neighbourhood Policing section above). Locally, accountability is also driven through the PDR process as well as through PPIs (see above). The PDR completion rate for 2006/07, in accordance with last year's policing plan target (ie the percentage of eligible staff, available for duty, who received a PDR), was 90.7%. The finance and performance panel of the SPA provides an overview on a regular basis.

There is recognition of good performance by police officers and police staff. Good work forms are available electronically to all. The scheme formally rewards good work. There are regular commendation ceremonies which recognise good work of officers and staff at BCU, department and force levels.

October 2007

Recognition payments and honoraria are regularly used. There are systematic submissions from the force for the national honours system, and both officers and staff have been recognised by Her Majesty the Queen.

The APP is a forward-looking document which has clear outcomes incorporated into it. All senior staff know which parts they are responsible for. The PPCB oversees all programmes of work to ensure that they are consistent and joined-up and that they support the strategic aims of the force (see the Neighbourhood Policing section above).

There has been devolved decision making in Surrey for over ten years; all departments have their own plans based upon a corporate template and are linked to the APP and force targets. Funds are delegated as appropriate and the force operates a zero-based budget system.

Feedback on force strategies and plans is actively encouraged; comment has already been made above on how this system works.

A comprehensive budget exercise was undertaken in December 2006, involving the SPA, the chief officer group and BCU and departmental commanders. The force is efficient at matching costs to objectives, and the 'dials and levers' monitoring process can also calculate the socio-economic cost of each individual crime committed within Surrey.

There is very strong involvement from the chief officer group in driving performance within a formal performance framework. Members of the team frequently make informal enquiries of key stakeholders in relation to any specific points of performance concern.

Surrey Police is innovative and robust in its approach to performance management and continuous improvement. Over 9,000 calls have been made to victims of crime to check performance and customer service. The feedback obtained contributes to personal appraisals and informs training. The extension of customer satisfaction surveys to a monthly format and down to borough level will further enhance quality assurance mechanisms.

Following consultation with the SPA, panels, external partners and the diversity directorate, the Surrey Police Charter was published in May 2006, well in advance of the national deadline, setting out the commitment to exceeding the requirements of the national QoSC. In parallel, there is an integrated response to delivering the requirements of the Victims' Code, which has included specific training for key roles, awareness briefings for senior managers and a detailed internal/external communications strategy for all staff and customers. This is supported by the Surrey Police Standard, which deals with values, conduct and service for all staff and has been championed by the Chief Constable.

Requirements for core performance data are met in a timely, accurate and appropriate manner. The National Crime Recording Standard compliance check for 2006/07 found that data quality arrangements were Good and had improved on the previous year; testing results were Excellent for user satisfaction and Good for crime data. Monthly and annual data returns are supplied to the Home Office in a timely manner. The HMIC detections audit for 2006/07 indicated that management arrangements were Good as were the data testing overall weighted grade, with adult cautions and offences taken into consideration Excellent and Good respectively. Testing for domestic violence (DV) data attracted a Good grade, and Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 stop-and-search was graded Good for management arrangements and Excellent for data quality (see 'Areas for improvement' below).

October 2007

## Work in progress

The force is exploring collaborative work with Surrey County Council to provide shared services, for example HR and ICT.

The integration of the PPI and ABC databases is imminent. That being said, the force is confident that the new Oracle-based PPI suite, together with a separate but robust ABC suite, will assist greatly in enabling informed decision making on budget, resources and HR issues, including the incapability procedure. Further work on utilising ABC to provide and enhance the capability to cost activity, and to develop unit/cost and resource usage indicators, has also commenced.

## Areas for improvement

Notwithstanding the positive comments above, it was apparent from group interviews of sergeants, constables and PCSOs that most could not recall the strategic priorities of customer service, control of crime, confident communities and capable, supported staff (the four Cs).

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** Surrey Police publish 4 key internal messages; customer service, control of crime, confident communities and capable, supported staff (known as the 4Cs). The force should consider how it can further improve the communication of these objectives to employees to ensure that they understand the meaning behind the message and how they can personally contribute to improving Surrey Police's performance.

Notwithstanding the positive comments in the Neighbourhood Policing section concerning the use of PDR objectives, there are areas for improvement in the PDR process. Following a random audit of some 30 PDRs drawn from across the force and covering officers and staff, it is evident that use of SMART objectives is inconsistent; some 56% had objectives that were not completely acceptable. There is a quality/audit process within the PDR process which dip-samples some 25% of all reports. Of those reviewed, some 16% had been through this process, but did not have SMART objectives. Overall some 50% did not have role-specific behavioural competency assessments.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** HMIC conducted an audit of PDRs within Surrey as part of this inspection and found a number of areas for improvement. It is acknowledged that only a small number of PDRs were inspected in this process, however Surrey should review compliance with their PDR policy to assess whether HMICs findings are replicated on a larger scale and take appropriate action.

The force operates the unsatisfactory performance procedure and makes use of PPIs (described above) to inform the process. However, the force recognises that the process is not as robust as it would like and that there is room for improvement in how it is managed.

Even though the HMIC detections audit showed very favourable results, there were concerns about discontinued cases, non-sanction detections, penalty notices for disorder and cannabis warnings, all of which attracted a Poor grade. Furthermore, the management arrangements for data compliance for DV attracted only a Fair grade.

October 2007

## *Developing Practice*

**INSPECTION AREA:** Performance management

**TITLE:** The case director model

**PROBLEM:**

Opportunities were identified to improve the performance and quality of volume crime investigations across the force. Enhanced supervision of cases was required to ensure corporacy and so to lead to an increase in the force's detection rate and number of offenders brought to justice.

**SOLUTION:**

It was decided to develop a corporate model for volume crime investigation, prisoner handling and case building which would span the whole criminal justice process from pre-arrest to conviction.

The case director model was introduced to the force in November 2006. The model involves detective sergeants on each BCU whose role is to provide a greater level of supervision, support and direction to officers and staff conducting criminal investigations. The BCU teams provide cover from 8am to 1am, seven days a week, working closely with the Crown Prosecution Service duty prosecutors and providing 'gate-keeping' cover for BCU. TPT officers are also able formally to seek advice from the case directors by mobile phone on the way to deal with incidents, where appropriate.

Prisoners booked into custody are monitored by the detective sergeant who will either provide supervision, guidance and advice themselves or ensure that an appropriate supervisor is already overseeing the investigation. The supervision includes setting and recording investigative strategies on crime reports, tasking actions to investigators as required, ensuring all key primary evidence is obtained as soon as possible, maximising all evidential opportunities, documenting the investigation process, leaving clear audit trails with evidence of decision making, and expeditiously identifying key issues and cases. Performance indicators are in the process of being developed in order to evaluate the success of the initiative objectively. The supervision and direction given by the case directors promotes a more structured investigation and allows officers to be given more support where required by experienced and knowledgeable detective sergeants. The model allows for flexibility and individual case assessment by the case directors, who then dedicate the required time, resources and investigators to each case.

Case directors are supported by an administrator, allowing them to concentrate on live investigations; there are also police staff investigators whom case directors can task should further immediate enquiries be identified. Within the team also sit specialist police staff to prepare and build the case files under the case director's supervision, and the prisoner investigation unit which takes on the continued investigation of cases referred to the team. This structure allows enhanced investigations and high-quality case building, and captures opportunities to develop and learn.

October 2007

**OUTCOME(S):**

A bank of performance indicators has been set up to monitor implementation of this model, and this is now providing accurate information for comparison.

Early indications during the ongoing review period have been very positive, with the prisoner investigation units feeling more supported with more direction; the TPTs regularly contacting case directors for crime advice both before and after an arrest; quicker assessment of cases and more evidence being captured at an earlier stage; more face-to-face referrals being made to the duty prosecutor; less unnecessary bail; and more verbal handovers of prisoners, allowing accelerated turnaround of staff.

**FORCE CONTACT:** Detective Inspector Greenslade-Jones, Force Volume Crime Team, Headquarters – 01483 482560

**INSPECTION AREA:** Performance management

**TITLE:** Personal performance indicators

**PROBLEM:**

Performance in the force has historically been addressed predominantly via a top-down approach, with the use of aggregated data to hold divisional commanders and departmental heads to account. However, performance management and accountability also need to be supported with a bottom-up approach, for two main reasons. Firstly, a bottom-up approach helps make all individuals in the force aware of how they contribute to the strategic goals of the organisation in quantifiable terms; and secondly, such an approach provides line supervisors and managers with a tool that helps them objectively assess the performance of individuals, in support of both delivering the strategic aims of the force and personal development.

**SOLUTION:**

The PPI project was initiated and sponsored by the Chief Constable. The project recognised that with the development of the new Oracle data warehouse and the recently installed MIS software (Oracle Portal – a web-based application), the force had the tools to supply individuals and supervisors quickly with secure, accurate and timely data on personal performance.

Individuals can easily access the PPI system from the Surrey Police intranet. After entering security information they are presented with the PPI portal, which displays their own HR information and, where relevant, details of the staff they supervise – a feature which, in itself, helps to improve data quality within HRMS. The PPI portal provides access to the PPI reports on individuals, as well as to aggregated reports on teams, departments, divisions and the force as a whole.

The indicators currently available include:

- incidents (road traffic collisions and signal crimes);
- crimes (including number of detections together with detection method breakdown; number of no crimes; and number of crime filed undetected);
- number of arrests linked to crimes (together with a breakdown of the outcomes); and

October 2007

- number of stop-and-searches (with breakdown).

The project is looking to include other contextual indicators such as absence, and to widen the suite of measures to encompass data quality PPIs and specific PPIs for NSOs and PCSOs. In recognition of the fact that the data is essentially quantitative and has the potential to encourage perverse incentives, another strand of the project is looking at how weighting measures can help militate against this effect.

A particular intention of the project was to not set specific performance targets at the individual level, in recognition that such an approach would potentially favour quantity over quality.

**OUTCOME(S):**

- Operational staff can now understand, and evidence in quantifiable terms, how they contribute to the strategic goals of the organisation.
- The system provides supervisors and managers with a tool which delivers a more objective and evidence-based approach to tackling poor performance and rewarding good performance in support of the PDR process.
- North West Division has implemented a PPI intervention strategy. This strategy uses the PPI system to recognise good performance, with various rewards such as nominations for the APEX scheme and letters of appreciation, but also agrees the channels through which action can be taken to address poor performance. Such a strategy is designed to encourage a positive and sensible use of the PPI tool in the context of other qualitative factors, in order to guard against the pursuit of purely quantitative outcomes. Since implementation, other divisions have taken on similar approaches.

**FORCE CONTACTS:** Chief Superintendent Sue Warren, PPI Project Lead, North West Surrey – 01483 485122 / Tony Fenton-Jones, Senior Management Information Analyst, Performance Management Unit – 01483 482606

**INSPECTION AREA:** Performance management

**TITLE:** Safer and stronger communities partnership board – ‘dials and levers’ report

**PROBLEM:**

With the introduction of the LAA, it was hoped that greater partnership working would result, through the publication of shared targets and priorities for safer and stronger communities, specifically the reduction of crime as measured through the CDRP-based BCS comparator crime reduction targets. However it was recognised through the SSCPb that CDRPs still did not have a great sense of ownership of the target (as measured through the BCS comparator), and were unsure how they could successfully impact on the areas which posed the greatest risk of not achieving their locally mandated reduction targets.

October 2007

**SOLUTION:**

The force has developed a BCS comparator crime risk assessment report, broken down by borough and each of the constituent BCS comparator crime categories. In addition, Home Office research into the economic and social cost of crime is factored into the risk assessment to ensure that priority is given to those crimes which have the greatest impact socially and economically.

The risk assessment ranks the constituent elements of the BCS comparator by economic and social cost of crime. Each cell within the grid (ie crime type by borough) has a colour-coded upper and lower forecast based on the CDRP's crime reduction target – green if the forecast indicates the CDRP will achieve the target, amber if performance has improved but is still short of the target, and red if the target either has not, or is predicted not to be achieved.

To complement this report, a borough-based strategic and tactical assessment is produced by the head of intelligence analysis, using the risk assessment as a basis for a borough-based intelligence assessment of the areas of risk identified.

Finally a 'levers' report is produced which effectively evaluates the success or otherwise of tactics previously deployed in the pursuit of crime reduction across the county.

**OUTCOME(S):**

The approach enables a detailed risk assessment of how each CDRP is performing against its BCS comparator crime reduction target, and further identifies which constituent elements represent the greatest risk in terms of the target not being met.

The approach helps to highlight what works, where and why, and enables knowledge and learning around crime reduction initiatives to be formally captured and shared across and within CDRPs in the county. Consequently CDRPs can be held to account for their performance and the effectiveness of the tactics (or levers) they are adopting in order to impact on their crime reduction targets.

The approach brings greater CDRP accountability for and ownership of the Home Office PSA1 target, where previously accountability has rested with police forces through iQuanta (ie the shapes and ladders and banding analysis).

**FORCE CONTACT:** Damon McCarthy, Deputy Director, Strategic Support Directorate – 01483 482737

October 2007

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Overview

### National contextual factors

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

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

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

### Contextual factors overview

During last year's baseline assessment, Surrey Police was one of only three forces awarded a Good grading. The force has continued to seek to improve, assisted by the SPA, which has funded additional posts. This significant growth has led to improved capacity and capability within the dedicated public protection investigation units (PPIUs). Since October 2006, Surrey Police has shared information with or had personal visits from representatives of over 50% of UK police forces, seeking advice on how they can improve the protection of vulnerable people.

Surrey Police recognises its responsibility to assist in the protection of the vulnerable. In 2002 specialist vulnerable persons units were established on each of the four BCUs, supported by a public protection strategy unit (PPSU) at headquarters, which in turn reports to the ACC (SO). The structure brings together child abuse, vulnerable adult abuse and domestic abuse (DA), missing persons and sex/dangerous offender management. The risk management officers (RMOs) for multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) are based within the PPIU offices but are managed centrally by the headquarters public protection risk management unit (PPRMU).

In recognition of the close links between missing persons and the existing disciplines, missing person specialists have also been added to the PPIU structure. Although a relatively recent development, this has already been successful, with examples of positive outcomes including improved strategic co-ordination with local children's homes and helping

October 2007

a local mental health hospital to improve its missing person contingency planning. The inclusion of the multiple disciplines within a single co-located unit, supervised by dedicated detective inspectors, is delivering improved communication between disciplines, improved intelligence flow, more effective management of risk and a higher quality of service to the public.

The response to public protection sits within a clearly defined strategic and operational accountability framework which routinely considers performance at BCU, force and partnership levels. Public protection issues form part of Surrey's local policing plan 2007/08 and are also considered within the force risk register.

The PPIUs are well-resourced in terms of accommodation (staff have access to well-equipped victim interview suites), vehicles and IT. The force crime management system and the command and control systems are linked and include a flagging system to highlight previous public protection incidents.

The protecting vulnerable people (PVP) structure within Surrey Police has been developed to ensure that intelligence relating to those who pose a risk (or those who are potentially at risk) is properly captured and is made readily available for the use of others, subject to agreed disclosure considerations.

Surrey Police is continuing to develop a performance regime within the PPIUs which is driven by the PPSU, ensuring that activity is constantly reviewed and risk-assessed.

The PPSU monitors compliance with force policy, ensuring corporacy, clear accountability and improved service. The PPSU hosts regular meetings for BCU and headquarters staff to ensure a clear understanding of force policy and to seek feedback from practitioners.

The PPSU collects monthly data across the public protection disciplines. Some data is indicative of compliance and performance while other measures are indicators of volume. Key elements of the PPSU data are considered within the force's monthly performance meeting, during which BCU commanders are held to account by the ACPO team.

A six-monthly performance assessment is produced, which is a composite of statistics, audit results and outcomes of regular consultation with PPIU practitioners. The resultant product is used as a health check for each BCU PPIU, and its conclusions and recommendations are formally presented to BCU senior management teams (SMTs) by the head of profession and his deputy. Further structured discussion then takes place as to BCU compliance with force policy, identified best practice, opportunities for performance improvement and a review of staffing levels. On a local basis the PPIU supervisors have regular performance meetings with their staff. There is also a provision to task the force registrar to conduct independent inspections.

The PPSU acts as a support and co-ordination unit for the PPIUs and as a source of general advice throughout the force. There is a dedicated specialist adviser for each discipline within the PPSU, who is responsible for ensuring that the police response is compliant with force policy and delivered consistently within each BCU.

The PPSU has additional responsibilities which include environmental scanning for best practice, development of policy, co-ordination and training (this is a tailored approach which is specific to the discipline and takes into account sensitivities and risks). A great deal of work is done by the PPSU to raise awareness of the public protection responsibilities of

October 2007

non-specialist staff, for example initial response to domestic and child abuse. The PPSU also has an inspection and support role which involves assessing initial action at the scene and levels of supervision, and quality-controlling the recording of incidents, attendance and the conduct of any subsequent investigation.

Appropriate staffing levels and supervision are in place to deal with predicted demand. Apart from intranet guidance and general training for all staff, the PPIUs and PPSU are able to give specialist advice to colleagues and partners 24/7.

There is clear guidance available to all officers and police staff in relation to their responsibilities when dealing with the vulnerable, supported by formal training which is co-ordinated and delivered by the PPSU.

Quality-assurance processes have been developed, including regular external surveys designed to assess customer satisfaction.

Surrey Police has developed a corporate spreadsheet of all case conferences, including child abuse, MAPPA and the multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC). The monthly management information captures the number of meeting invites received and the details of the officer who attended.

The PPSU produced and implemented a reviewed and standardised PPIU specialist investigator job profile this year that identifies both desirable and essential training requirements for each discipline.

Recent restructuring has taken account of both workload and resilience, and has proved to be successful, leading to well-developed internal focus on risk, better communication/intelligence sharing between disciplines, and much improved relationships with partner agencies and the public. The force continues to collaborate effectively and to develop effective working relationships with partner agencies. There is clear evidence of joint investigation and full participation within partnership fora at tactical and strategic levels.

Although this issue is not specifically subject to HMIC assessment on this occasion, the force has recognised the links between public protection activity and the prevention of child sexual exploitation online. The PPSU has developed an in-force dedicated paedophile online investigation team (POLIT) equipped with a well-developed risk-assessment process.

The police assessment tool for internet offenders firstly enables assessment of new referrals in order to prioritise the POLIT work accurately, and secondly allows a more detailed assessment of risk.

The force has worked with the Lucy Faithfull Foundation to develop a two-phase risk-assessment tool for responding to and managing the risks associated with internet offenders.

All public protection staff are part of an ongoing mandatory programme of occupational health (OH) support groups as well as having the opportunity to self-refer to OH at any time. OH has access to external specialist support if required, and officers have access to external confidential counselling paid for by the force. Public protection supervisors have been briefed on the identification of officers who may suffer adverse effects as a result of working within such a challenging specialist role, and they also have a responsibility to refer staff to OH should they perceive any cause for concern.

October 2007

Professional focus groups have been established across all disciplines to ensure corporacy, identify best practice and support staff in the units.

The build-up to the implementation of the MARAC within Surrey police started in October 2006, leading to a pilot in January 2007. The force now has a force-wide commitment. Starting from 1 April 2007, each BCU now has a formal meeting every month with key partners and relevant services, including children's services, voluntary groups, housing and alcohol and drug abuse interaction teams. An early assessment of progress reveals high incidences of third-party referrals and an encouraging reduction in repeat cases.

The SPA has a nominated authority lead for public protection matters who is knowledgeable about the challenges associated with PPU activity. The force provides quarterly public protection updates which are consolidated by formal six-monthly and annual reports. The force also involves the police authority in regular control of crime meetings, during which public protection is a standing agenda item.

## **Strengths**

The force has linked protection of the vulnerable within one discipline, and it is recognised by the chief officer team as a critical area of policing activity. The head of profession is extremely enthusiastic and fully engaged, continually raising the performance bar to ensure improvement. The force has agreed significant growth within the PVP disciplines, which has been funded by a well-informed police authority. The front-end response to PVP is well resourced and equally well supported by the headquarters support and co-ordination unit. The force is active in self-inspection, audit, review and promoting organisational learning, and its relationship with partners is excellent.

Building on child abuse best practice the force has developed a generic spreadsheet to track all cases investigated within the PPIUs.

## **Work in progress**

The force is developing a new IT system, Project Enterprise, to replace the existing CIS. The PPSU has been engaged since early development of the product, and public protection requirements have been included in the product specification for the new system, with the focus on risk assessment.

The PPSU has produced and implemented a reviewed and standardised PPIU specialist investigator job profile that identifies both desirable and essential training requirements for each discipline. The force is currently reviewing which secondary skills are appropriate for public protection investigators.

Surrey Police has developed a corporate spreadsheet of all case conferences. The monthly management information captures the number of meeting invitations received and the details of the officers who attended. It is currently developing the spreadsheet to monitor all meeting attendance, including the quality assurance and auditing group (QAAG), the quarterly joint managers group, the practice development group and the Surrey safeguarding children board (SSCB).

October 2007

The PPSU has undertaken to produce an annual report for the SPA and reports regularly to the SPA control of crime group.

### **Areas for improvement**

Much has been and is being done within the force to ensure that the protection of vulnerable people within Surrey remains a key priority. Although in a much advanced position in respect of this policing discipline, and notwithstanding excellent current partnership arrangements (eg through MAPPA, MARAC and joint child abuse investigations), the force can improve its performance by continuing to ensure that partner agencies become more involved in the joint assessment of risk and work together in relation to joint problem solving.

October 2007

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse

GRADE	Excellent
-------	-----------

### 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

Child abuse investigation (CAI) is a sub-discipline of the PPIUs based on each BCU. The structure, systems and other contextual factors which govern CAI are generic and detailed within the PVP overview above; see also [www.surrey.police.uk/cp.asp?artid=946](http://www.surrey.police.uk/cp.asp?artid=946), which provides useful information about investigations into child abuse, vulnerable adult abuse and DA, missing person enquiries and the management of dangerous offenders. The website also provides useful hyperlinks to a number of different charities and help and advice lines.

### Strengths

The detective superintendent (head of profession) currently performs the role of deputy chair of the SSCB and chairs the SSCB budget group. Standard operating procedures, joint training and agreed protocol arrangements with partners are sophisticated and are regularly reviewed by the PPSU to ensure they remain contemporary.

The force works to the decisions of the SSCB and complies with standard operating procedures (SOPs) jointly agreed with partner agencies. The local policing plan specifically sets out the responsibilities relating to child protection.

October 2007

Surrey Police has published an up-to-date child abuse manual on its intranet, complemented by a more specific SOP for specialist child abuse practitioners which includes a section on the conduct of joint investigations and the police role in case conferences. Both documents are consistent with ACPO guidance.

Compliance with child protection policy is monitored on a monthly basis by PPSU supervisors during PPIU inspection visits, by regular audit of the CIS, which holds crime, intelligence, custody and other data, and through customer satisfaction surveys.

A child abuse adviser (an accredited detective) has been appointed, who is responsible for conducting investigative scrutiny checks that are fully auditable. Following auditing and evaluation, all members of the SMT, chief officers and the SPA are provided with published overview reports that provide accurate management data to inform resource decisions and future force response. In accordance with policy implemented in early 2007 officers and staff are not abstracted to other duties.

As part of the 2006/07 performance plan, the PPSU has undertaken to conduct a structured monthly health check of each PPIU, specifically in the area of CAI. The PPSU has developed a customer service survey which assesses the perceptions of the service held by parents or carers of victims of child abuse.

Officers and staff involved in child protection have up-to-date job descriptions and generic role profiles, and receive role-related training which is supported by regular training needs analysis. Refresher training is being developed where required; mandatory training includes the Specialist Child Abuse Investigator Development Programme and a requirement for all staff to embark on the learner detective programme.

The PPSU has negotiated a one-week slot to deliver public protection (including child abuse) input on every probationer course. The PPSU also has input into the inspector statutory responsibilities training; the operational leaders' course is helping to develop a number of related e-learning packages.

Training is regularly reviewed to incorporate feedback from practitioners and the results of PPSU audits. The skills review encompasses specific consideration of the welfare needs of staff involved in CAI, and includes an initial mentoring phase.

When PPIUs were established, a rationale was devised which set consistent staffing levels on each BCU. The staffing model is flexible and allows for periodic growth or shrinkage dependent on demographic profile and workload. A significant three-day audit was carried out in February 2007, during which the workload to staff ratio was assessed. There is recognition of the important role that PPIUs play, and abstraction levels of core staff are monitored and minimal. Each PPIU has recently received an additional sergeant, investigative officer and administrator.

Role descriptions, including practitioners, BCU commanders, and ACPO, are unambiguous with clearly defined accountability. The force engages in joint training with partners, including social care staff: this encompasses Achieving Best Evidence courses as well as multi-agency foundation training with partners such as education, health, housing and social care services.

October 2007

Child abuse intelligence is considered within the daily T&CG process on BCUs, along with any other related PPIU intelligence. Any child perceived to be at risk is flagged on IT systems and automatically referred for the attention of specialist child abuse investigators.

The flow of intelligence between partner agencies is excellent, allowing officers responding either to calls or making enquires to be informed of any known child protection issues connected with premises or an individual. There is clear evidence that the 'child coming to notice' form (39/24) is well understood by officers and widely used; details from the form are recorded on IT systems and routinely forwarded to social services.

The CIS is used to manage and supervise child abuse investigations. In addition to this system the force has developed two corporate spreadsheets which track the progression of referrals and case conferences.

As already stated, each PVP discipline compiles a monthly spreadsheet with a wide range of qualitative and quantitative data that is submitted to the PPSU for auditing purposes. It is evident that the force has given careful thought to ensuring a full capture of available data within CAI so as to measure the functions that fall outside the general core performance measures. The information thus gained provides the focus for the auditing processes that are now clearly embedded within PVP. The data is examined and assessed to ensure that the force maintains a resilient and flexible approach to this critical area of business.

The PPSU has implemented a QAAG that links to the LSCB and comprises partners from key agencies such as health, social services and education. The membership comprises relatively junior managers who have up-to-date skills for reviewing live and finalised cases.

Case conferences relating to child abuse investigations are attended by PPIU practitioners of various ranks, depending on the assessment of intelligence. Shared intelligence also informs a formal decision-making process which considers at what point the force will engage in joint investigations with partner agencies.

Each PPIU provides representation to quality-assure standard case progression strategies and tactical interventions. This enables effective partnership and collaborative relationships, with a focus upon learning from mistakes and promulgating best practice.

There is effective information sharing between staff involved in the investigation of child abuse and the other disciplines managed by the PPSU. Due to the realignment of resources, the specialist officers engaged within each discipline are co-located within the PPIUs, improving communication. Regular PPIU office meetings are held to discuss individual cases, allowing staff to share intelligence and engage in joint problem-solving activity.

The PPSU ensures that relevant learning is collated and disseminated through programmed partnership meetings and in force focus groups. All work undertaken by the QAAG is scanned for strategic issues and articulated in appropriate management reports and forums attended by senior management, for example the crime forum.

CAI units work alongside the RMOs, ensuring that information held on the national Violent and Sex Offenders Register (ViSOR) database can be shared where appropriate. There is also evidence of effective joined-up working with colleagues within the PPIU and partners, including recent initiatives to reduce the number of children who habitually go missing from children's homes.

October 2007

Children found at the scene of DA incidents are automatically referred via form 39/24 to child abuse officers, who in turn share information with the local health authority and social services.

Individual officer caseloads can be examined through interrogation of the CIS, which is used to progress all child abuse investigations. This process is supplemented by the requirement for first-line managers to hold documented supervision meetings with staff on a fortnightly basis. Regular debriefs are held with departmental heads to identify any critical cases or welfare issues.

### **Work in progress**

The SSCB aims to deliver the recommended outcomes contained within the recent government report *Every Child Matters*. The force is currently integrating the concepts of the SSCB in all work involving children.

In the absence of a national child protection register, the force continues to build on existing information-sharing protocols with partner agencies, and is lobbying at a national level to ensure areas of risk to the public are assessed appropriately with enforcement from information-sharing legislation.

### **Areas for improvement**

Notwithstanding the day-to-day good relationships identified between child abuse investigators and colleagues from partner agencies (predominantly social services), the force should consider further development of joint training with all partners involved in CAI, and seek to conduct joint inspections of related multi-agency processes with partnership colleagues.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:** Notwithstanding the day-to-day good relationships identified between child abuse investigators and colleagues from partner agencies (predominantly social services), the force should consider further development of joint training with all partners involved in CAI, and seek to conduct joint inspections of related multi-agency processes with partnership colleagues.

October 2007

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Domestic Violence

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

### 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

DA investigation is a sub-discipline of the PPIUs based on each BCU. The structure, systems and other contextual factors which govern DA investigation are generic and detailed within the PVPs overview above; see also [www.surrey.police.uk/cp.asp?artid=946](http://www.surrey.police.uk/cp.asp?artid=946), which provides useful information about investigations into child abuse, vulnerable adult abuse and DA, missing person enquiries and the management of dangerous offenders. The website also provides useful hyperlinks to a number of different charities and help and advice lines.

October 2007

## Strengths

The force is committed to the MARAC process. Supported by an independently chaired multi-agency steering group which meets every six weeks, each BCU now holds regular MARAC meetings, which have led to a high incidence of third-party referrals. The force is analysing MARAC data, which shows an early reduction in repeat referrals. A formal review of MARAC is planned for September 2007, the results of which will be published in November.

MARAC was introduced in January 2007; it has been subject of a rapid process of progression and is now properly embedded in the force vision with respect to the strategic and operational response to DA and support for victims.

The success of the implementation programme has been recognised by the award of £15,000 of government funding. The processes that drive MARAC are properly documented and take full account of partner engagement strategies and consultation. A fully tested risk process is the foundation of a strong cohesive system that operates on a minimum standards baseline with clear accountability and audit functions.

The PPSU co-ordinates public protection activity. The unit scrutinises all new data (including the Chief Constable's daily log) to ensure that there is early intervention whenever possible. It utilises analytical products to establish the most appropriate opportunities to run media campaigns. The unit also uses the force's established review product (MCRT) to consider PPU-related cases, including perceived near-misses. The learning from these reviews is considered during force policy development and fed into the force training plan.

The PPSU is also conducting comparative analysis with Surrey NHS in relation to the collection of data from accident and emergency units, in order to establish to what degree there is any under-reporting of DA within the county.

There are effective chief officer and head of profession leads for DA activity. Nationally, the DCC holds the ACPO (DA) portfolio.

Surrey Police has engaged in a number of partnership arrangements to improve its response to DA, including hosting and taking part in multi-agency DV forums, the DV funding group, the multi-agency DA training and development group, DAFG and MARACs.

DA is considered within the local policing plan and action plans to improve the force response to DA are monitored by the SPA. MARACs have recently been introduced and work is being undertaken to formalise the agreement with multiple agencies. A multi-agency steering group has been set up to monitor the early stages of implementation and a full review will begin in September 2007, reporting its findings in December. A local response under MARACs has recently been trialled between Surrey Police and Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Trust.

Critical issues that emanate from MARACs are addressed through monthly inspection audit functions which are further reported to ACPO and the SPA and fed back to BCU SMTs.

The CIS, which includes, crime, intelligence, custody and other functions, and the command and control (ICAD) system are linked, and include a flagging system to highlight previous incidents of DA. DA intelligence is appropriately considered within the NIM framework

October 2007

ensuring that relevant (risk-assessed) cases are brought to management attention through the T&CG meetings.

There is a reviewed and revised DA manual of guidance published on the force intranet. The guidance relates specifically to roles and responsibilities of investigators and supervisors when engaged in DA investigations. Compliance with policy and procedures is monitored by PPSU supervisors on a monthly basis during PPIU performance visits, by regular audits of CIS and through customer satisfaction surveys.

Each officer has been issued with a laminated aide-memoir card containing a number of mandatory questions, which must be undertaken when making initial DA enquiries. During group interviews officers and call- and incident-handling staff showed a good knowledge of what they are required to do when receiving a complaint of DA and what to do during the initial enquiry. Furthermore, on CIS and on the intranet there is advice and guidance on what to do, how to do it and when to do it during and investigation. There was also clarity among officers and staff about the vulnerability of children at risk from DA incidents and the importance of completing the 'child coming to notice' 39/24 form in order that any identified risk posed to a child can be formally assessed.

The force has adopted a 16-point risk plan used by front-line officers when dealing with cases of DA. The risk assessment forms the basis of a wider consideration of future risk planning tailored to individual need.

A dedicated sergeant reviews all risk elements of an incident in a wider context to inform the further policing response. The post is supported by an effective administrative resource. The PPSU employs a risk co-ordinator who conducts corporate standard checks and links into BCUs to provide real-time feedback and support where necessary.

The PPSU also supports the risk management process by holding a quarterly meeting, chaired by a member of the SMT, that is used as a forum to discuss best practice and identify critical risk issues.

The provision of monthly statistical returns from BCUs, capturing qualitative and quantitative data, enables a more focused approach to auditing and accountability

A training needs analysis in relation to DA has been conducted throughout the force and informs the delivery of training. All officers and staff have received specific training in how to respond to DA incidents. DA staff receive a one-week specialist course in addition to multi-agency training.

The PPSU has negotiated a one-week slot to deliver a public protection (including DA) input on every probationer course. Additional DA inputs are given during the operational leaders' course and inspectors' statutory responsibilities training, and to CRB, IHC, PCSOs and detectives. The force utilises the Centrex (now NPIA) modular training packages.

Surrey Police has a published deployment policy. Incidents are recorded on the CIS and DA investigators are automatically notified by the DA flag contained within the investigation screen. An audit is periodically conducted by the force crime registrar as part of National Crime Recording Standard compliance monitoring. The DCC takes a keen interest in incidents of DA and personally dip-samples cases to ensure compliance with the published force policy in relation to arrest, investigation, victim care and the appropriateness of flagging.

October 2007

Audit controls are in existence to ensure that staff remain focused on servicing the needs of victims of DA: responses are monitored by first-line supervisors, force control room supervisors cannot close incidents of DA until there has been appropriate supervision; the quality of initial reports is checked to ensure Home Office Counting Rules are complied with; and supervisors within the PPIUs monitor all live investigations. Effective audit functions also provide for the timely identification of individual capability issues, through assessment of comparable BCU data. Audit functions are conducted every three months with independent auditing undertaken by the force registrar.

The force conducts a structured PPIU monthly health check which includes a focus on DA investigation. This process is supported by a more detailed six-monthly analysis which leads to a detailed report and presentation to BCU SMTs, ACPO and the SPA. On a local basis, the PPIU supervisors have regular supervision sessions with their staff.

Strategic and operational issues and points of learning are promulgated through a variety of formal meetings held with key staff at properly diarised points.

The PPSU also conducts regular DA audits including dip samples of both live and closed DA investigations. Specific data from these audits is included in the wider performance framework, allowing chief officers to challenge and support those who are both responsible and accountable for the delivery of effective DA investigation.

Force policy sets out minimum staffing levels. Supervisory levels are equitable across the force. Abstractions are monitored by PPSU supervisors during monthly inspection visits and any issues are fed back to the BCU SMT.

A matrix has been developed to assess potential risk; this assists in both the prioritisation and level of response to DA cases. Surrey Police has developed a DA risk assessment for all partner/ex-partner incidents. The evaluation is conducted by a trained specialist officer and action is taken on the basis of the potential and perceived impact of harm.

The assessment also incorporates risks to children and links in with other disciplines investigated by the PPIUs.

The force has invested heavily in media support to push the DA agenda, including multi-agency campaigns which have targeted vulnerable groups at key locations during periods which analysis suggests will have the greatest impact.

The CIS is used to manage and supervise DA investigations. All DV data is regularly collected on a corporate spreadsheet, analysed by the PPSU and shared with BCUs. The data informs the strategic development of DA services and supports regular performance visits to PPIUs.

During performance visits wider discussion is held with PPIU staff (including supervisors) and BCU SMTs to ensure that risk is being assessed appropriately, especially in light of the recent requirement to complete DV risk assessments. Within Surrey there is an appropriate response to repeat victimisation cases, emerging trends are recognised and multi-agency action plans are being developed to reduce re-offending. HMIC also notes that supervisors are able to ensure that DV risk assessments are appropriately supervised within the force.

As a result of the development of multi-agency interdependency there is clear evidence of joint problem solving of DA cases with partners. There are numerous referral opportunities

October 2007

for victims of DA. Perpetrators can also be referred to the MARAC process and some will be monitored on the Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme . This is a probation service programme for offenders and forms part of their community sentence.

The co-location of PPIUs assists in an efficient intelligence flow between disciplines. Children found at the scene of DA incidents are automatically referred via form 39/24 to child abuse officers, who in turn share information with the local health authority and social services. The receipt and referral of such notifications is tracked on the CIS and management data spreadsheet.

### **Work in progress**

The corporate spreadsheet is being reviewed for 2007/08 and a new MARAC spreadsheet is being developed that will provide information for the quarterly reviews of PPIUs.

The PPSU has liaised closely with the team who are developing a new force CIS (Project Enterprise) to ensure that it meets user requirements for DA investigation.

A DA steering group has been set up to provide support to staff, identify best practice and ensure corporacy.

October 2007

**Protecting Vulnerable People – Public Protection**GRADE **EXCELLENT****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

October 2007

greater consistency in MAPPA practice. The guidance outlines four considerations that are key to the delivery of effective public protection.

- 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**

Surrey Police has implemented a central PPRMU that manages the MAPPA process. There is clear accountability within the PPRMU structure. Nine dedicated RMOs are located within divisional PPIUs and report to centrally based dedicated supervisors (detective sergeants and a detective inspector) within the PPRMU at headquarters. These staff are supported by a MAPPA co-ordinator and a dedicated administrator. The detective chief inspector and detective inspector also manage the force POLIT. The linking of these two areas of business is highly innovative and builds on the close working relationship that these two departments previously had. All staff within the PPRMU concentrate exclusively on public protection.

The force has taken cognisance of draft ACPO guidelines in determining staffing levels for the RMO role, and has 12 RMOs who manage a total of 457 registered offenders located between the four BCUs; they are line-managed by a dedicated, appropriately trained sergeant. The force has adopted a model in which professional management of RMOs is carried out by the PPRMU. All RMOs are co-located alongside colleagues performing other PVP disciplines, to increase the cross-flow of intelligence and dynamic risk assessment across all areas of business.

The protection of vulnerable people (PVP) responsibility is a sub-discipline of the PPIUs based on each BCU. The structure, systems and other contextual factors which govern PVP investigations are generic and detailed within the PVP overview above.

The Surrey Police website ([www.surrey.police.uk/psafety\\_item.asp?artid=4694](http://www.surrey.police.uk/psafety_item.asp?artid=4694)) provides useful information about investigations into child abuse, vulnerable adult abuse and DA, missing person enquiries and the management of dangerous offenders. The website also provides useful hyperlinks to a number of different charities and help and advice lines.

### **Strengths**

The ACC (SO) has specific responsibilities in relation to the public protection portfolio. He is supported by a central PPSU headed by a detective superintendent. The ACC (SO) attends the strategic management board (SMB), which is chaired by the detective superintendent.

Surrey procedures for public protection are found within the force strategic vision document.

October 2007

The force manages any cases for review in line with guidance documented in the *Public Protection Manual* endorsed by the SMB.

The force SOP provides clear guidance on the management of identified dangerous offenders. The head of profession also attends the SMB to ensure corporate links at an accountable and senior level. This process has the effect of capturing those cases that do not fit MAPPA criteria. The SOP also provides clear direction and guidance in terms of resources and trigger plans.

All policies relating to PVP are subject to quarterly review against current local and national priorities. The PPSU has ensured that policy reviews are measured in the interim against the draft ACPO guidelines. Any changes are also considered against current role profiles, which are validated through consultation processes that engage headquarters personnel and SMT. Sign-off and endorsement are agreed at ACPO level. All policies are adequately cross-referenced to departmental and force business plans.

The policy for public protection was reviewed in March 2007, and the RMO role profile was reviewed and adjusted in June 2007 to take proper account of current and potential future demand.

The force has ensured that resilience is maintained within public protection and other PVP disciplines through clearly documented SOPs which specify that RMOs, in line with other PVP staff, will not be abstracted to other functions and duties. This shows a clear focus and determination on the part of the force to manage risk in a timely and accountable process.

In cases where individuals are assessed as falling outside MAPPA criteria but still present a potential risk, intelligence is submitted through established NIM processes. Risk is assessed and action plans are developed and considered at BCU T&CG meetings. Local officers are briefed on the details and are made aware of any issues which have led to concern. The local BCU PPIU detective inspector is notified of the circumstances and has a responsibility to ensure that the force response is both proportionate and necessary. Other agencies are considered as part of the risk management process, and if necessary information is shared subject to agreed and established disclosure protocol agreements.

The force ensures that a corporate and consistent approach to MAPPA is achieved by appropriate attendance of a senior manager who can influence and direct resources at all levels. Level 3 meetings are chaired by the PPSU detective chief inspector jointly with senior probation officer representation. Level 2 meetings are chaired by the BCU PPIU detective inspector. A headquarters detective inspector (risk management unit (RMU)) also attends level 2 meetings.

Single-agency MAPPA level 1 meetings are held monthly on each BCU. The meetings are used to consider potential risk and ensure that appropriate action plans are developed in anticipation of any reoffending, including possible referral to level 2. The meetings ensure that there is clear accountability, and previous action points are reviewed to ensure that they have been undertaken by named individuals. Appropriate minutes are taken at each meeting and recorded on ViSOR for audit purposes.

The PPRMU and PPSU co-ordinate all levels of MAPPA to ensure consistency, and provide a dedicated member of support staff to minute level 2 and level 3 meetings. Quarterly

October 2007

returns are collated from each BCU and are examined and tested for compliance with the SOP. A report is compiled for notification to SMTs in each BCU, the PPSU SMT and ACPO. The SPA is provided with an update report for scrutiny purposes every six months.

Key individuals' details are flagged on the force CIS and the monitoring of relevant ICAD incidents also ensures that RMOs are alerted to any intelligence relating to ViSOR core nominals.

Review dates for level 1 and 2 MAPPAs are identified through the ViSOR system. The force routinely trawls all available data sources prior to these meetings to ensure that any new intelligence is considered.

Surrey Police staff engaged in MAPPAs are required to return monthly key performance indicators which are considered by the chief officer team. This requirement is supported by regular attendance at the PPSU focus groups by PPRMU supervisors. These meetings are used to ensure a corporate response to MAPPAs. Risk management plans are reviewed during formal multi-agency meetings to ensure they remain dynamic. The minutes of these meetings are routinely entered on the ViSOR system. Currently the force ensures that there are bi-monthly meetings attended by all RMU staff (both at headquarters and within PPIUs).

Job descriptions for detective chief inspectors, detective inspectors, detective sergeants and RMOs are up-to-date and accurately reflect the role requirements.

In the absence of national accredited role-specific training, the force has developed a bespoke training package (delivered in a half-day presentation) that fully encompasses the role of the MAPPAs chair. The training has been designed to support the critical nature of the role with a clear emphasis on adopting best practice from experiential learning. This training has been made available to key partners.

The PPRMU is negotiating with the training department to ensure that appropriate training is given to all officers. A training matrix has been completed which details both the essential and the desirable training courses for all officers and staff within the PPRMU. An SOP has been developed which details the minimum training requirements for RMOs and their supervisors. PPRMU detective inspectors (in conjunction with staff from the training department) have developed training sessions on risk management, which are delivered to BCU and specialist crime officers. Furthermore, input is being developed for student police officers and there is already an input into the training of crime management department detectives and custody officers.

All RMOs are properly trained in ViSOR and Risk Matrix 2000; in addition the force has ensured that all RMOs attend Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre training and are able to attend nationally recognised conferences where appropriate. The PPSU is presently researching training opportunities on a national level, but meanwhile ensures that RMOs are properly supported in role through a formal RMO meeting held every six weeks, chaired by the PPRMU, which is a platform to instruct on national priorities. The afternoon session is devoted to peer learning opportunities, case studies, and best practice principles. This process is enhanced through the inclusion of other key agencies who participate actively.

Surrey Police is the only police force that is currently delivering bespoke training to PPRMU supervisors to allow them to preview illegal images forensically on computers; this ability

October 2007

extends both the proactive and reactive capabilities of the force in relation to public protection investigations.

There are frequent practitioner (RMO) meetings at which concerns can be raised, good practice shared and updated legislation considered.

The force use of ViSOR is subject to internal scrutiny, in order to ensure that there is only properly vetted access and that those who use the system are properly trained in its use. There are dedicated ViSOR trainers/advisers located within the PPRMU at headquarters. The product is subject to regular monthly audit.

The RMOs work alongside the PPIUs located on each BCU. This has led to close working relationships between the public protection disciplines. The RMOs' role is well understood within the force and they are often called upon to assist in major crime enquires or to play a part in the PPIUs' contribution to community impact assessments.

RMOs have a close working relationship with specialists in other PPIU-related disciplines. The response to registered sex offender management is comprehensively published and specifically targeted at those who may investigate sexual assault cases and at investigators attached to the major crime teams.

POLIT staff regularly assist RMOs with sex offender visits. The PPRMU and RMOs also assist the POLIT with search warrants. There is clear evidence that the RMOs regularly submit graded intelligence relating to CIS nominals for the benefit of all officers.

There is a strong link between the force intelligence bureau (MAPPA desk) and the centralised team, ensuring that intelligence is shared by the PPRMU. The force intelligence bureau and the PPRMU have devised a strategy for information sharing and working together under NIM principles.

The force T&CG processes intelligence requirement seeks intelligence on key individuals and identified 'risk spots'.

The multi-agency SMB commissions a well-structured quarterly audit, inspects the quality of MAPPA management and suggests areas for improvement. Both the audit and the new multi-agency protocol (work in progress) will assist in identifying joint objectives and targets.

The PPRMU is in the process of developing links with local mental health units to assist in the early identification of MAPPA offenders and their management upon release. Formal links have so far been established with three mental health units which have started to submit referrals for multi-agency consideration.

All RMU staff are management-vetted and have the opportunity to self-refer to OH at any time. OH has access to external specialist support if required. Supervisors of RMOs have been briefed on the identification of officers who may suffer adverse effects as a result of working within such a challenging specialism, and they also have a responsibility to refer staff to OH should they perceive any cause for concern. Public protection officers participate in an ongoing mandatory programme of OH support groups and have access to confidential counselling paid for by the force.

The PPRMU monitors resilience and demand on a monthly basis through a focused audit and inspection regime, supported by statistical returns from BCUs based on qualitative and

October 2007

quantitative data.

PPIU sergeants are not required to perform other functions, and as a consequence are able to divide their time between key administrative functions and focused proactive interventions with their staff. ViSOR reflects adequate supervisory direction and guidance.

Each supervisor is required to conduct a minimum number of dip-sample checks for quality assurance and these provide audit trails back to other force systems.

The detective inspector and detective sergeant from the PPRMU attend level 1, 2 and 3 MAPPA meetings to ensure that force policy is complied with. Information exchange internally and with partners, is recorded and auditable on the ViSOR database. Audit and quality control are also considered at bi-monthly PPRMU meetings and at the monthly ordinary general meetings.

Level 2 and 3 MAPPA meetings are regularly chaired by PPRMU staff. Surrey Police is predominantly responsible for organising and co-ordinating these meetings. The MAPPA administrator (jointly funded by the probation service) performs the various functions associated with holding multi-agency meetings, including circulating agendas and recording/circulating minutes. In support of these meetings memoranda of understanding have been agreed which allow information to be disclosed between agencies, subject to disclosure considerations.

Level 2 meetings have a standing agenda item entitled 'Information Sharing' to facilitate discussion and safety/action planning between agencies on identified issues relating to vulnerable people. The force documents all activity in this forum to ensure integrity of process and progression of actions identified.

The PPSU conducts a monthly health check of each divisional PPIU (including the force response to MAPPA). This is complemented by an additional (more in-depth) six-monthly analysis/health check of each BCU's MAPPA, the results of which are considered by PPSU management, BCU SMTs and the ACC (SO). At a more local level, PPIU supervisors hold regular performance meetings with RMOs.

### **Work in progress**

Building on existing arrangements, a new multi-agency protocol has been developed jointly by Surrey Police and the local probation service. The final draft has been circulated to the agencies with a statutory duty to cooperate' for agreement and signature.

At the time of reporting, there has been widespread buy-in from partner agencies, with the force awaiting formal agreement from just one key agency before the protocol can be launched publicly.

The force is currently reviewing policy on vetting requirements, to ensure that all staff who have access to ViSOR information have appropriate clearance.

An SOP has been developed which states that all RMOs have to attend an annual OH assessment. The force now awaits publication of ACPO guidelines on health screening.

October 2007

A training needs analysis has been completed for all staff within the PPRMU, and a bid has been made for courses to be undertaken as soon as possible. The bid will be reviewed over the next 12 months.

In light of the new centralised departmental structure, a review is taking place of the job descriptions for MAPPA advisers, administrators, co-ordinators and risk management officers, and these will be amended where needed.

Approximate minimum staffing levels have been set within the force following a review of workloads and officer and staff numbers in February 2007. The PPRMU is currently awaiting the publication of ACPO guidelines before conducting a further review of resource allocation.

At the time of reporting, the force policy/guidance available to officers on the intranet does not reflect current practice or recognise the recent change to a centralised structure of the PPRMU. The force is currently reviewing policy/guidance against draft ACPO guidance. New SOPs have been written; however, these await the publication of the new ACPO guidance before they are published in turn. As an interim measure, all current guidance has been reviewed to ensure that force policy reflects the draft ACPO guidance.

A Surrey multi-agency protocol also now exists (the draft is at the consultation stage) which details each agency's responsibilities.

### **Areas for improvement**

The force needs to reconsider the level of attendance at level 3 MAPPA meetings. Although within Surrey the structures and processes at all three levels appear robust, the national MAPPA guidance emphasises that representatives must have the authority to make decisions committing their agencies' involvement, since if decisions are referred the effectiveness of the multi-agency operation is weakened.

**RECOMMENDATION 5:** Surrey police needs to review policy in relation to level III MAPPA attendance to ensure that Surrey Police is represented at the most effective level and that a meaningful commitment can be made by the force in relation to supporting joint intervention tactics and agreement as to resource allocation.

October 2007

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons

GRADE

GOOD

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1	21	21	0

### National contextual factors

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

### Contextual factors

Every year there are around 210,000 missing person incidents reported in the UK. About half of these involve teenagers. Most people return home within a few days, but thousands do not. The Police National Missing Persons Bureau is a specialist police unit which acts as a centre for the exchange of information connected with the search for missing persons both nationally and internationally. It is based at New Scotland Yard and serves UK forces and overseas agencies. It focuses on cross-matching missing persons with unidentified bodies or people. Surrey Police has sought the advice and guidance of the Police National Missing Persons Bureau and Crimestoppers in many cases.

There are close links between missing persons and other PPIU disciplines missing person specialists have been added to the PPIU structure and missing person investigations are now a sub-discipline of the PPIUs based on each BCU. The structure, systems and other contextual factors which govern missing person investigation are generic within PPIUs, and are detailed within the PVP overview above. Although a relatively recent development, this has already been successful, with examples of success including improved strategic co-ordination with local children's homes and assistance given to a local mental hospital to improve its missing person contingency planning. The inclusion of the multiple disciplines within a single co-located unit, supervised by dedicated detective inspectors, is delivering improved communication between disciplines, improved intelligence flow, more effective management of risk and a higher quality of service to the public.

### Strengths

The PPSU conducts regular audits and quality control exercises to ensure that the PPIUs and non-specialist officers have an understanding of, and are compliant with, force policy in relation to the investigation of missing persons (which is in turn compliant with ACPO guidance). The PPSU also conducts regular missing person audits, including dip samples of

October 2007

both live and closed missing person investigations. Specific data from these audits is included in the wider force performance framework, allowing ACPO to challenge and support those who are both responsible and accountable for the delivery of effective missing person investigation (see the Developing Practice boxes below and the Performance Management section above).

The existing CIS, which links crime, intelligence, custody and other functions, has been exploited to good effect and is utilised to record, manage and supervise missing person reports. A tracking system has been developed to manage investigations. Additionally a corporate spreadsheet is maintained of all missing person reports (see 'Work in progress' below).

Each BCU is collating data in relation to any influences or precursor events which lead to young people going missing repeatedly. The analysis of the data has brought a more focused approach to intervention, which has in turn led to a reduction in repeat missing person reports. The PPSU has also led an innovative approach to customer surveys in relation to missing persons (see the Developing Practice boxes below). During the return interview the initial contact is asked whether they are willing to speak to police about customer satisfaction issues. If they are agreeable, they are contacted further and a customer service questionnaire is completed. The learning from this process is fed back both at a generic BCU level and, if appropriate, to individual officers.

A bespoke specialist missing persons course has been developed, along with a risk-assessed media strategy which ensures that any media appeal is tailored to the circumstances of the case.

In recognition of the close links between missing persons and other PPIU disciplines dedicated missing person specialists have been added to the PPIU structure. Although a relatively recent development, this initiative has been successful, with examples of success including improved multi-agency strategic co-ordination with local children's homes and assistance given to a local mental hospital to improve its missing person contingency planning. Further evidence of multi-agency working can be seen in the service level agreements and protocols in place between the force, its BCUs and partners such as Surrey and Borders NHS Trust, various children's homes and mental health institutions (see 'Work in progress' below).

The missing persons specialist investigators have also been utilised to maintain a focus on historic cases (see [www.surrey.police.uk/news\\_item.asp?artid=6604](http://www.surrey.police.uk/news_item.asp?artid=6604)). Furthermore, missing persons is a standing item on a subcommittee of the local safeguarding children board (see Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse above).

There is an accountability framework, with a named chief officer within the force having specific portfolio responsibility for the management of missing person investigations. The ACC (SO) who holds this responsibility ensures that those with operational responsibility are accountable at a strategic level through the force performance framework. Operationally, the borough-based duty inspector (usually the TPT inspector) has responsibility for missing persons, with a chief inspector critical incident manager having county-wide responsibility. The investigation of missing persons falls upon the missing person specialist role, which is part of the PPIU structure (see 'Contextual factors' above). There is clarity about the role of the SIO within this operational structure.

Compliance with policy (which is in turn compliant with ACPO guidance) and procedures is monitored by PPSU supervisors on a monthly basis during PPIU performance visits, by

October 2007

regular audits of CIS and through customer satisfaction surveys. A missing persons manual has been published on the intranet: this sets out the roles and responsibilities of Surrey Police personnel, and standard operating procedures for specialist investigators and supervisors. Interviews with operational staff confirm that there is clarity about their responsibilities, and there is a 'what to do, how to do it and when to do it'-style SOP accessible on both CIS and the intranet.

All force control room staff and initial response officers have had specific training in force policy on the investigation of missing person incidents. There are clear lines of supervision and review systems to ensure that dynamic risk assessment is continually conducted, ensuring the right level of supervision and force response.

As part of the risk assessment process, consideration is given to the threshold at which an SIO from the major crime team will take over the investigation. Open missing person investigations are automatically included within NIM, BCU and T&CG considerations.

The PPSU has negotiated a one-week slot to deliver public protection input (including the policy on missing persons) to every probationer course. Additional inputs are given during the operational leaders' course and inspectors' statutory responsibilities training, and to Criminal Records Bureau, Incident Handling Centre Staff, PCSOs and force detectives.

The force utilises the Centrex (now NPIA) modular training packages. The force has also issued each officer with a missing persons booklet based on the NPIA national guidance, containing a number of prompts which must be followed when making initial missing person enquiries.

A training needs analysis has been conducted and recommendations accepted by the training prioritisation group. The PPSU is currently involved in designing a questionnaire for an e-learning gap analysis.

The PPSU collates monthly data across the public protection disciplines, including data relating to missing persons. Key elements of the PPSU missing persons data are included in force performance data, which is considered by ACPO during regular performance meetings (see the Developing Practice boxes below and the Performance Management section above).

### **Work in progress**

An improved risk assessment process for missing persons is currently being developed by the force.

The missing person spreadsheet is currently in the process of being reviewed for 2007/08.

The PPSU has liaised closely with the team which is developing a new force CIS (Project Enterprise) to ensure it meets user requirements for missing person investigation.

Surrey Police is engaging with partners in order to identify strategies to reduce missing person incidents, and is developing joint protocols for dealing with particular groups of vulnerable missing persons, such as fostered children and mental health services. A missing persons working group is in place, at which any person can bring cases to the table to problem-solve and search for strategic solutions, and at which multi-agency working can be discussed and explored and best practice identified.

*October 2007*

### **Areas for improvement**

Although there is evidence of multi-agency and partnership activity; Surrey Police could do more to develop agreed multi-agency strategies, joint objectives and targets and to develop joint responses to both repeat and anticipated missing person incidents.

Missing person enquiries should be evaluated to determine what works; and the new organisational learning co-ordinator could assist in developing systems for feedback to the missing persons working group.

October 2007

## *Developing Practice*

**INSPECTION AREA:** Protecting vulnerable people

**TITLE:** Management data and performance monitoring

**PROBLEM/OPPORTUNITY:**

- The volume of activity within the PPIUs, particularly activity that was not performance-driven, was not being measured.
- There was a need to provide the ability to evidence the competing demands upon the PPIUs.
- There was an opportunity to review and justify resource levels/funding.
- There was an opportunity to verify compliance with force policy and procedures.
- There was an opportunity to look at the amount of work carried out with partner agencies.

**SOLUTION:**

- In April 2006, the PPSU introduced a range of management and performance monitoring requirements for the BCU-based PPIUs, to be collected monthly. Where possible this data is captured automatically by the force's corporate development department.
- Key elements of the PPSU data were extracted onto the force SPECS performance regime, within which BCU commanders are accountable to ACPO, and collated.
- Corporate spreadsheets have been developed and are maintained within each of the BCU public protection teams. The aim is to standardise key processes to be followed by specialists and supervisors and to identify resource requirements and productivity.
- Mainly quantitative statistical data is used to review compliance of each PPIU with SOPs and policy. This review is carried out by PPSU supervisors through monthly audits of the CIS and of working practices, including with partner agencies. This qualitative approach substantiates or negates conclusions drawn from the statistics.

**OUTCOME(S):**

- The PPSU submits a monthly paper, including graphical representations, to accompany the SPECS data; the audience for this report is BCU commanders and ACPO. Some data is indicative of compliance and performance while other measures are indicators of volume. The data enables greater understanding of the business areas, allowing supervisors to identify best practice and areas for development, and will inform resourcing according to demand.
- A six-monthly performance assessment is produced that draws together the statistics, the results of the audits, and outcomes from regular consultation with PPIUs. The paper analyses this information, presents conclusions and generates recommendations. The assessment is shared with SMTs and helps to formulate discussions around compliance, best practice, performance improvement and appropriate staffing levels.

October 2007

- The data has allowed for greater understanding of variations in demand and response, informing caseload management and future resourcing, and as a result the SOPs are under review.
- The data has generated a far greater understanding of the volume of work carried out with partner agencies and an improved focus on priorities.
- The need to monitor performance and build previously uncollected data in these specialist areas, and the value of being able to do so, have been recognised at every level. The process of reviewing the statistics required next year, and the way in which the data is collated, is already under way.

**FORCE CONTACT:** Public Protection Strategy Unit, Surrey Police Headquarters, Guildford – 01483 484807

**INSPECTION AREA:** Protecting vulnerable people

**TITLE:** Training

**PROBLEM/OPPORTUNITY:**

- There was no formalised structure of training across all public protection disciplines.
- There was an opportunity to link in with the training department to produce accredited and standardised training in public protection on a corporate basis.
- There was an opportunity to raise the profile of public protection through specialised training.
- There was an opportunity to quality-assure public protection training against the Centrex learning packages.
- Early identification of suitably skilled and trained officers for roles within public protection.

**SOLUTION:**

- Public protection training was introduced for new recruits within the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme.
- Specialist domestic abuse and missing person courses for officers carrying out investigations and enquiries within the PPIUs have been identified and delivered.
- There is a heightened awareness on the part of all non-specialist staff of their roles and responsibilities in public protection disciplines.
- There has been liaison with Centrex to identify appropriate training at all levels.
- Potential public protection officers are now identified at point of recruitment and receive subsequent training in this career path.

October 2007

**OUTCOME(S):**

- In collaboration with the training school, the PPSU has developed and implemented a dedicated week of public protection training for probationers during their Initial Police Learning and Development Programme.
- Specialist training for DA and missing person investigators has been provided. Both these courses incorporate Centrex modular training material. Officers are now more competent, better equipped and better able to carry out their specialist roles.
- There has been recognition of a need to conduct knowledge checks with non-specialist staff in the area of PVP. This process will identify staff training needs for.
- There is a need to raise the profile of PVP, to identify suitable opportunities for raising awareness of public protection work, and to consider succession planning.
- Training has been modified to reflect legislative changes in the PVP arena.
- The streaming of new recruits into the specialised area of public protection has commenced.
- Opportunities have arisen to explore the possibility of linking child abuse investigation training and vulnerable adult training in the area of Achieving Best Evidence.

**FORCE CONTACT:** Public Protection Strategy Unit, Surrey Police Headquarters, Guildford – 01483484807

**INSPECTION AREA:** Protecting vulnerable people

**TITLE:** Consultation

**PROBLEM/OPPORTUNITY:**

- It was identified that no formal feedback process existed for the force's partner agencies to report their level of satisfaction with the services provided by Surrey Police.
- The force customer satisfaction surveys did not include people affected by CAI, DA or missing persons.
- There was no formal consultation process in place with the PPIUs to identify any issues that gave cause for concern.

**SOLUTION:**

- A questionnaire has been developed in consultation with the force research department which seeks the views of partner agencies on the service delivered by Surrey Police.
- A customer survey questionnaire has been developed for officers to use (with consent) on victims of and carers of those affected by child abuse and DA and those who have either reported or have been reported as a missing person.
- The PPSU has formulated a process for monthly visits to the four BCUs, which include audit and review of investigations. These visits are followed by quarterly visits to PPIU management teams and separate visits to divisional SMTs.

October 2007

**OUTCOME(S):**

- The force is now able to quality-check its working relationship with partner agencies, including social services, health services and the probation service. The resultant information is fed back to divisions to improve practices and performance.
- The PPSU now has professional management of customer satisfaction surveys. This has involved direct conversations with victims and carers of victims to gauge their satisfaction with Surrey Police. To enhance this initiative even further, a workshop was held with 13 survivors of DA and this was then evaluated by an independent facilitator and outreach officer.
- Throughout this consultation process, healthy discussions have taken place around the issues affecting the divisions, the organisation and its customers. This now provides a continuing process involving all levels of management. As a result, staffing levels have been adapted and increased, supervision has improved and divisions are now able to identify and focus on local issues. Importantly, SMTs now have a far greater understanding of the work carried out within the public protection arena.
- To improve the force's profile further, enhance its corporate image and encourage further proactive relations with all its customers, the PPSU is now preparing a media strategy. The force is also seeking to raise public awareness and provide the public with reassurance in these business areas.

**FORCE CONTACT:** Public Protection Strategy Unit, Surrey Police Headquarters, Guildford – 01483 484807

October 2007

## Recommendations

### **Recommendation 1**

Surrey Police are keen to move as fast as possible to embed neighbourhood policing. HMIC recognise the forces commitment to this objective, however we recommend that the force reviews its NP communication and training strategies in relation to key partner agencies in order to improve notification, consultation and gain a wider understanding of external inhibitors to fast change processes.

### **Recommendation 2**

Surrey Police publish 4 key internal messages; customer service, control of crime, confident communities and capable, supported staff (known as the 4Cs). The force should consider how it can further improve the communication of these objectives to employees to ensure that they understand the meaning behind the message and how they can personally contribute to improving Surrey Police's performance.

### **Recommendation 3**

HMIC conducted an audit of PDRs within Surrey as part of this inspection and found a number of areas for improvement. It is acknowledged that only a small number of PDRs were inspected in this process, however Surrey should review compliance with their PDR policy to assess whether HMICs findings are replicated on a larger scale and take appropriate action.

### **Recommendation 4**

Notwithstanding the day-to-day good relationships identified between child abuse investigators and colleagues from partner agencies (predominantly social services), the force should consider further development of joint training with all partners involved in CAI, and seek to conduct joint inspections of related multi-agency processes with partnership colleagues.

### **Recommendation 5**

Surrey police needs to review policy in relation to level III MAPPA attendance to ensure that Surrey Police is represented at the most effective level and that a meaningful commitment can be made by the force in relation to supporting joint intervention tactics and agreement as to resource allocation.

## Appendix: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

### A

ABC	Activity-based costing
ACC	Assistant chief constable
ACC (SO)	Assistant chief constable (special operations)
ACC (TO)	Assistant chief constable (territorial operations)
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
APP	Annual policing plan

### B

BCS	British Crime Survey
BCU	Basic command unit

### C

CAI	Child abuse investigation
CDRP	Crime and disorder reduction partnership
CIAG	Community incident action group
CIS	Crime information system
CMD	Crime management department
COG	Chief Officer Group

### D

DA	Domestic abuse
----	----------------

October 2007

DCC Deputy chief constable

DV Domestic violence

**E**

EPIC PPP Enforcement, Prevention, Intelligence and Communication – Police, Public, Partners

**H**

HMIC Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

HR Human resources

**I**

ICAD

ICT Information and communications technology

IT Information technology

**J**

JAG Joint action group

**L**

LAA Local area agreement

**M**

MAPPA Multi-agency public protection arrangements

MARAC Multi-agency risk assessment conference

MCIT Major crime investigation team

October 2007

MSF            Most similar forces

**N**

NIM            National Intelligence Model

NMT            Neighbourhood mapping tool

NNPT          National Neighbourhood Policing Team

NPIA           National Policing Improvement Agency

NPT            Neighbourhood Policing team

NSO            Neighbourhood specialist officer

**O**

OH             Occupational health

**P**

PAT            Problem analysis triangle

PCSO          Police community support officer

PDR            Performance development review

PND            Penalty notice for disorder

POLIT          Paedophile online investigation team

PPI            Personal performance indicator

PPIU          Public protection investigation unit

PPRMU        Public protection risk management unit

PPSU          Public protection strategy unit

PRINCE2      Projects in Controlled Environments 2

PVP            Protecting vulnerable people

**Q**

QAAG Quality assurance and auditing group

QoSC Quality-of-service commitment

**R**

RMO Risk management officer

RMU Risk management unit

**S**

SA Strategic assessment

SARA Scanning, analysis, response and assessment

SIO Senior investigating officer

SMB Strategic management board

SMT Senior management team

SOP Standard operating procedure

SPA Surrey Police Authority

SPECS Surrey performance evaluation of computerised statistics

SSCB Surrey safeguarding children board

SSCPB Safer and stronger communities partnership board

SSD Strategic support department

**T**

T&CG Tasking and co-ordination group

TNP Targeted Neighbourhood Policing

TPT Targeted patrol team

**V**

ViSOR      Violent and Sex Offenders Register