

DEVELOPING A PERFORMANCE CULTURE

INTRODUCTION

1. This report has been prepared in response to a request from members for information on:
 - What is a performance culture?
 - How can Humberside Police develop such a culture?

In addition, members also requested further information in respect of comments made in HMIC Baseline report 2005/06 on the need to improve the force's performance management arrangements.

INFORMATION

Defining a performance culture

2. The words "performance culture" is frequently used in reports on policing but is often not properly defined. The current definition of a performance culture is to be found in a document produced by the Policing Standards Unit (PSU) September 2004 entitled "Managing Police Performance: A Practical Guide to Performance Management.
3. The document defines 10 hallmarks of an effective performance management framework:
 - Clarity about the roles and responsibilities of the police authority, Chief Constable and managers at all levels for performance.
 - A framework which links performance to corporate planning, budgeting and resource management.
 - Chief Constable ownership and active involvement in the force's performance review process.
 - Performance review structures which hold staff to account, replicated from top to bottom and across operational and support departments.
 - Recognition of good performance but with a relentless follow-up where performance falls short.
 - A culture of continuous improvement evident throughout the organisation.
 - Clearly articulated priorities which are widely understood by officers and staff at every level.
 - Individual PDR objectives and appraisal linked directly to performance.
 - Timely, accurate and relevant data is used to inform decision making.
 - Performance data is easily captured and clearly reported.

4. Specifically culture is defined in this document as *“The pattern of shared beliefs, values and assumption which are acquired over time and shape behaviour within an organisation”* or *“the way things are done here - how decisions are made, how employees are looked after, how the public are treated”*. Further the handbook states that *“In performance management terms a force should aim to create a culture where high performance is part of everyday life that way, staff and customers come to expect high performance and work towards it. This links to our sixth hallmark”*.
5. The guide defines the following key stages necessary to create a high performance culture:
 - What sort of cultures (behaviours) do we want in the force?
 - What kind of culture do we have?
 - What do we need to close the gap between the two?

Developing a performance culture

6. The PSU handbook recommends there are three main aspects of managing police performance; processes, people and data systems. In October 2003 the PSU formally engaged with the Police Authority and Force. An early part of the engagement process was the appointment of Price Waterhouse Cooper (PWC) to conduct a holistic review and analysis of performance management in the force. This work was framed around the key elements of processes, people and data systems and culminated in the following projects;
 - Project 1 – Performance measurement and monitoring;
 - Project 2 – Audit and inspection;
 - Project 3 – Process mapping;
 - Project 4 – Culture and leadership;
 - Project 5 – Performance and development reviews.
7. These projects formed the basis of a number of work-streams that were put into place to create and build a new performance framework for the force. These work-streams were all delivered as part of the work of Operation Vanguard which was formed in late 2003 as part of the response to engagement with the PSU. A Vanguard Programme Board, comprising Members and Officers of the Authority, the force, HMIC, PSU and Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber oversaw this work and satisfied themselves the work-streams were delivered.
8. Appendix ‘A’ has been extracted from the monitoring report used by the Vanguard Programme Board and shows the work that has been undertaken in order to build a performance framework. It is broken down into three specific areas; process enablers 3(i) a-d, people enablers 3(ii) a-d and data & systems enablers 3(iii).
9. In November 2004 PWC produced a final report on project 4 entitled “Performance Culture”. The work was framed around the three key stages identified in the PSU handbook deemed necessary to create a high performance culture (paragraph 5). That report defined a performance culture

as meaning: *“A foundation stone for everything (the force) does and an umbrella under which everything sits...at its simplest ensuring that the right attitudes and environments are in place to encourage and enable staff to perform at their best”.*

10. The work PWC undertook included a staff survey and interviews with senior managers in which they sought to identify the kind of culture that existed within the force at that time. The report's findings and recommendations identified what needed to be done to close the gap and these recommendations were subsequently incorporated within the people enabler work-streams 3(ii) a-d.
11. Although Vanguard Programme Board satisfied themselves that the work-streams were substantially complete, the force recognises that its performance management framework is something that will always need to be kept under review. In particular the right performance culture is not something that will evolve overnight. As PWC commented in their report *“the force needs evolution not revolution”.*
12. For this reason, in 2005, the force repeated the staff survey in order to check, amongst other things, that the performance culture was developing as planned. The survey was split into 3 sections; communication, priorities and performance, and the force as an employer. It was conducted on-line using the Force intranet and 988 surveys were completed, a response rate of 25.3% of all staff. The survey was followed up by more detailed discussion within focus groups.
13. The results of the survey were encouraging, for example, 71% of respondents were aware of at least the major performance issues in the Force and 95% of all respondents felt they contributed in some way to Force performance. However, while encouraging, some comments reinforced the importance of getting the right balance between a relentless drive for performance and improving the satisfaction and resolve of staff. For example some staff felt the force was now too performance led with too much of a focus on priorities.

HMIC Baseline Inspection 2005/06

14. All police forces were subject of a further Baseline Inspection during 2005/06. Baseline forms part of the Police Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF) used by the Home Office to compare forces. It comprises a number of component baselines which are separately assessed and graded against specific grading criteria. Forces delivering better performance than their peers are assessed as 'excellent' or 'good' while forces delivering performance similar to their peers are assessed as 'fair'. Forces delivering performance worse than their peers are assessed as 'poor'.
15. Performance management and continuous improvement is contained within component baseline 7B. In October 2004 this component achieved a score of 'Poor'. In the most recent Baseline assessment for 2005/06 this component achieved a score of 'Fair' and improving. Although there is room for improvement the force regards this as a significant achievement and reflects

the effort that has been put into developing the performance management framework.

16. In reaching their conclusions HMIC also provided a commentary on what they assessed as the areas for improvement. In order to ensure work is put in place to deliver these improvements the force has created a Baseline improvement action plan. Appendix 'B' is an extract from the relevant part of the plan in respect of component baseline 7B. Progress against the action plan is the responsibility of a nominated action manager who is required to report to the Force Audit Board.
17. Although self explanatory a substantial piece of work contained within the plan is worthy of special mention. This involves the creation of unit level performance data and targets. In seeking to develop a performance culture amongst their staff one of the major problems BCU Commanders faced has been the lack of reliable corporately produced data that will allow them to hold teams, units and individuals to account. Although the force performance management guide (PMG) is recognised as providing exactly what is needed at force and BCU level, its limitation has always been that it does not allow the Commander and his management team to drill down any deeper.
18. As a result of Baseline 2005 the Chief Constable personally led discussions with other Chief Officers and Strategy Team on how to improve the performance culture. The lack of a framework for unit level performance data was recognised as one of the areas that was necessary to improve the performance culture as it allowed for a corporate process of accountability to be built at levels below BCU Commander.
19. As a result all forces were contacted with a request for details on their approach to this issue and visits made to two forces. A small project team from within the Performance Development Unit then worked on this action and produced a draft framework for unit level performance indicators. A joint review of performance management arrangements involving Authority members and officers, BCU Commanders and staff from Corporate Development Branch was held on 27 October 2006. Here it was agreed to immediately roll out the framework for unit level performance indicators across all BCU.
20. Using the indicators BCU Commanders are now able to set targets at unit and team level as well as measuring individual performance. The activities measured vary from role to role and when assessing performance supervisors are obliged to undertake qualitative assessment to ensure that under performance is contextualized.
21. The joint Authority and Force review of performance management arrangements also agreed the next stages of development of unit level performance indicators. This will involve monthly performance checks by supervisors and submission of electronic evidence sheets that will be linked to the PDR system. In addition, as a result of Authority Members comments following their attendance at Divisional Challenge Meetings, other improvements were agreed in the structure and content of performance

management meetings. These will also help in delivering the areas for improvement identified by in Baseline report 2005/06.

22. Subject to consultation and agreement between Chief Officers and Staff Associations the next stage will be to build rewards and sanctions into the process. Potentially this could follow the process adopted with sickness absence, in which staff need to demonstrate a good attendance record to qualify for promotion or payments of competency related threshold payments. However such developments need to be handled sensitively in order to ensure the culture reflects the right balance between a relentless drive for performance and improving the satisfaction and resolve of staff.
23. Other work ongoing within the force, particularly around the development of the Chief Constable's core values and a leadership strategy will all have an impact on the culture of the force and ensure the balance between performance and staff needs are met. Further use will be made of staff surveys as a way of measuring culture and hence ensuring that balance is maintained.

RECOMMENDATIONS

24. It is recommended that:
 - i) Members note the contents of this report.

Tim S Hollis
CHIEF CONSTABLE

Contact Officer: Chief Superintendent Cheeseman Telephone: 01482 578248

Background documents: Appendix A – Extract from monitoring report
Appendix B – Extract from Baseline Action Plan

APPENDIX A

Disengagement Criteria 3 (i)		
Area :	Performance Management 'Processes' Enabler	Hallmarks :
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity about the roles and responsibilities of the police authority, Chief Constable and managers at all levels for performance. 2. A framework which links performance to corporate planning, budgeting and resource management. 3. Chief Constable ownership and active involvement in the force's performance review process. 4. Performance review structures which hold staff to account, replicated from top to bottom and across operational and support departments. 5. Recognition of good performance but with a relentless follow-up where performance falls short.
Requirement		Summary of Progress to Date / Future Milestones and Targets
a) Develop balanced set of KPIs which take account of National & Local requirements and reflect inputs; outputs; and outcomes. <i>[PwC Phase 1 Report: from Recommended Project 1]</i>		The Police Authority held its annual Priorities Workshop on 17 th January. This followed consultation on local priorities with partners at the Chief Constable's Strategic Performance Conference in December. At the Priorities Workshop targets were set for the Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs) 2006/07 and measures were set for the Local Domain.
b) There must be greater clarity about how divisional plans are aligned with both the force plan and local priorities <i>[PwC Phase 1 Report: from Recommended Project 1]</i>		Progress to Date: Divisional Plans are in a Corporate Force format and contain appropriate performance indicators. July 2005 - amended Div Plan information is aligned with the force priorities/objectives and each CDRP's strategy. Refreshed Plans are published on the Force Intranet
c) Consolidate performance meetings to enhance effectiveness of performance management process. <i>[PwC Phase 1 Report: from Recommended Project 1]</i>		The Performance management Handbook containing directions on a corporate structure of performance challenge meetings was re-written in early 2006 and is now undergoing a second update. The performance challenge process now follows a linear progression from Chief Officer challenge to divisions via the following:- DCCs monthly performance meetings; ACC divisional and branch tactical performance challenge mtgs (monthly for Div's 1/4ly for Ops Branch); Monthly divisional performance challenge meetings at SMT level, 'pillar heads' monthly challenge meetings with second line supervisors; monthly team challenge meetings down to individual level by first time supervisors supported by introduction of Unit Level Performance data. The Police Authority are represented at the DCCs and SMT level meetings.
d) Audit and inspection work needs to be more clearly focused on those areas of business that have been identified as high risk. <i>[PwC Phase 1 Report:</i>		Progress to Date: Force audit board has been established under the DCC. Full time Audit Manager has been appointed. Audit Board maintains a risk register. Annual audit plan in place. Force audit manual completed and agreed at SSG on 3 June 05. Risk Management training has been under taken by a number of senior personnel.

<p><i>Recommended Project 2]</i></p>	<p>An action plan to develop and embed RM has been agreed. This will include it becoming an element of the new Performance Regime. Whilst risks will be locally owned and managed the regime will enable risk to be escalated when required. It is accepted that the force has a good many risk management practices in existence and work will be commenced to map these and identify any possible gaps. It is intended that the draft policy will available in Sept 05. The Force Audit Board will still play a role in initiating remedial action. The whole process will also be linked into the Business Change/Force Development schedule. It is envisaged that the process will include that if a business case is not in relation to an identified force risk/performance matter it may not get support.</p> <p>Force NCRS Group established to enhance performance via appropriate application of NCRS</p>
<p>e) A review of the management meeting structures is required in order to position the role of Strategy Team in the governance of the force <i>[PwC Phase 2: Workstream 3]</i></p>	<p>PwC review of COG, Strategy Team and business case process complete. Revisions to COG, Strategy Team and business case process are set out in the force Business Change Handbook which was formally agreed at Strategy Team on 22 September 2005.</p> <p>Force inspection to be concluded 19/12/06 by HMIC Mr Williams – awaits final report.</p>

Disengagement Criteria 3 (ii)			
(a)			
(b)			
(c)			
(d)			
Area :	Performance Management 'People' Enabler	Hallmarks :	6. A culture of continuous improvement evident throughout the organisation. 7. Clearly articulated priorities which are widely understood by officers and staff at every level. 8. Individual PDR objectives and appraisal linked directly to performance.
Requirement		Summary of Progress to Date / Future Milestones and Targets	
a) To ensure a high level of awareness and understanding amongst staff of Force/Individual performance and priorities;		<p>30/03/06 The policing plan has now been completed and contains the force priorities for this year. Police Authority has agreed the targets within the plan. The new PDR process relies on these priorities and objectives becoming part of each individuals PDR, hence staff will become much more aware of the force priorities. Each member of staff is required to have a number of performance objectives within their PDR and these must be directly linked to their BCU or Branch objectives and in this way staff will become much more engaged and therefore better understand the force objectives.</p> <p>DCC Performance enablers report produced fortnightly and used at DCCs performance challenge meetings.</p> <p>Unit Level Performance data now compiled monthly which allows performance to be monitored and challenged down to team and individual level. Includes targets down to team/individual level set against force/disaggregated local targets</p>	
b) Develop a PDR process that is aligned to the force planning cycle; meaningful to staff and fully supported by leaders; delivers through objectives and targets that are SMART and in turn linked to rewards, recognitions or sanctions; and linked to other personnel functions <i>[PwC Phase 1 Report: Recommended Project 5]</i>		<p>30/03/06 The force has now gone live with the new PDR process – Update reports provided to PSU re implementation.</p> <p>Unit Level Performance linked to PDR via requirement to update officer/staff performance against targets on monthly basis</p> <p>Outstanding Work:</p>	
c) Map the perceptions of officers around the performance agenda; develop a set of key messages that will embed a performance culture; develop a strategy for disseminating those messages; and establish a mechanism for monitoring the effectiveness of the performance messages on the culture of the force <i>[PwC Phase 1 Report: Recommended Project 4]</i>		<p>Staff surveys now embedded into force calendar with feedback led by CC.</p> <p>Work ongoing to develop ma performance culture within the organisation centred initially around Unit Level Performance and development of performance challenge process</p>	

d) Explore the challenges and issues that need to be addressed in the near future by the force and the implications of these for leadership; highlight potential development needs in light of this	'Visioning day' held by COG on 23/11/06 to develop force strategy post 31/3/07
---	--

Disengagement Criteria 3 (iii)		
Area :	Performance Management "Data & Systems' Enabler	Hallmarks :
		9. Timely, accurate and relevant data is used to inform decision making. 10. Performance data is easily captured and clearly reported.
Requirement		Summary of Progress to Date / Future Milestones and Targets
To effectively communicate and make readily available, information on performance to staff and develop consistent performance monitoring reports		<p>Progress to Date: The Force weekly, monthly and quarterly performance management information has been re-structured and re-presented so that the key performance indicators appear first and most prominently, comparisons with MSF are used, iQuanta is used, and where appropriate data broken down to LPT level and available at the times and in the format required for formal performance monitoring. The new Performance Management arrangements include Performance Managers Monthly meeting whereby corporacy of data quality; analysis; interpretation and presentation is assured.</p> <p>Daily performance reports to force and divisional levels published on intranet and briefing provided daily to ACC(O).</p> <p>Pegasus Enablers performance report published fortnightly and used at DCCs Performance Challenge mtgs</p> <p>Unit Level Performance reports published monthly for all operational teams</p> <p>Force inspection to be concluded 19/12/06 by HMIC Mr Williams – awaits final report.</p>

APPENDIX B

Ref	Area for Improvement	Action	Update	Action Manager	Priority H/M/L	Target Date
7B PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT FAIR/IMPROVED						
7B1	The performance culture is not yet embedded fully in the organisation. There is some resistance amongst some staff to performance monitoring, dip sampling and a resistance to intrusive supervision. The Force should restate the directions given in the Performance Management Handbook in relation to Team Unit and Individual Performance and as to what is expected of first line managers and supervisors.	1. Unit Level PI framework 2. Performance management Handbook to be amended to include policy on monitoring/management of Unit Level Performance	1. To be delivered to force 6/10	Superintendent Performance Development Unit		30.11.06
7B2	A corporate approach to performance management should be developed for collection and collation of policing activity both quantitative and qualitative towards local objectives and policing priorities. In line with reducing bureaucracy the Force should explore the feasibility of individual performance data collection centrally utilising its IT functions. Where appropriate necessary awareness training should be delivered.	1. As per action 7B1	1. As per action 7B1	Superintendent Performance Development Unit		30.11.06
7B3	The force should continue to develop its performance management framework to cover support departments such as the special operations unit.	As per 7B1		Superintendent Performance Development Unit		30.11.06
7B4	The force should heighten the status of performance management and the	PDU to develop corporate performance posters		Superintendent Performance		30.11.06

Ref	Area for Improvement	Action	Update	Action Manager	Priority H/M/L	Target Date
	aim to make improvements by displaying posters and up-to-date performance statistics in view of staff. There was little knowledge among staff about relative performance at police constable, sergeant and inspector level in one BCU. Posters highlighting force and BCU policing priorities would aid this approach.	In C division a performance development sergeant has been appointed who will ensure that performance information appropriate to divisional teams is clearly displayed in key location		Development Unit/ Divisional Commanders		
7B5	Accountability mechanisms could be more robust in that allocated tasks and actions should be rigorously pursued and audited thereby ensuring that performance improvement is achieved.	<p>1. Action Schedule for DCC and ACC challenge meetings now held centrally and revised after each respective meeting</p> <p>2. New Performance meeting schedule to be developed 27 October</p> <p>3. PDU to audit divisional/branch internal challenge meetings</p>		Superintendent Performance Development Unit		1 and 2 Complete. 31.03.07
7B6	While some teams have performance indicators, there are limited formal meetings, below the rank of Inspector, to review performance and hold staff to account. One exception is the Crime investigation team, where monthly meetings are held by senior management to review investigative performance with an emphasis on key activities such as sanction detections, intelligence submissions etc.	<p>1. Divisional Commanders/ Branch Heads responsible for internal structures</p> <p>2. Performance Mgt Handbook to be re-written with specific corporate minimum standards for all challenge meetings down to team level</p>		Superintendent Performance Development Unit		30.11.06
7B7	There was concern over the knowledge of the Force / Divisional	1. As per action 7B4 re corporate posters re Force		Superintendent Performance		30.11.06

Ref	Area for Improvement	Action	Update	Action Manager	Priority H/M/L	Target Date
	priorities and whether staff would know what was contained in the divisional control strategy.	priorities 2. Div Commanders/ Branch Heads responsible for divisional/local priorities		Development Unit		
7B8	Divisions do not have an effective forum to exchange good practice or coordinate effective responses to procedural or systemic problems. The result is that each division addresses issues in isolation. This is neither efficient nor effective. The monthly performance forum should be utilised to address this issue.	1. Addressed by Op Pegasus team and through fortnightly Pegasus Meetings	Complete	Superintendent Performance Development Unit		Complete
7B9	Specific performance indicators do not exist for Neighbourhood Officers or PCSOs. With the planned introduction of significant numbers of PCSOs it is important that as well as being clear about their role and responsibilities, they are clear about what level of activity is expected from them. It is therefore necessary to consider the introduction of PIs for the neighbourhood policing function and response.	1. Framework to be developed by PDU through work on unit level performance 2. Div Commanders and NHP Lead responsible for setting specific targets	Unit Level Performance framework completed to include NHP. Divisions to set own targets.	Superintendent Performance Development Unit/Chief Inspector Neighbourhood Policing		
7B10	The performance challenge meetings observed varied in quality and level of detail. More challenge of individuals is necessary using data that drilled down on to enablers and performance e.g. forensics, fixed penalty tickets for crime, number of detections per group / team. Currently they are primarily information meetings with updates on actions. The force should	1. PDU to re-write Performance Management Handbook to ensure corporate approach to performance management 2. Unit Level Performance information to be developed 3. Pegasus Performance		Superintendent Performance Development Unit		30.11.06 Complete Complete

Ref	Area for Improvement	Action	Update	Action Manager	Priority H/M/L	Target Date
	ensure that such meetings provide a robust challenge.	Enablers' now developed and monitored/challenged at DCCs fortnightly Pegasus Meeting				