

HUMBERSIDE POLICE AUTHORITY
PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

31 OCTOBER 2006

- PRESENT:-** Councillor Tress in the Chair
- Elected Members:-** Councillors De Freitas, Rudd and Uzzell
- Independent Members:-** Mr S Abdul Rahman and Mr G Southern
- Magistrate Members:-** Mr A Smith JP
- Officers:-** Mr J Bates, Director of Performance and Resources, Mr P Wainwright, Performance and Resources Manager, Mr N Kingston, Assistant Chief Executive, Mr A Leaver, Assistant Chief Constable (O), Inspector S Beveridge, Chief Superintendent S White, Mr D Porter, Performance Development Unit, Ms V Wise, Consultation and Partnership Officer and Ms J Smith and Mr R Gray, Performance and Resources Officers.

The Committee met at Pacific Exchange, Kingston upon Hull.

- 22** **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST/OFFERS OF GIFTS OR HOSPITALITY –**
The Chair reminded Members of the need to record any personal or prejudicial interests in items on the agenda and to disclose any relevant receipt or offering of gifts or hospitality.
- No interests were declared or disclosures made.
- 23** **APOLOGIES** – Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Black and Mrs Groves.
- 24** **MINUTES** – **Resolved** – That the minutes of the meeting of this Committee held on 25 July 2006, having been printed and circulated amongst the Members, be taken as read and correctly recorded and be signed by the Chair.
- 25** **UPDATE ON THE MINUTES** – The Performance and Resources Manager referred to (i) minute 7 regarding Banding Assessments and advised that there had been no change since the last results; (ii) minute 9 regarding the five year revised forecast and the Director of Performance and Resources reported that this had been submitted to the last meeting of the Audit and

Strategy Committee, and (iii) minute 14 regarding NCRS and advised that an audit was due to commence at the end of November and an update report would be submitted to the next meeting.

Resolved – That the updates be noted.

- 26 **(18) ACTION SCHEDULE** – An action schedule detailing the progress of actions requested at previous meetings was submitted.

The Performance and Resources Manager referred to minute 63 and reported that the best value review process had been put on hold whilst merger issues were being considered. He advised that the Police and Justice Bill was going through Parliament at the moment and that consideration was still being given to whether best value was still to be part of a Police Authority's business.

The Assistant Chief Officer (O) referred to minute 6 regarding violent crime and submitted an analysis for 04/05 and 05/06. Members queried whether the increase was attributable to the recent changes in Licensing laws and he advised that although the increase couldn't be fully attributed to this it had led to increased activity on the streets. He indicated that Humberside was recording more violent crime and that this was not reflected throughout the country. He suggested that this may be because it was easier to report crime, however, work had been commissioned to investigate the reasons for the increase.

Resolved – That the action schedule and updates be noted.

- 27 **PRESENTATION - BCU INSPECTION – D DIVISION** – In accordance with minute 50 (05/06) Chief Superintendent White, D Division Commander, attended the meeting and advised that HMIC Staff Officers had re-inspected D Division in August this year. The formal report on this re-inspection would not be received until the imminent Baseline inspection had been conducted, however, he had received verbal feedback. The 8 recommendations from HMIC arising from the original inspection had been revisited and feedback was as follows:- (1) personnel issues should be monitored by a HR professional rather than a Chief Inspector – this post was to be created by the end of March and the action had therefore been signed off; (2) team building activities should be conducted for the Senior Management Team – a number of events had been held and HMIC had reported that they had found the Team to be more settled, cohesive and organised and the action had therefore been signed off; (3) communication strategy was not embedded sufficiently and more evidence of communication with front line staff was required - briefings for Sergeants had been arranged for 4, 11 and 18 December, to which all Members and Officers of the Secretariat were invited to attend, these sessions would cover the performance imperative, how the

Division worked, standards and supervision; (4) training for first line supervisors – it was necessary for more Sergeants to complete the programme and the Force Training Module needed more focus on delivery; (5) performance management – this action was partially completed as above Inspector rank there was a good awareness of performance issues, however, there were some difficulties regarding PCs and Sergeants: a meeting was to be held to develop unit level performance; (6) call handling – praise had been received from HMIC for the way that the Force and the Authority had worked hard to resolve this issue, this action was effectively discharged although more work was still required regarding quality; (7) tactical operation – it had been suggested that more alignment with the NIM was required, good progress had been made and the establishment of daily meetings had led the HMIC to be happy to sign this action off; (8) people on bail – the new NSPIS custody system had introduced more control, the Volume Crime Model had also assisted in this area, the work allocation database was looking at how issues around those who did not answer bail could be tied in.

To conclude he advised that HMIC had indicated from their re-inspection visit that the right policing structure was in place in the Division, that improvements were visible and that the Division was working towards the priorities set by the Authority and the Force. The base of performance was low regarding crime reduction and detections and it was therefore likely that HMIC would revisit to look at those actions that had not been fully resolved. The report would be submitted to Members once it was received.

Members commented on (i) partnership working and the Divisional Commander reported that the re-inspection had been confined to the 8 recommendations arising from the original inspection - the issue of partnerships may be investigated during the inspection in November; (ii) the profile of officers within the Division which the Divisional Commander advised was no different to anywhere else nationally; (iii) the impact of PCSOs who the Divisional Commander confirmed were making a difference and he invited any Member wishing to conduct a patch walk with their local PCSO to contact their Divisional Commander - he referred also to the possibility of using PCSO posts to support/match fund the BID in Myton ward; (iv) whether the communication, training and performance management issues were relevant just to D Division or to the Force to which the Divisional Commander responded that communication was an issue that tended to feature in inspections, that the performance management issue reflected a weakness across the Force and that training was also a Force wide issue, and (v) that whilst the performance issues were real, the staff survey had highlighted staff concerns that the organisation focussed too heavily on performance.

Resolved – That the presentation be noted.

28 (19) **PPAF FOCUS SESSION** – The Chief Executive submitted a report that

provided an update on discussions from the APA PPAF (Policing Performance Assessment Framework) Focus Session held on 17 October 2006 that had been attended by the Performance and Resources Manager.

The Performance and Resources Manager advised that his subsequent presentation would provide a further update.

Resolved – (a) That the report be noted, and (b) that a further update be submitted to the next meeting.

- 29 **(20) PRESENTATION – BASELINE ASSESSMENT AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT** – The Performance and Resources Manager gave a presentation on the results of the Baseline Assessments that had been published by HMIC in October 2006 and the Performance Assessments which compared Forces with others in their MSF groups.

Members queried how the issues highlighted would be picked up and actioned and the Chair advised that work was underway and that significant improvements had been made regarding incident handling. The Performance and Resources Manager advised that the differences between Humberside and other Forces would be looked at to see what improvements needed to be put in place. Some simple wins may be possible as it may have been the way that the evidence was presented that had led to the scores. The Assistant Chief Officer (O) confirmed that improvements needed to be made in certain areas and that some of the results had to do with how the forms had been filled in.

The Director of Performance and Resources indicated that it had been made clear at the meeting with Paul Evans in the summer that PPAF and Banding Assessments were important to the PSU when presenting any case to Ministers for disengaging. He also referred to the importance of comparison results with MSFs and Most Similar BCUs and partnership working, particularly in the area of crime reduction.

The Chair concluded that whilst Humberside was improving so were other Forces.

Resolved – That the presentation be noted.

- 30 **(21) PERFORMANCE AGAINST THE POLICING PLAN 2006/07** – The Chief Constable submitted a report that set out the achievements of Humberside Police in meeting the objectives set out in the Policing Plan 2006/07. The report compared data for the period April - September 2005/06 with April - September 2006/07.

The Assistant Chief Constable (O) and Members commented on the

performance. Particular concerns were raised regarding the percentage of non emergency calls answered within the target of 30 seconds and the Chair indicated that the Command Centre were getting close to the 90% target but that the Crime Centre performance was bringing the overall figure down. It was suggested that consideration may need to be given to separating the targets. It was also suggested that checks needed to be made to ensure that what was being measured was what Members thought would be measured when they set the target earlier in the year.

Reference was also made to the percentage of high priority incidents attended within 30 minutes which, year on year, appeared to be decreasing and it was suggested that an analysis be conducted to identify if there was a particular time of the day when this target was not being met and to compare calls for service with resources available at the time.

Resolved – (a) That the report be noted; (b) that a report be submitted to the Police Authority on 19 December outlining (i) why the target for the percentage of non emergency calls being answered within 30 seconds is not being met and reviewing how this target was set, and (ii) an analysis of why the target for the percentage of high priority incidents attended within 30 minutes is not being met, including details of particular times of day when this is a problem and resource levels at those times.

- 31 **(22) PRESENTATION – LOCAL DOMAIN** – The Performance and Resources Officer gave a presentation setting out the local priorities and performance indicators for 2006/07.

The Consultation and Partnership Manager advised that the performance indicator target for public meetings had been set at a time when it was thought that separate public meetings would be established in Hull. This had not yet happened and was therefore reflected in the figures. The first of these forums was to be held in November.

Reference was made to the “Pride and Respect” category and it was explained that this included issues such as criminal damage and anti social behaviour. It was reported that joint working with local councils was being investigated together with whether the Force was over recording criminal damage. The Director of Performance and Resources advised that criminal damage was an issue that the D Division Challenge meeting was examining at each meeting by comparing the performance of each NPT.

Resolved – That the presentation be noted.

- 32 **(23) STOPS DATA FOR APRIL – JUNE 2006** – The Chief Executive submitted a report that outlined the data for and Stop and Search/Stop and Account encounters carried out by Humberside Police during April – June

2006.

The Consultation and Partnership Officer advised that this was the first report on the matter. She reported on the Authority's duty to monitor the figures and to look for any anomalies. The information would be produced quarterly and submitted to this Committee and to the Independent Advisory Group.

The Assistant Chief Constable (O) commented on (i) the difference between Stop and Talk and Stop and Search, and (ii) the figures leading to arrest, and he explained that the high number of arrests in certain categories in D Division was due to specific intelligence based operations.

The Chair commented that the figures were small so it was difficult to draw any particular conclusions and queried whether it was necessary to commission any research. The Consultation and Partnership Officer advised that a Home Office representative had attended the Stop and Search Project Board and had agreed that it was difficult to draw any conclusions from the figures. The Home Office were looking at Stop and Search and it was suggested that their rating of Humberside's figures be awaited before considering the commissioning of any research. Members agreed with the approach and that there was no need for any independent research to be conducted at this stage.

Resolved – (a) That the figures be noted, and (b) that future reports be received on a quarterly basis.

- 33 **(24) POST IMPLEMENTATION AUDIT AND INSPECTION MAJOR INCIDENT INVESTIGATION** – The Chief Constable submitted a report that detailed the progress made with regards the four recommendations that resulted from the Post Implementation Audit and Inspection of Major Incident Investigation.

Resolved – That the report be noted.

- 34 **(25) NATIONAL STANDARD FOR INCIDENT RECORDING (NSIR): UPDATE REPORT** – The Chief Executive and Chief Constable submitted a joint report that provided an update on progress with the National Standard for Incident Recording, including an update on local issues, current local compliance (for September 2006) and national issues.

Inspector Beveridge commented on the Audit Commission audit, due at the end of November, which would look at NCRS, NSIR and victim satisfaction levels. The Audit would not lead to a grading.

Resolved – (a) That the report be noted, and (b) that regular reports on progress continue to be submitted.

- 35 **(26) NATIONAL STANDARD FOR INCIDENT RECORDING (NSIR) IMPLEMENTATION** - The Chief Constable submitted a report that outlined the progress made with the implementation of the National Standard for Incident Recording within Humberside Police.

Members raised concerns regarding 80% of calls for service relating to non-crime incidents and they discussed the possibility of publicity being undertaken to reduce this number. The Assistant Chief Constable (O) reported that this had been done locally and nationally. Furthermore although the majority of calls related to non crime incidents they were issues that should rightly have been brought to the attention of the Police. An analysis of the incidents was possible and could be provided. Members also commented on the development of further software and it was confirmed that a project group was looking at this matter and tried and tested software would be used.

Resolved – (a) That the report be noted; (b) that further progress reports be submitted as appropriate, and (c) that an analysis of the non crime incidents that make up 80% of the calls for service be submitted to the next meeting of this Committee.

- 36 **(27) OPERATION PEGASUS** – The Chief Executive submitted a report that provided an update on progress being made by the Pegasus Programme Board which met monthly to determine (i) progress towards disengagement from the Police Standards Unit; (ii) delivery of sustained improvement in key areas of performance with an emphasis on volume crime and sanction detections, and (iii) delivery of long term and sustained improvements in volume crime detections and crime reduction.

Members commented on the quality of this report and suggested that it be referred to the Police Authority so that all Members were aware of the wide range of work being undertaken by the Pegasus Programme Board.

Resolved – (a) That the role of Operation Pegasus as detailed in the report be noted; (b) that regular reports on progress continue to be submitted, and (c) that the report be referred to the Police Authority.

- 37 **(28) FRONT LINE POLICING MEASURE 2006** – The Chief Constable submitted a report that advised on the two Annual Data Returns from which the Front Line Policing Measure was calculated.

Members expressed concern at the findings outlined in the report as the Force appeared to be going backwards in terms of figures relating to numbers of frontline policing staff. The Assistant Chief Constable (O) indicated that this could be down to recording errors. Members stressed the

importance of the quality assurance of information provided in reports to a public forum. Data should be checked and known to be accurate before it was publicised.

Resolved – That the information contained in the report be re-examined and a further report be requested.

- 38** **(29) ACPO EXCELLENCE IN POLICING PERFORMANCE CONFERENCE 2006** – The Chief Executive submitted a report outlining the content of the ACPO Excellence in Policing Performance Conference that had been held in Warwickshire on 11-12 September that had been attended by the Performance and Resources Manager, the Deputy Chief Constable and Superintendent Kelly.

Members commented on Lancashire, where PCSOs were being offered to local authorities at a subsidised rate. It was suggested that this may be something that Humberside would wish to consider. It was also suggested that this may find favour with Parish Councils in rural areas. The Assistant Chief Constable (O) suggested that this was something he could discuss with fellow Chief Officers, however, it had to be borne in mind that the costs would need to be underwritten and that external funding for PCSOs would eventually run out. The Director of Performance and Resources commented on the need to balance such a suggestion with other financial pressures on the Authority, together with the degree to which external partners would agree to long term funding. He advised that he had already spoken to the Assistant Chief Officer (Support) as there were a significant number of partnership initiatives underway with imaginative ways of securing the services of additional PCSOs. This matter needed to be explored further and fed into the budget process.

Resolved – (a) That the report be noted, and (b) that the possibility of jointly funding additional PCSOs with partner agencies be explored and the findings fed into the budget process.

- 39** **(30) ASSESSMENT OF POLICING AND COMMUNITY SAFETY (APACS)** – The Chief Executive submitted a report outlining Home Office proposals to develop a framework called APACS, Assessment of Policing and Community Safety, which would be properly aligned with other frameworks for the criminal justice system and connected to those Public Service Agreements to which the police and partners contributed.

Resolved – (a) That the report be noted, and (b) that further details on APACS be submitted to the next meeting.

- 40** **(31) EFFICIENCY PLANS 2005/06 AND 2006/07** – The Chief Constable submitted a report that updated Members on the progress with the Force

Efficiency Plans for 2005/06 and 2006/07.

Members commented on (i) the questions posed in the Appendix that had been left unanswered and requested that these be completed for the next meeting; (ii) the lack of certification by the HMIC, and (iii) the approval method for the use of cash savings. The Director of Performance and Resources advised that the use of cash savings was supported by virements which were reported to the Authority. He commented on activities that generated non cashable savings that contributed to achieving efficiency targets. He advised that the issue of cashable savings was a matter that would undoubtedly feature in this year's budget formulation and could be picked up at the budget setting meeting.

Resolved – (a) That the progress of the 2005/06 and 2006/07 Efficiency Plans be noted, and (b) that the issue of cashable savings be discussed at the budget setting meeting.

- 41 **(32) FORCE AUDIT BOARD – AUDIT AND INSPECTION REPORTS** - The Chief Constable submitted a report that outlined the content of the Force Audit Board meetings that took place on 8 June, 13 July, 18 August and 26 September and sought to update on the progress of audits and inspections that had recently been carried out on behalf of the Force Audit Board. The Director of Performance and Resources advised that reports on the activity of the Force Audit Board were also submitted to the Audit and Strategy Committee.

Members commented on the drop out rate from the E-Fit Project.

Resolved – That the report be noted.

- 42 **(33) BEST VALUE REVIEW – SHIFT ARRANGEMENTS** - The Chief Constable submitted a report that outlined the progress of this review.

A Member who had taken part in this Best Value Review expressed concern that Recommendations 1-3 of the Review, relating to the appointment of a Force Resourcing Manager and Divisional Resourcing Managers, were not being implemented because of the lack of revenue funding. The Assistant Chief Constable (O) reported that despite various attempts to identify funding, both at the Senior Management Team and at the Police Authority budget meeting, other schemes had been deemed to have a greater impact on performance and requests for funding for these recommendations had therefore been unsuccessful. The Director of Performance and Resources advised that if these recommendations were not to be implemented then Members needed to be appraised of what the alternative arrangements were. The Performance and Resources Manager advised that bad publicity, as a result failing to meet demands for calls for service due to lack of staff

resources, should also be taken into consideration in the business case for the implementation of these recommendations.

Members noted that the revised shift arrangements had been subject to a ballot and were to be implemented from 8 January 2007. It was suggested that the impact of this change and the alternative management arrangements to those proposed in the review should be assessed in 12 months time before deciding whether it was necessary to pursue the implementation of recommendations 1-3.

Resolved – That the progress of the review be noted and a further report be submitted on the impact of the implementation of the revised shift arrangements in October 2007.

43 **(34) BEST VALUE REVIEW – HATE INCIDENTS** - The Chief Constable submitted a report that outlined the progress of this review.

Resolved – That the progress of the review be noted.