



HMIC Inspection Report
Northamptonshire Police

October 2007



Northamptonshire Police – HMIC Inspection Report

October 2007

ISBN: 978-1-84726-470-1

CROWN COPYRIGHT

FIRST PUBLISHED 2007

Contents

Introduction to HMIC Inspections

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

Force Overview and Context

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

Findings

National summary of judgements

Force summary of judgements

Neighbourhood Policing

Performance Management

Protecting Vulnerable People – Overview

Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse

Protecting Vulnerable People – Domestic Violence

Protecting Vulnerable People – Public Protection

Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons

Appendix: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

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://inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/>.

In 2006, HMIC conducted a broad assessment of all 43 Home Office police forces in England and Wales, examining 23 areas of activity. This baseline assessment had followed a similar process in 2005 and has thus created a rich evidence base of strengths and weaknesses across the country. However, it is now necessary for HMIC to focus its inspection effort on those areas of policing that are not data-rich and where qualitative assessment is the only feasible way of judging both current performance and the prospects for improvement. This, together with the critical factor that HMIC should concentrate its scrutiny on high-risk areas of policing – in terms of risk both to the public and to the service's reputation – pointed inexorably to a focus on what are known collectively as 'protective services'. In addition, there is a need to apply professional judgement to some key aspects of leadership and governance, where some quantitative measures exist but a more rounded assessment is appropriate.

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

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

Programmed frameworks

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

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

Neighbourhood Policing has been inspected not only because it is a key government priority but also, and more importantly, because it addresses a fundamental need for a style of policing that is rooted in and responds to local concerns. The police service must, of course, offer protection from high-level threats such as terrorism and organised criminality, but it

October 2007

also has a key role in tackling the unacceptable behaviour of the minority of people who threaten the quality of life of law-abiding citizens.

Performance management is an activity largely hidden from public view, although members of the public are directly affected by poor performance on the part of their local force. This inspection has focused on the need for forces to maximise the opportunities for performance improvement. It also posed questions as to whether forces have an accurate picture of how they are doing and the capability to respond to changing priorities. This area was selected for inspection because it is a key factor in delivering good performance across the board.

Protecting vulnerable people covers four related areas – child abuse, domestic violence, public protection and missing persons – that address the critically important role of the police in protecting the public from potentially serious harm. In the 2006 baseline assessment this was the worst performing area and raised the most serious concerns for HMIC and others. As a result, this area was prioritised for scrutiny in 2007.

Risk-based frameworks

In addition to its programmed inspection work, HMIC continues to monitor performance across a range of policing activity, notably those areas listed in the table below.

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

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

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

The grading process

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

Excellent

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

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

Good

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

Fair

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

Poor

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

Developing practice

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

October 2007

Future HMIC inspection activity

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

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

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

Force Overview and Context

Geographical description of force area

The county of Northamptonshire is located in the south of the East Midlands region and covers an area of 914 square miles. The largest town is Northampton, with other main towns including Brackley, Corby, Daventry, Kettering, Rushden, Towcester and Wellingborough. Its central location affords easy access, with good road and rail links. The M1, M6 and M40 motorways, together with the A1 and A14 trunk roads, pass through or near the county. Good transport links have led to rapid growth in light industry, particularly in warehousing and distribution, retail and financial services. There has also been an expansion of the smaller, hi-tech motor-racing industry, particularly in the south of the county around the world-famous Silverstone racetrack, and also in the north where the Rockingham venue attracts motor-racing enthusiasts.

Demographic profile of force area

Northamptonshire has a population of 651,824 (totalling 269,719 households). The black and minority ethnic (BME) proportion of Northamptonshire's population is 6.1% (estimated at June 2004) compared with 10.6% for the East Midlands region as a whole, with the highest percentages living in the Northampton and Wellingborough areas. The employment rate for the county is high at 80%, above the national average of 74.3%, and ranging from 91.8% in South Northants to 71.5% in Corby. The proportion of the population claiming job seekers allowance averages 2.1% across the county. The cost of housing is above the regional average (£174,510 compared with £163,226), but low compared with the national average of £207,573. The county is scheduled for a significant increase in population over the next 25 years as a result of the planned housing growth in the South Midlands subregion, with the population predicted to rise by 47% by 2031, and an additional 167,000 new homes.

Strategic priorities

The force's annual budget for 2007/08 is £110 million, an increase of 4.7% on 2006/07, which is broadly in line with inflation. However, to meet strategic commitments a significant budget reprioritisation process has been undertaken. Strategic priorities as identified in Policing Northamptonshire (which incorporates the strategic plan and local policing and performance plan) are as follows:

Strategic aims for the next three years:

- **to tackle crime** by driving down crime levels and bringing more offences to justice;
- **to increase public confidence and satisfaction** by reducing the fear of crime and disorder, maintaining public safety and delivering high standards of service to victims; and
- **to position the force for the future** by strengthening partnerships, positively influencing the level of funding available for policing, delivering effective regional collaboration, aligning scarce resources with force priorities and achieving a well-led, motivated and skilled workforce.

Focus for 2007/08 is on:

- **further reductions in crime**, with a particular emphasis on achieving substantial reductions in burglary and robbery;

October 2007

- **reducing the threat of serious harm** through improving the management of dangerous offenders, enhancing services for vulnerable people, and seeking actively to prevent major and organised crime, homicide and terrorism;
- **increasing confidence** by maintaining the current performance in detecting and bringing to justice more offences and improving levels of victim and witness satisfaction;
- **reducing the community impact of anti-social behaviour (ASB)** particularly through the effective delivery of safer community teams (SCTs); and
- **better managing calls for assistance** by ensuring resources are deployed to maximum effect.

Force developments since 2006

Within Northamptonshire, levels of recorded crime continue a downward trend. Since 2003/04, levels of all recorded crime have fallen by 17.8%, residential burglaries by 27.9%, vehicle crime by 30%, robbery by 16.8% and violent crime by 10.6%. Public satisfaction continues to improve, with Northamptonshire currently above the most similar force (MSF) average with regards to overall customer satisfaction.

In the 2006 baseline assessment the force was graded Poor and Stable for Major Crime and Managing Critical Incidents; Poor and Improved for Tackling Serious and Organised Criminality; and Fair and Declined for the implementation of the National Intelligence Model (NIM). A number of areas for improvement were identified, with some of them overlapping these three domains; these areas have been subject to reinspection in 2007 and a summary of progress is outlined below. The force was also awarded a grade of Poor and Declined for protecting vulnerable people (PVP). The inspection in this area of business is covered in the main body of the report.

Until May 2007 the force was voluntarily engaged with the Police Standards Unit (PSU), now part of the Police and Crime Standards Directorate (PCSD), supported by the police authority (PA) and HMIC in a collaborative approach to performance improvement. During the period of engagement the force has been totally committed to improving performance and achieving the disengagement criteria, at the same time striving to develop the areas for improvement identified in the 2006 baseline assessment. The delivery is governed and monitored by the strategic improvement board (SIB) which is chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable (DCC).

Major crime and managing critical incidents

Areas for improvement included a need for performance monitoring and evaluation in the crime and community department. A suite of performance indicators has been developed, although more work is needed to produce appropriate qualitative indicators.

Another concern was the lack of a dedicated major crime team; the force now has in place 25 dedicated staff, including 4 recently added posts to deal with disclosure and exhibits. The aim is to deliver a professional and effective service on major crime while minimising abstractions of BCU staff.

Critical incident training and awareness were inadequate at both operational and strategic levels. A project plan for critical incident training is now in place – some training has been delivered and all staff will have received training by autumn 2007. The force introduced a new policy and standard operating procedure (SOP) for critical incidents in April 2007.

October 2007

Extant partnership arrangements were focused on crime and disorder priorities, and missed opportunities to examine how local information and intelligence could be recorded and disseminated to support force intelligence requirements around major crime and counter-terrorism. Evidence shows that intelligence submissions have increased significantly this year and the roll-out of the Neighbourhood Policing SCTs has had a significant impact in this area.

The force's strategic assessment had not taken into account the predictable demand profile of critical incidents and vulnerable communities and locations, nor did it provide an assessment of potential risks and threats. Considerable development has been achieved in this area – a range of problem profiles have been completed to support and inform the strategic assessment, and SCTs are engaged in identifying its vulnerable communities.

The force had limited capacity to deal with cold case reviews. It has now introduced a formal review policy and four new posts within its major crime model to service this area of business.

Following the reduction from four to two BCUs, the force needed to review its resourcing protocol as the existing model was recognised as not fit for purpose. A dedicated team is now in place to respond to major crime and the force has amended its resourcing protocol to minimise abstraction of BCU resources, and introduced a 72-hour resourcing review attended by BCU commanders.

Poor linkages between the force intelligence system (FIS) and the Home Office Large Major Enquiry System (HOLMES) have been addressed. An entirely new range of effective working practices have been developed to transfer relevant intelligence from HOLMES to the FIS; this process is effective and is now a strength for the force.

It was highlighted that the force had not delivered training in disclosure in recent years. Some disclosure training had been delivered via modules in crime training. It now has a disclosure training plan which aims to deliver appropriate training to all of its operational officers in the next year, with four officers now trained in enhanced disclosure investigation.

With the exception of those cases where there were believed to be suspicious circumstances, there was no direct involvement of supervisors in cases of sudden death. The force now has a standing order and policy which directs that supervisors must attend and assess all sudden deaths. The corporate development department (CDD) will conduct a compliance review of supervisory attendance in the autumn of 2007.

A good range of measures has been introduced by the force to progress the areas for improvement and this area is now graded as Fair and Improved.

Tackling serious and organised criminality

A National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) workshop and training on drug mapping and organised crime groups has been delivered to all of the analysts in force. The work is now owned by the level 2 senior analyst, who has completed organised crime group charts which are linked to the constant refreshing of drug maps; this has enhanced the understanding of current and emerging threats from level 2 criminality.

The force did not have a comprehensive range of harm indicators applying to particular communities, and there was no evidence that it monitored and responded to signal crimes. It now acknowledges that, through a range of processes, it already identifies harm indicators – for example, critical incidents, tension indicators and community impact assessments (CIAs) – and it is now seeking to formalise this structure.

October 2007

Recent cases demonstrated that, while witnesses are protected and offenders receive custodial sentences for intimidation, in-force arrangements for witness protection are limited. The force has recently implemented a 'threat to life' policy which includes Osman warnings, linked to witness protection. The force is currently developing plans on how to service likely demand from the new policy.

The force has no surveillance team or technical support unit capacity dedicated to level 2 work, which is not unusual for forces of its size. Prioritisation of the surveillance team capacity is therefore conducted through the level 2 force tasking and co-ordination meeting. A matrix structure is now in place to control level 2 resources, specifically the technical support unit and surveillance capacity, through the NIM – this is working effectively.

The force had some success in tackling level 2 crime in 2005/06 but its policing plan does not contain targets relating to level 2 activity, designed to reduce the harm caused by organised crime. The inspection revealed some evidence of performance monitoring and evaluation in the crime and community department, but the information used is more quantitative than qualitative – eg the value of assets seized and the number of arrests made. The force is developing a suite of performance indicators with an objective to produce and include qualitative indicators that are more appropriate to this complex area of policing.

Suspicious activity reports (SARS), received from financial institutions via the Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA), were dealt with reactively by the force and only brought into play when individual nominals were referred to the financial investigation unit. A dedicated SARS officer commenced employment in October 2006; all level 1 and 2 financial intelligence is now appropriately tasked. The force is also developing an information technology (IT) solution for the management and handling of SARS reports.

Taking into account the progress to date and commitment by the force to address these areas for improvement, a grade of Fair and Improved is now appropriate.

National Intelligence Model

A number of areas for improvement were identified in 2006. Problem profiles had been completed in a limited number of areas (five in total) but there were no plans in place to refresh them on an ongoing basis, the constraint being the limited analytical and research capacity in the force intelligence bureau (FIB). A significant number of problem profiles have now been completed by the force across a range of areas, which all now feed regularly into the strategic assessment. The force has completed a review of its analytical capacity and capability, which recommended growth of one post and a restructure of its existing resources to improve service delivery.

The lack of a force-wide corporate standard for knowledge and understanding of intelligence and intelligence systems and products across the force attracted criticism last year. The force has developed and part delivered an intelligence training plan, with a target to deliver in full by the autumn of 2007. Evidence shows that intelligence submissions have increased this year.

Partner agencies did not participate in the level 2 tactical tasking and co-ordination meeting, although the force was engaging informally with a variety of partners at level 2. These arrangements have now been formalised, with action planned to develop other related opportunities with partners.

The level of technical support available to supervisors for briefing staff was inadequate; the force has introduced a NIM development group with a specific remit to implement the national briefing model.

October 2007

The force uses the community profiling and shared solutions (ComPaSS) database, its own FIS and beat profiles to capture community intelligence. However, there is a need to improve the inter-operability between ComPaSS and the FIS. This is a major technical challenge that may not be achievable in the near future, although the force already has some inter-operability between FIS and the crime beat profiles and other systems in force. ComPaSS is in continual development and the force will seek further opportunities around inter-operability that are technically and financially viable.

Taking into account the progress achieved in tackling these issues, the grade for implementation of the NIM is now Fair and Improved.

October 2007

Findings

National summary of judgements

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

Force summary of judgements

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

October 2007

Neighbourhood Policing

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

National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6	14	21	2

National contextual factors

The national Neighbourhood Policing programme was launched by ACPO in April 2005 to support the Government's vision of a policing service which is both accessible and responsive to the needs of local people. It was anticipated that, by April 2007, every area across England and Wales would have a Neighbourhood Policing presence appropriate to local needs, with all Neighbourhood Policing teams in place by April 2008. For local communities this means:

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

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

Contextual factors

During the last 12 months Northamptonshire Police has made significant progress in implementing Neighbourhood Policing – specifically, in rolling out all of its planned safer communities teams (SCTs) and embedding community engagement and consultation. This progress has been facilitated by a much-improved project structure and a recent merger of the previous four territorial BCUs into two. By building on a model of existing community action teams this has ensured that SCTs, together with partners, are really starting to tackle identified local problems.

HMIC's inspection of Neighbourhood Policing, reported in October 2006, identified a number of areas for improvement. All have been significantly progressed as part of the Neighbourhood Policing implementation plan. Most notable are the development of the role of BCU community safety chief inspectors as Neighbourhood Policing champions, on behalf of the project team; introducing a community engagement guide to shape the way that SCTs have developed this vital aspect of Neighbourhood Policing; and reducing the abstraction of SCT staff from their neighbourhoods.

Strengths

- A clear Neighbourhood Policing philosophy is evident throughout the force. The assistant chief constable (territorial policing) (ACC (TP)), with wider support from the ACPO team, a project team and BCU senior managers, has moved the delivery of Neighbourhood Policing significantly forward in the last 12 months. Officers and staff at all levels have a clear understanding of, and commitment to, the aims of Neighbourhood Policing; maintaining SCT staff levels is prioritised by BCU commanders. The force strategic priorities for 2007–10, which include increasing public confidence and customer satisfaction, outline how SCTs will help deliver these objectives.
- The force has invested in the training of SCT staff. The PCSO national training package is supported by the use of beat managers as mentors, who also monitor PCSO deployment. The three-day training package being delivered to SCT officers covers all the key elements of Neighbourhood Policing as identified by the Centrex training model, and has been recognised by the ACPO Neighbourhood Policing project team as good practice, shared with other forces in the region. This course is supplemented by one-day training for SCT sergeants and inspectors. Upon completing the modular learning that follows the three-day course, a certificate in Neighbourhood Policing is awarded by the Chartered Institute of Managers (NVQ level 3 equivalent) and is also available to PCSOs. Partnerships with mental health facilities provide the opportunity for beat managers to improve their ability to deal with mental health patients (as reported in *Police Review*, 27 April 2007, 'Mind matters – mental health training in Northamptonshire').
- The force has undertaken a self-developmental process in conjunction with the ACPO Neighbourhood Policing team. The team field officer has worked closely with the Neighbourhood Policing project board and actions from this process have been integrated into the Neighbourhood Policing project plan with strong progress being made.
- Force systems and processes are being adjusted to support the roll-out of SCTs. At force level, the Northamptonshire policing model (NPM) has been reviewed in light of the deployment of SCTs to ensure that they are fully mainstreamed, that territorial BCUs minimise abstractions for SCT staff, and that they deal with all crime relevant to local priorities. At BCU level a good example is the recent development of a community intelligence desk on one of the BCUs to deal more effectively with such intelligence coming from SCTs.
- As part of the inspection process, a telephone survey of 100 residents chosen at random was carried out, asking six questions about their experience and views about how well Neighbourhood Policing is being delivered. In four of the questions there was a slightly better than national average percentage of positive answers, and for the question “are local police speaking to local people about tackling their problems?” there was a significantly better than national average percentage of positive answers.
- The effectiveness of Neighbourhood Policing is being assessed at various levels. During the roll-out of SCTs the force performance review process has held BCUs to account for the timeliness of roll-out against the Neighbourhood Policing project plan. BCU community safety chief inspectors also carry out detailed inspections of SCTs and, on a rotational basis, SCTs are required to make presentations to BCU

October 2007

senior management on their development. Project team members make test calls to the force communications centre (FCC) to test call handlers' knowledge of SCTs and the Neighbourhood Policing website, with a high rate of success reported.

- The governance of the Neighbourhood Policing project has ensured that the National Quality of Service Commitment (NQoSC) action plan has been linked to the operation of SCTs. In 2006 the force introduced the online victim information service, allowing victims to check the progress of their crime investigation. This facility, which allows for direct contact between officer and victim, has been considerably enhanced with the roll-out of SCTs. In the first year of operation more than 10,000 checks were made, and the initiative was praised by the Prime Minister's Delivery Unit. As part of the FCC's review of its processes to ensure they support SCTs, a dedicated team of four staff – working a shift rota – has been introduced to provide feedback to the public on low-level incidents such as reports of suspicious activity and ASB. E-mail and text messaging are used to provide updates following investigation by SCT staff.
- SCTs use a systematic problem-solving process in conjunction with ComPaSS; problem-solving plans designed to fit local needs are progressed with partners through joint action groups (JAGs). Opportunities to carry out problem-solving training and awareness with partners have been identified; for instance, neighbourhood managers attend the problem-solving part of the SCT training course, and an annual Neighbourhood Policing joint agency practitioner event provides an opportunity to discuss good practice.
- A document 'Making NIM happen' was devised by the force, which sets out how the SCTs integrate with NIM and the meeting processes that feed into the level one partner and police meetings.
- BCU managers recognise the importance of succession planning for SCT staff, to ensure continuity for communities as vacancies, planned or unplanned, are managed and filled quickly. At the time of inspection, all sergeant and beat manager posts on SCTs were filled within a 28-day period and there was a clear expectation among SCT staff that they would remain in post for a minimum of two years. The force recruitment plan for PCSOs has a turnover factor of 11% built into it.
- A performance monitoring framework has been developed to hold SCTs to account for performance, using learning from other forces. The Neighbourhood Policing indicators, which will be monitored through the citizen focus board and managing performance group (MPG) from August 2007, include a number of quantitative measures on crimes and incidents, community intelligence, community interaction, SCT priorities and abstractions. These feed into confidence and satisfaction outcomes which translate into targets relating to police accessibility and visibility, and public perception of how well local police understand and deal with local issues.
- The ComPaSS multi-agency website provides a range of functions for SCTs and partners to use as a Neighbourhood Policing tool. As well as containing multi-agency information for analytical purposes and developing beat profiles, the system also provides templates for beat profiles, community engagement interactions and referrals, and crime and community solution profiles. Key individual networks (KINs) are also recorded on the website, with new contacts being added as SCTs develop their engagement. An email facility has excellent potential to communicate widely with community representatives and provide them with information – there are approximately 900 community contacts and 400 partner contacts on ComPaSS.

October 2007

- A communications strategy, developed with all of Northamptonshire's councils and implemented in January 2007, has been instrumental in embedding the philosophy of Neighbourhood Policing both throughout the force and with partners. The strategy has underpinned the wide use of media by SCTs to communicate their launch and team details, as well as their engagement tactics. It includes the need to feed back to the community.
- A detailed Neighbourhood Policing programme plan is in place, monitored by the SCT project board which reports to the safer communities project board. This programme governance structure ensures that full Neighbourhood Policing implementation remains on target for April 2008, specifically driving community engagement and joint problem-solving. The plan includes detailed costs so any issues about sustainability can be identified, as well as the phased integration of Neighbourhood Policing into mainstream processes and force objectives.
- A variety of factors has been considered when allocating resources to SCTs, including beat profiles, local policing experience, alignment with partner priority areas and community opinion. Additional resources have been allocated to the seven priority neighbourhoods in the county. The force has committed to maintain SCT levels as a priority.
- The human resources (HR) strategy (2006–09) for SCTs is in place, outlining recruitment, role definitions and training for sergeants, beat managers and the extended police family (specifically, Special Constables, volunteers and accredited persons). Beat manager roles are designated as specialist posts.
- An abstraction policy for beat managers is in place and BCU managers robustly monitor the target for beat managers to be on their geographic area at least 80% of their time dealing with incidents on that neighbourhood. The policy also provides for SCT staff to discontinue accreditation of specialist skills after six months, to assist in minimising abstraction over the longer term – for instance, in relation to major enquiries. At the time of inspection the abstraction target was being attained across the force; some SCTs reported 95% of their time on their neighbourhoods. SCT staff reported minimal abstraction as an important factor in both their job satisfaction and their increased visibility.
- Recognising that communities were not consulted fully during the initial identification of some neighbourhoods, further consultation (including consultation with crime and disorder reduction partnership (CDRP) partners) took place during 2006 which led to a more informed identification of all neighbourhoods that align, where appropriate, with partner priority areas.
- ComPaSS provides a wide range of data, including fear of crime, that is used in developing neighbourhood profiles and identifying priority areas that require more resources. The profiles are being used in the development of BCU level joint strategic assessments, and are reviewed as and when new and significant data is received.
- The training manager and Neighbourhood Policing lead have worked closely together on developing the SCT training programme. Courses are evaluated following completion and SCT deployment, and changes are made in emphasis and content as appropriate.

October 2007

- SCs are assigned to SCTs and are committed to a minimum of six hour per week. In addition, neighbourhood wardens and neighbourhood managers also work closely with SCTs in the seven designated neighbourhood management areas. A policy for using community volunteers has recently been agreed by the chief officer group (COG).
- All SCTs are accommodated in fully equipped operational police premises, located as close to their communities as possible. SCT staff have access to the full range of force equipment, including police transport.
- The force has implemented an SCT deployment policy that clearly defines the type of incident to which SCT staff will be deployed in their neighbourhood. SCT staff reported that their investigative workloads were, overall, appropriate and manageable, as monitored by the sergeant.
- A menu of generic objectives for use in the personal development reviews (PDRs) of Neighbourhood Policing staff has been developed. Managers and staff report that these are relevant to their aims and objectives and that they can be further customised as necessary.
- Progress against the Victim Code and NQoSC is regularly monitored and has resulted in improvements to the service for victims of crime. One initiative sends a letter to victims of crime with a unique reference number, which directs the victim to an online service for checking the progress of the investigation. This service is available in a variety of languages that match those required for the victim support team.
- CIAs are used at force and BCU level to identify risks of community concern and tensions for potentially sensitive public events and police operations. The force independent advisory group (IAG) – which includes representatives from the BME communities, travellers and disability groups – provides external scrutiny of community-sensitive policing issues, such as use of stop-and-search powers.
- All 41 SCTs are now in place, with the last being deployed in April 2007. The majority of teams have several beat managers and PCSOs, and each team has a dedicated or shared sergeant. SCTs operating within the county's seven neighbourhood management areas have additional police resources. By the end of April 2007 all of the force's full complement of 138 PCSOs was deployed to SCTs. An additional 25 PCSOs, jointly funded with local authorities and parish councils, strengthen links with these partners.
- Contact details for SCT staff, including names and mobile telephone numbers, are continually and widely published through a variety of media – each team has a page on the Neighbourhood Policing section of the force website. A reality visit to Kingswood in Corby revealed a high level of contact with PCSOs and knowledge of SCT contact details among local businesses, community centres and local residents.
- A community engagement guide provides SCTs with a template to identify, prioritise, and seek views from the community on tackling local priorities. A wide range of community engagement tactics are used to identify local concerns, including media releases, doorstop surveys, newsletters, use of KINs, and through community priority forms and leaflets. Community panels are used to discuss, prioritise and agree priorities.

October 2007

- Agreed local priorities are available on the force website. At BCU level, an overview of all local priorities is available on a local database which is constantly updated by SCT supervisors; this helps identify trends and themes for inclusion in the daily management meeting and, if appropriate, for inclusion in tasking and co-ordination meetings.
- The community engagement guide identifies the importance of feeding back progress made in tackling local priorities to the community. More established SCTs have developed various means of feeding back to communities the progress made in dealing with local priorities. For instance, in neighbourhood management areas, the neighbourhood board structure – with its subgroups that involve members of the community – is used to provide feedback and agree sign-off when priorities are resolved. Elsewhere, community panels are used to feed back and some SCTs also use their own databases to ensure that members of the public who have submitted a community priority card receive updates.
- Many examples of successful joint problem solving at a neighbourhood level tailored to fit specific local problems have been evidenced by both staff and partners. A range of such examples was presented by BCU commanders during a county-wide parish council conference held at police headquarters (HQ) in May 2007 such as tackling ASB, the use of mini-motorbikes and the recording of nuisance incidents using head cameras. Where appropriate, the BCUs allocated increased resources through the tasking and co-ordination process.
- A series of seminars has been, and continues to be, held for SCT staff and a wide range of partners that provides an opportunity for the sharing of good practice and to discuss problems. Force staff reported that the seminars were very useful and informative.
- Information-sharing protocols are in place and proving effective in supporting successful joint problem solving.

Work in progress

- Engagement with harder-to-reach groups is at an early stage, but there are positive signs of the involvement of such groups in deciding local priorities. For instance, several SCTs have developed good contacts with Polish communities, while others attend senior citizen events. One SCT recently organised a launch day for its harder-to-reach group campaign that attracted a large attendance from local Bangladeshi and Somali communities.
- The force has invested a lot of energy in developing formalised police and partner tasking meetings to improve the effectiveness of joint tasking in dealing with local priorities that cannot be resolved at the JAG level. Several joint tasking meetings have now been held, chaired by the BCU partnership superintendent. A wide range of partners and SCT staff attend the meeting, although the tasking process has still yet to be fully worked through as meetings are still focusing primarily on aims, terms of reference and lists of attendees.
- SCT staff have received training on identifying community intelligence, and the amount of such intelligence is increasing. As a part of this, Special Branch provide regular briefings and presentations to SCTs. Additional analytical capacity, to deal more effectively with the intelligence, is being introduced through community intelligence desks. Implementation of these desks is still in process; a desk on

October 2007

Northamptonshire North Area started in May 2007, and the West Area desk started in early July, although it is not yet fully operational. The desks, consisting of one local intelligence officer and an analyst, examine all new intelligence logs and then use criteria to decide whether the intelligence should be inputted into the FIS: one criterion will be relevance to the SCT priority and the BCU control strategy.

- A joint strategic assessment is planned with partners, following a recent commitment to produce such an assessment for each BCU by October 2007. Much of the process is already in place as force and BCU strategic assessments already contain partner input – the focus now is on enhancing this input and developing the format.
- SCTs deployed more recently are still working through their individual Neighbourhood Policing project plan, following a corporate model, to develop community engagement and establish local priorities. At the end of April 2007, 18 SCTs had developed agreed priorities; all neighbourhood profiles will be completed by August 2007.
- In response to reports about the difficulties in using ComPaSS, changes have been made to the website and a "what ComPaSS can do for you" awareness package has been developed. A review of the website is ongoing and one-to-one training for front-line practitioners continues. There is an opportunity to include in this package guidance on how users can more easily identify from the system good practice around problem-solving and engagement tactics.
- The force has acknowledged that SCT staff would benefit from awareness training around new and emerging communities, especially those from Eastern Europe. As part of the community cohesion strategy, research is addressing these issues, including engaging in the national "what have you learnt about your community?" sharing initiative. A Muslim awareness unit is also being developed with support from the Metropolitan Police Muslim contact unit.

Area for improvement

- SCT staff spend a lot of time inputting into ComPaSS – for instance, recording problem-solving actions and community interactions. The force is in the process of appointing two data entering staff per area, assigned to the community intelligence desks, to reduce this burden on SCT staff.

October 2007

GRADE	GOOD
-------	------

Performance Management

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

Until May 2007 the force was voluntarily engaged with the PSU – now part of the PCSD – supported by the PA and HMIC in a collaborative approach to performance improvement. The force has maintained and improved performance over the last year, with a strong focus on volume crime. It has continued to expand its performance analysis capability with investment in both staff and systems which provide supervisors and managers with access to robust data at BCU, team and individual officer level. The Managing Performance Group (MPG), chaired by the DCC, provides a systematic review and challenge of performance. The focus performance review (FPR) is now embedded with a clear spotlight on inspection, compliance and performance improvement; this also includes key departments within the force such as crime and community.

Regular performance seminars are held, which began in spring 2004 at the start of engagement with the PSU, and have continued since then to provide updates on the engagement process, performance improvements and current risks to performance.

The baseline assessment of performance management (October 2006) identified three areas for improvement, concerning the embedding of the performance culture within the organisation, the alignment of strategic planning with the NIM and finance processes, and improving the use of activity analysis (AA). The force has made good progress in all three areas, which now appear as strengths in this report.

Strengths

- Activity-based costing (ABC) is used well above the level required by the Home Office; the force has developed and pioneered a system which allows staff to use electronic forms to improve the collection process. ABC has been used to support strategic improvements, revising the NPM and reducing bureaucracy in recording sickness.
- The integration of finance, HR and information and communications technology (ICT) has continued to develop synergy. The managing finance group is chaired by the director of resources and exemplifies how these functions are brought together by structured and regular meetings: the group takes cognisance of the force priorities, including protective services.
- Chief officers and senior managers have recently formulated a new vision statement for the force to deliver the best possible quality of policing services to the people of Northamptonshire, enabling individuals and neighbourhoods to feel safe and secure. In support of this vision, it is developing a communications strategy to inform staff of the new vision and how they can support and deliver it.
- An accountability mechanism for the FPR process uses internal audit and inspection to examine quality and compliance for departments and BCUs. This then feeds into the improving performance group (IPG), chaired by the ACC (TP), which in turn is the driver for the MPG which holds BCU and departmental heads to account. An example is the improvement in the force performance in increasing sanction detections.
- The force has a proactive rewards policy, exemplified by the high number of statutory bonus payments that have been awarded to police officers. It holds regular commendation ceremonies.
- The programme management board (PMB) chaired by the ACC (support) provides an overview and technical governance of all projects in force. All projects are managed using projects in controlled environments (PRINCE) methodology, and the force has trained staff in its discipline.
- The force FPR process is particularly robust, and has strongly supported the improvement in volume crime performance. This is chaired by the DCC who strikes the correct balance between intrusion into and support for BCU commanders and heads of departments. All members of the COG lead a number of strategic and performance-related groups.
- The SIB, chaired by the DCC, is a robust and thorough process which initially focused on the criteria for disengagement from the PSU. The work governed by the board has successfully steered the force to consistent performance in achieving the disengagement criteria. It has now broadened its scope to focus on other important areas for the force, such as PVP, for example.
- Various mechanisms are used by the force to seek feedback on strategies and plans; it regularly uses staff opinion surveys, which are monitored and reviewed by the CDD. One example is the finding that the percentage of staff who think equality and diversity issues are effectively managed rose in 2006 compared with the

October 2007

previous year. This informed the decision to further progress the existing equality and diversity policies and monitoring structures. The force also uses its senior managers' forum to seek feedback on a variety of strategies and plans. CDRPs have influenced strategies and plans, notably on the inclusion of violence and ASB within the local policing plan (LPP), and the redesign of the drugs priority aims to secure alignment with the drug and alcohol action team.

- Continuity in the role of both the ACPO officers and PA members has engendered an effective working relationship across a range of performance areas. The PA has its own performance monitoring group, whose members attend the FPR meeting and are fully engaged in developing the LPP.
- The alignment of strategic planning and the NIM within the force planning cycle has been improved over the last 12 months; priorities identified in the force strategic assessment feed into the PA and force seminar, which then takes cognisance of these issues and budgets when developing the LPP.
- All staff are focused on performance, and there is evidence of a strong, embedded culture at all levels. All staff interviewed were able to evidence the inclusion of specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, timely (SMART) targets within their PDRs.
- The force monitors a range of data in the MPG process which is replicated on areas; the force uses comparative performance data, specifically MSF CDRP, MSBCU and MSF. Over the last 12 months the force has also been tracking its performance against the PSU disengagement criteria.
- The force has set significant and challenging targets within its LPP, including citizen focus-oriented processes. These challenging targets have seen some good performance improvements over the past year – for example, in updating victims of crime.
- BCU supervisors and senior managers are carrying out quality checks, calling back victims of crime in order to address specifically the 'follow up' part of the user satisfaction performance indicator, which has been problematic. Where officers have not completed the 'follow up' properly, senior managers engage directly with the officer.
- All data requirements for core performance statistics are met in a timely, accurate and appropriate manner.

Work in progress

- The force has just developed the business engineering review team (BERT) which includes all departmental heads and is already connected to regional collaboration projects. BERT is intended to develop into a mechanism for prioritising resources and business engineering.
- The force has introduced two new working groups on community consultation to formulate proposals for enhancing customer satisfaction and public confidence. One group brings together the PA and force managers, while the community consultation and engagement group meets under the local area agreement (LAA) banner. Both

October 2007

groups will enable the force to review and test public opinion, and link this area of work to that of LAA partners.

- The PSU supported the introduction of the new business objects performance tool, which was made available to supervisors in May 2007. A total of 96 staff have been trained to use the system, with further sessions programmed for summer 2007. The force has an action plan to increase usage by staff, including a more detailed guidance presentation on the force intranet and further group sessions. It has the capability to identify team and individual performance, enabling supervisors to focus effectively on rewarding and improving performance. The system has considerable potential and the force plans to develop it to include more indicators.
- There is some evidence emerging of the use of survey data to inform and improve service delivery over and above the Home Office statutory surveys. The force is developing an ASB victim survey, and a survey designed for the general public around British Crime Survey (BCS) questions in connection with perceptions of service. For the future, the citizen focus board should help to channel developments in this area.
- The force is developing an integrated performance framework approved by the COG in May 2007. This links performance management in terms of baseline assessment areas with all of the force-level process groups operating, taking into account the LAA and LPP.

Area for improvement

- Departments, in particular, crime and community, need to develop further their existing management information to demonstrate how they deliver support to BCUs. Such information needs to be widely distributed to key managers.

October 2007

Developing Practice

TITLE: Performance management

PROBLEM:

How to make the best use of activity analysis and activity-based costing (ABC)

SOLUTION:

In 2004/05 Northamptonshire redesigned the AA paper form to make it easier to understand. In the same year, all officers and more staff members were asked to complete AA forms for ten tours of duty. After completion, the forms were manually checked for errors and inputted. The force achieved a 95% return rate (38% improvement) and a Good/Good audit rating. The following year (2005/06) a 96% return rate was achieved, with some areas achieving a return rate of 100%. Before the 2006/07 campaigns started, work was undertaken to look at other types of forms and systems for recording AA data. After consultation with three companies, the force decided on an electronic form system. Benefits included the fact that

- the form could be saved and returned to;
- that more role-specific activities could be included;
- there was flexibility on the minimum activity duration to be recorded (moving away from recording an activity every 15 minutes, even recording real time);
- there were built-in validation rules;
- and there was a quicker turn-around of getting data into the analysis software, which allowed feedback of data to the areas or departments more quickly.

Before writing reports, areas and departments are consulted to establish what data they would find most beneficial. Questions are then posed to senior management regarding those results and feedback is sought. AA campaigns are not run exclusively for the Home Office. Departments are asking that AA campaigns be completed during specific times (eg, during operations) to get a better understanding of how resources are helping to inform decision making. The PA receives regular updates regarding AA/ABC and the AA/ABC lead will also attend their meeting to provide updates. Regionally, the force led on a piece of work to look at robbery and burglary AA/ABC data for the five East Midlands forces.

OUTCOME(S):

The audit rating moved from weak/poor to good/good.

An initial 38% improvement in return rate from 2003/04 is now stable, well above 90%.

AA is used beyond the Home Office requirement.

More data is available to senior managers and they are more accountable.

Feedback from officers is that the e-form is easy to use.

FORCE CONTACT: Sarah Butterworth – 08453 700700, ext 8009

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

Staff servicing the PVP elements are dispersed between HQ and the two Areas. Child protection unit (CPU) staff are centralised in Rushden; the dangerous persons management unit (DPMU) is centrally based at HQ, while domestic abuse staff are based on Areas.

The head of the crime and community department has submitted two options for a public protection unit (PPU) to bring together the disciplines of child protection, DV and dangerous persons: either centrally in one location under one strategic lead, or centrally based but with delivery devolved entirely to areas. The force has employed a consultant to review the options and make recommendations, with a view to implementing the preferred model by April 2008. The PA has also appointed a lead member to this specialist area of policing.

Strengths

- The DCC is the portfolio holder of all four PVP elements and thus provides a strategic overview of all aspects.
- The force has conducted a qualitative audit and compliance check in all four PVP disciplines, using a red/amber/green grading system; this focuses attention and

October 2007

remedial work on areas of weakness. Action plans have been developed to improve compliance and service delivery.

- The FIS is accessible to all staff and allows searches of a range of information systems; staff can confidently search a nominal on FIS knowing it will signpost and flag the system on which more data is held. This system is applicable to all of the PVP strands and will, for example, flag if a person has been missing, connected to domestic abuse as a perpetrator or victim, connected to a child protection incident as a perpetrator, victim or witness or is a registered sex offender (RSO).

Areas for improvement

- None of the four PVP disciplines feature in the Areas' fortnightly tasking and co-ordination group (TC&G) meetings. HMIC acknowledges a process does allow for the elevation of PVP issues to TC&G, but there are business benefits to be achieved by routinely including PVP matters in the formal TC&G meetings.
- There are no formal links or shared meeting structure between the PVP disciplines: considerable reliance is placed on information systems to establish any relevant links. A formal meeting structure, at senior manager level or practitioner level (or both), would enhance information sharing and promote closer working.

Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse

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

National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
3	17	21	2

National contextual factors

The Children Act 2004 places a duty on the police to ‘safeguard and promote the welfare of children’; safeguarding children, therefore, is a fundamental part of the duties of all police officers. All police forces, however, also have specialist units which, although they vary in structure, size and remit, normally take primary responsibility for investigating child abuse cases. Officers in these units work closely with other agencies, particularly Social Services, to ensure that co-ordinated action is taken to protect specific children who are suffering, or who are at risk of suffering, significant harm. The Children Act 2004 also requires each local authority to establish a Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB). This is the key statutory mechanism for agreeing how the relevant organisations in each local area will co-operate to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in that locality, and for ensuring the effectiveness of what they do.

Membership of LSCBs includes representatives of the relevant local authority and its Board partners, notably the police, probation, youth offending teams, strategic health authorities and primary care trusts, NHS Trusts and NHS Foundation Trusts, the Connexions service, Children and Family Courts Advisory and Support Service, Secure Training Centres and prisons.

Contextual factors

The CPU is led by a detective inspector and its specialist staff service all force enquiries that meet the child abuse referral criteria. The unit’s staffing has increased recently with the addition of police staff to provide administrative support.

Baseline 2006 identified a number of areas of improvement concerning child protection. The central referral unit (CRU) – part of the CPU – is appropriately staffed and able to manage cases professionally to ensure partner agencies are involved, but work is required to strengthen the process for investigations which are referred to BCU.

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

Strengths

- CPU is centrally managed by the crime and community department, with a direct link to the DCC; staff are based in one location at Rushden and cover the force. The unit works to a clearly defined remit and investigative criteria, including intra-familial and cases involving professionals or care givers.

October 2007

- Safeguarding children features as a strong theme in both the LPP and control strategy.
- The inspection found evidence that IMPACT nominal index (INI) checks were being routinely carried out for all child abuse investigations dealt with by the CRU.
- A child protection database, developed in force to assist the management of child abuse investigations, is consistent with ACPO guidance on investigating child abuse and safeguarding children. It operates on a running log basis, with strategy discussions added to a separate part of the system.
- The child protection policy and supporting SOPs for child abuse investigation deal effectively with roles and responsibilities from the initial call taker through to case conferences and supervision.
- The CPU was subject to a best value review (BVR) in 2005 which identified that the current staffing levels were appropriate, apart from staffing of the CRU; this latter point has since been addressed.
- CPU staff attend all initial case conferences – typically around three conferences per month. The majority of strategy meetings are face to face, and about 20% are over the telephone, which includes urgent cases. Supervisors attend approximately one-third of conferences with the officer in the case, and always attend in a serious case.
- The risk-assessment process directs staff to consider eight areas; at the conclusion, staff from the CRU or the officer in the case grades the case as either 'immediate response required' or 'managed response required'.
- Some performance measurements are collated by the force, namely the number of referrals, timescales for completion and the number of strategy meetings attended.
- There is robust supervision of CPU staff and their investigations. All supervisors conduct monthly 'situation report' meetings with their staff; supervisors are involved in investigations, particularly serious cases, and engage in suspect interviews. They also review all risk assessments and there is good evidence of the levels of supervision recorded within the child protection database.
- Policy log training has recently been delivered to CPU staff for use in all serious cases; this will enable the production of an accurate and properly evidenced log of all investigative decisions taken in a case.
- All CPU staff are detectives and have received both Initial Crime Investigators' Development Programme (ICIDP) and Achieving Best Evidence (ABE) training. A basic mentoring course is offered to new staff joining the unit. The force has liaised closely with Centrex to review and discuss its training requirements.
- The CRU has continuous access to the child protection register and records all cases directly onto its child protection database. The inspection team found that comprehensive entries are consistently being made onto the database, providing detailed information relevant to the investigation.
- The inspection also found good evidence of links between missing persons and DV cases prompted by the information systems within force.

October 2007

- In December 2006 the force commissioned and has now completed a problem profile for child protection, which identifies high-risk offenders and hotspot locations.
- The force has seconded a detective inspector to the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) who participates in and is engaged with a number of subgroups focusing on child protection.
- All staff reported that their job descriptions were accurate and up to date with clear terms of reference.

Work in progress

- A training and development needs analysis has been conducted for all CPU staff and the training needs are being progressed.
- To ensure that all INI checks are conducted by area staff for appropriate investigations, the force has recently delivered a detailed marketing and communication strategy, including the head of the FIB meeting with area representatives to explain INI fully. It should continue to monitor this to reassure itself that the communication strategy was effective.

Areas for improvement

- While the child protection database is used by the CPU to manage its intra-familial investigations, the database is not used by area staff who deal with the extra-familial cases. The force needs to ensure a more robust overview and management of the progress of these investigations to match the effective processes adopted by the CPU.
- The child protection database can only be accessed by Area detectives via the CRU during office hours (CPU does have 24/7 on-call facilities) or the FCC inspector out of hours. The force should consider providing access to Area officers who conduct extra-familial child abuse investigations.
- Although the force risk assessment process is National Centre for Policing Excellence (NCPE)-compliant, development of this may add more value – for example, grading any risk assessments as low, medium or high, in line with other risk assessment models in force, with a menu of responses and measures to be introduced to reduce and manage the risk.
- Current performance indicators for CPU need development around more qualitative measures. This should also include the number of extra-familial cases referred to areas for investigation, to provide managers within an overview of the scale of cases managed.

Protecting Vulnerable People – Domestic Violence

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

National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1	13	27	2

National contextual factors

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

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

As with the investigation of child abuse, responding to and investigating domestic violence is the responsibility of all police officers. Again, however, forces have dedicated staff within this area of work, although their roles vary. In some forces staff undertake a support/liaison role, generally acting as a single point of contact for victims and signposting and liaising with other agencies and support services; in others, staff have responsibility for carrying out investigations.

Irrespective of who carries out the investigation in domestic violence cases, an integral part of every stage is the identification of risk factors, followed by more detailed risk assessment and management. In 2004, HMIC, together with HMCPSI, published a joint thematic inspection report on the investigation and prosecution of domestic violence. At that time, risk identification, assessment and management were in the early stages of development throughout the service. Since then, there has been considerable progress in developing formal risk identification and assessment processes and - in a number of forces - the implementation of multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARACs). Other improvements include the introduction of specialist domestic violence courts and the strengthening of joint working arrangements.

Contextual factors

The force has a total of eight specialist domestic abuse officers (SDAOs), four per area, with two area staff based in a Sunflower centre (multi-agency, one-stop shop for domestic abuse victims). Staff are located in community safety units and are accountable to the area commander. Strategic and policy responsibility is retained centrally.

The HMIC baseline assessment in October 2006 identified two points for improvement, one concerning the two Sunflower centres. The geographical areas covered by the centres has been extended since the last inspection and the force is actively engaging with partners to develop the model to cover the whole of the force. Both centres continue to provide a robust

October 2007

and dynamic service to victims. The other area concerned capacity/caseloads, and remains problematic.

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

Strengths

- The force has a strong positive culture and focus on domestic violence arrests – officers must complete a form explaining why an arrest has not been made. One area was able to demonstrate interventions by senior managers with officers who had not taken arrest opportunities.
- All operational staff have received domestic abuse awareness training and there is a plan in place to deliver training to those few staff who missed the initial deliveries.
- Domestic violence is included in the annual policing plan, with a number of targets, eg to reduce domestic violence repeat incidents from 49.9% (2004/05) to 17% in 2006/07.
- Force policy outlines precisely what actions should be taken – initially and throughout the investigation process – and is consistent with ACPO guidance on investigating domestic violence. It identifies process, procedures and the responsibilities of all staff involved in a domestic abuse incident. The policy includes a set of SOPs. Staff were able to demonstrate that policy is being applied consistently across the force.
- The force uses its VANTAGE command and control system to manage domestic abuse incidents; this has drop-down menus that follow the SOP to assist and direct call takers. FCC staff can access an array of information, from a range of systems, to brief officers as they go to domestic violence incidents.
- In the Home Office domestic violence audit in March 2007 the force was graded Good for data compliance management arrangements, and Good for recording the percentage of domestic violence incidents where an arrest was made related to the incident. To achieve Good, the force scored between 90% and 95% in the audits.
- The recording of incidents and tracking of investigative progress is managed by the CIS, which is integrated with the FIS and accessible throughout the force; it is a robust system that searches all force databases, raising flags and signposts to the relevant source of information.
- Annually, domestic abuse is subject to a compliance review by the corporate development department, which then features in the force FPR.
- A robust monitoring system is in place to oversee the risk identification forms completed by officers attending domestic violence incidents. VANTAGE does not allow an incident to be closed until a risk identification form has been completed and submitted. A weekly monitoring system is used by senior managers to identify the number of risk forms outstanding, so they can intervene where appropriate. All forms are further assessed by SDAOs; the operational performance unit (OPU) sergeant deals with risk assessment when the SDAOs are unavailable on Sundays and bank holidays. This process is outlined in the SOP for domestic violence.

October 2007

- A range of performance indicators for domestic violence has recently been introduced and these are reported at the MPG meetings.
- All domestic abuse staff have received training by an accredited Centrex trainer.
- The Sunflower centres are good examples of engagement with multi-agency partners. A senior officer also chairs the county domestic abuse forum, which brings together a range of multi-agency practitioners to tackle the four agreed strands: victims and witnesses, offences brought to justice, perpetrators and protecting children.

Work in progress

- The force domestic violence project board has been in place for a year, and is chaired by a superintendent, with membership composed of key personnel. Although in its early stages, it is setting strategic priorities and has a domestic violence action plan with eight key objectives.
- A small dip-sample of files during inspection identified one case where there were no warning flags on a high-risk domestic violence offender; the particular incident involved repeat victimisation with children present. HMIC acknowledges that this incident preceded the launch of the risk assessment policy; the force has introduced a daily management process for all domestic violence incidents, utilising the VANTAGE system, and scrutiny of the level of supervision for cases captured in the FPR process. This process should provide reassurance that this was an isolated incident.
- ICT is currently developing a solution to introduce a child protection 'tick box' on the CIS for officers to complete, as they do for cases of domestic violence. Officers may be aware of child protection issues when attending domestic violence incidents, but if they do not flag them on the CIS they may be subsequently missed by CPU staff.
- Scoping has now been completed and the force is developing a dedicated electronic risk assessment and case management system to manage domestic abuse cases, replacing the VANTAGE system. Staff in the multi-agency Sunflower centres have a stand-alone computer holding data on domestic violence cases, and staff on areas also hold paper records if a domestic violence incident is not reported as a crime. To resolve this problem the force is rolling out over the next 12 months the Canary database which will facilitate data sharing between partners.
- The force has a draft homicide prevention strategy, with reference to domestic violence.
- The force is reviewing its SDAO functions to ascertain whether they are all necessary to create spare capacity to enhance their role in risk assessment and giving support to investigations. Working practice changes mean all SDAOs increasingly concentrate on high risk, both in terms of risk management and investigation. Any high-risk cases that arise 'out of hours' are owned by duty sergeants and inspectors under the co-ordination of OPUs. SDAO involvement in the investigation of high-risk cases is increasing and risk assessment across the county is becoming more dynamic following procedures developed by the Sunflower centres.

October 2007

- Job descriptions for domestic abuse officers are currently being reviewed to take account of the new role, with its focus on risk assessment processes.

Areas for improvement

- Police bail decisions are not being updated consistently on force information systems; updates are manual at present. The force needs to review the process and consider developing a technical solution.
- Although good daily audit procedures are in place, the force needs to reassure itself that all domestic violence incidents are being captured on the CIS. In particular, where criminal damage or violence to secure entry was the crime recorded in relation to a domestic disturbance, audit evidence shows that these incidents are not always identified as domestic violence cases. Although the number of incidents falling into this category is relatively low (probably less than 5% of domestic violence cases), the risk of harm is such that it needs to be addressed.
- There has been no training needs analysis undertaken with regard to specialist domestic abuse staff.

Protecting Vulnerable People – Public Protection

GRADE	GOOD
-------	------

National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
2	16	23	2

National contextual factors

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

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

Category 1 – Registered Sex Offenders (RSOs)

Category 2 – violent and other sex offenders

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

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

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

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

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

October 2007

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

Contextual factors

The force has invested heavily in its Dangerous Persons Management Unit (DPMU), recently increasing the officer and police staff complement from four to eight which demonstrates a commitment to manage robustly this priority area of vulnerability. Located within the DPMU is the force and local points of contact for the Violent and Sex Offenders Register (ViSOR) and the multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) co-ordinator and administrative officer (the latter two posts being Probation Service staff). The staff are centrally located at the force HQ.

The HMIC baseline assessment in October 2006 criticised the lack of a management structure for dangerous offender management, and the fact that BCU staff were not trained to perform home visits or able adequately to manage offenders evidenced by a backlog of home visits for RSOs. The significant investment by the force in its DPMU and the commitment of the staff have turned these areas for improvement into strengths.

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

Strengths

- A clear structure is in place identifying lines of responsibility and accountability, from constable to DCC. Accountability structures are managed by the head of the crime and community department.
- In April 2007 the force introduced its comprehensive policy for the management of sex and violent offenders based upon the draft ACPO manual of guidance. It is a 'cradle to grave' guide to the DPMU, clearly identifying responsibilities and key processes, procedure and training.
- The force has implemented a robust policy for breach of notification requirements by RSOs. The DPMU staff investigate these offences, rather than custody interview teams. Positive action is always taken; the minimum standard for a first-time breach is a contemporaneous interview and formal caution.
- The force control strategy directs the DPMU to increase the number of Sexual Offences Prevention Orders (SOPOs) sought in the next year. At present, eight SOPOs are in place, more than was achieved in the previous three years. A National Strategy for Police Information Systems (NSPIS)-based process conducts a monthly review to identify all persons charged with a relevant offence – details are sent to the DPMU to initiate a court application for a SOPO. The system will be modified in July 2007 to send an automatic e-mail at the point of charge, providing real-time information and eliminating the need for a monthly review. The FCC also sends an email to the DPMU identifying all sex-offence incidents.

October 2007

- The force has made a significant investment in its PPU, increasing staff numbers from four to eight, supervised by a detective sergeant. Robust evidence was provided on the equitable allocation of RSOs. For example, two staff complete the 'high' and 'very high' category of risk visits, with an average caseload of ten. The remaining six staff conduct the 'medium' and 'low' visits, with an average caseload of 67.
- The dedicated detective sergeant in the DPMU was able to demonstrate effective engagement and management of staff. A database is held on a range of activities, including visits to RSOs, providing accurate and timely information to demonstrate that visits are up to date. Weekly risk assessment meetings are chaired by the DPMU sergeant who reviews and monitors all risk plans and visits.
- The force command and control system (VANTAGE) flags all sexual offences and indecent exposures, sending an automated message directly to the DPMU for officer attention.
- Job descriptions are accurate and reflect current roles and responsibilities, having been reviewed in early 2007.
- DPMU officers provide written details of all initial notification requirements to RSOs, who are asked to sign to acknowledge receipt. This has often proved beneficial in securing a later conviction for a breach of notification.
- The centralised DPMU promotes effective working through supervision, joint visits as required and co-location of the MAPPA co-ordinator and ViSOR administrators, which gives some resilience.
- An initial RSO evaluation is completed to risk assess the need for single, joint or supervisory visits; all initial visits are undertaken by two officers and all RSOs are subject to a new risk assessment before each visit.
- All RSOs are risk assessed using Risk Matrix 2000 (RM 2000) to identify a baseline for likelihood of further conviction and a minimum level for police management. A further risk assessment tool is completed, based on dynamic factors, which is used to elevate (or reduce) the risk of harm and associated level of police management.
- The DPMU is proactive in the management of its RSOs – a weekly risk assessment meeting is chaired by the detective sergeant, focused on the 'high' and 'very high' categories of risk, together with a review of all offenders who received a home visit in the previous week.
- The DPMU collects a comprehensive range of performance indicators; for example, identifying the quantity and quality of home visits completed by the due date, which is being used by supervisors and managers to monitor the success of methods adopted.
- Inspection found that comprehensive use is made of ViSOR, with appropriate completion of attachments and antecedent information, supplemented by thorough completion of the activity log.
- The force recently investigated a homicide which was probably committed by a dangerous offender but where there was insufficient evidence to charge the individual. The force recognised the risk in releasing the offender and instigated a

October 2007

MAPPA level 3 meeting, with appropriate partners, which led to the offender being detained under mental health legislation. This is an example of positive and beneficial use of MAPPA by the force and partners to jointly manage and minimise risks. Recently, Special Branch officers successfully submitted a domestic extremism case to MAPPA level 3.

- The force is developing a 'shadow MAPPA' process and protocol with a secure mental health unit; an SCT officer will be located in the unit, with appropriate secure access to ViSOR.
- All staff in the DPMU are RM 2000 and ViSOR trained, with plans for offender risk assessment system (OASys) (a Probation Service system) risk assessment training to raise their awareness of the process.
- A robust welfare and counselling service ensures that staff receive annual mandatory sessions; new staff are monitored and included in the system.
- The DCC has just become the police member on the strategic management board (SMB). The director of intelligence attends MAPPA level 3 meetings while area detective inspectors attend MAPPA level 2 meetings. Chairing of meetings is a joint responsibility between police and probation, and all meetings are minuted.
- All staff in the DPMU are vetted to counter terrorism check (CTC) level.

Work in progress

- An internal audit of public protection systems was undertaken in July 2007. A formal report will be presented to the force in late summer 2007.
- The MAPPA manager currently chairs both level 2 and 3 meetings, which leaves the force somewhat dependent on a single officer to maintain critically important processes. The force acknowledges this and has secured funding for administrative support posts, including a deputy MAPPA manager, to address this situation.

Areas for improvement

- When RSOs have completed a period of notification, the DPMU continues to monitor them, including the completion of home visits, where risk assessment justifies this approach. The force does not yet have a process of classifying these persons as category 3 offenders within MAPPA. To continue with this approach the force should classify these cases as MAPPA category 3 in order for the process to withstand full scrutiny.
- At present the DPMU detective sergeant is engaged at both tactical and strategic levels. The force needs to ensure its new PPU model provides effective line management to take the strategic lead, leaving the detective sergeant to focus on the tactical issues.

Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons

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

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

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

Strengths

- The force has developed an in-house dedicated computer system, called CHAMPION, to manage its missing person enquiries, which has good functionality and is accessible by all operational staff. It automatically sends an email to the appropriate supervisor required to complete a review, and allows the review to be returned by email, automatically updating CHAMPION. The review warning flag will not be automatically deleted from the screen until the enquiry has been reviewed.
- The child agency Connections is automatically e-mailed when a child aged between 12 and 18 years returns after being reported as missing. An officer conducts the initial return interview and then the Connections member of staff will complete a follow-up and email the response back directly to the CHAMPION database.
- The force policy is up to date and includes a section on risk assessment, which is reviewed by the investigating officer's supervisor. The policy directs that, for all high-risk cases, the criminal investigation unit (CIU) will have primacy; medium-risk cases remain with the incident resolution team (IRT) and low-risk cases are managed by the operational performance unit (OPU).
- Area commanders are accountable for missing persons enquiries; the OPU monitors and manages all enquiries to ensure they are correctly finalised in line with policy. There is consistent evidence of appropriate supervisory review of missing person enquiries, and subsequent tasking of actions up to and including superintendent

October 2007

level.

- The force provides staff with a missing person booklet which complies with NCPE best practice and contains relevant information to assist investigating officers. It also includes a risk assessment model and tear-out section to be given to persons reporting someone missing, identifying a number of support agencies. The booklet makes appropriate reference to Child Rescue Alert, an early warning system that engages the media in tracing a missing child.
- Missing persons enquiries are a routine part of daily tasking on areas.
- The risk assessment process is user-friendly, with tick-box responses to set questions that lead to a designation of low, medium or high risk.
- The force has developed protocols with a number of children's homes concerning unauthorised absences; this ensures that officers are not deployed to record details of missing children unless there are recognised risks.
- The FCC call script has been amended in line with the SOP for missing persons to ensure that FCC staff in particular are fully aware of the protocols with children's homes concerning unauthorised absences.

Work in progress

- The new CHAMPION system was not fully back-record converted prior to its inception in December 2006. However, BCUs did identify their 'top ten' missing persons, regardless of risk level and frequency. The force is currently reviewing all high-risk missing persons to be included on CHAMPION and recognises the benefit in back-record converting high risk, repeat missings and persons from high repeat locations, so that all data is accessible on the system.
- In July 2007 chief officers approved a reprint of the missing person booklet, to be customised and aligned with CHAMPION to improve processes.
- An inter-agency working forum has been developed by the force, which began in June 2007. This offers further opportunities to deliver multi-agency collaboration to reduce repeat missing persons.
- This forum is addressing some gaps around protocols with children's homes, particularly around private care homes with which the force needs to engage and negotiate the introduction of protocols.
- A range of performance data is being gathered from the CHAMPION database which identifies repeat missings and locations. It is intended to circulate this to managers in force who can then assess the data to inform future responses to missing person enquiries.
- The inspection team found from its small sample that some CHAMPION system entries were fragmented, incomplete and with limited details of enquiries completed to locate a missing person. In response to this, and its own audit, the force has established a working group and formulated an action plan to resolve these issues.

Areas for improvement

- In the main the force has delivered cascade training on CHAMPION, although some staff have not received any training. However, there is evidence that the level of training currently received by operational officers results on occasion in less than complete entries on the system. A review of this training would ensure corporate and consistent data-recording standards.
- Although force policy requires a review of risk assessment by a supervisor, reality testing identified that this is sporadic and inconsistent.
- HMIC acknowledges that the force is revising its missing persons policy and SOPs to comprehensively define the requirements for return home interviews. These currently require that all high- and medium-risk missing persons are interviewed upon their return. This may be usefully extended to include low-risk cases, as useful information can be obtained to prevent a further missing report. These interviews are not documented in any detail on the CHAMPION system. The link to child abuse investigations was not evident during inspection, and this aspect should be included in any future audit.
- An audit and review of missing persons was completed by the force in April 2007. The most significant finding was that 47% of reviews were conducted late or not at all, increasing the risk and vulnerability for the force. HMIC acknowledges that the force is working to implement changes to address the audit findings. It should ensure that the existing policy and SOPs are strengthened around reviews, to identify clear timeframes for completion.

Appendix: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

A

AA	activity analysis
ABE	Achieving Best Evidence
ACC	assistant chief constable
ACC (TP)	assistant chief constable (territorial policing)
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
ASB	anti-social behaviour

B

BCS	British Crime Survey
BCU	basic command unit
BERT	business engineering review team
BME	black and minority ethnic
BVR	best value review

C

CDD	corporate development department
CDRP	crime and disorder reduction partnership
CHAMPION	IT system
CIA	community impact assessment
CIU	criminal investigation unit
COG	chief officer group
ComPaSS	community profiling and shared solutions
CPU	child protection unit
CRU	central referral unit
CTC	counter terrorism check

October 2007

D

DCC	deputy chief constable
DPMV	dangerous persons management unit
DRATS	dynamic risk assessment tools
DV	domestic violence

F

FCC	force communications centre
FIB	force intelligence bureau
FIS	force intelligence system
FPR	focus performance review

H

HMIC	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
HOLMES	Home Office Large Major Enquiry System
HQ	headquarters
HR	human resources

I

IAG	independent advisory group
ICIDP	Initial Crime Investigators' Development Programme
ICT	information and communications technology
IMPACT	intelligence management, prioritisation, analysis, co-ordination and tasking
INI	IMPACT nominal index
IPG	improving performance group
IRT	incident resolution team
IT	information technology

J

JAG	joint action group
-----	--------------------

K

KIN key individual network

L

LAA local area agreement

LPP local policing plan

LSCB local safeguarding children board

M

MAPPA multi-agency public protection arrangements

MPG managing performance group

MSF most similar force(s)

N

NCPE National Centre for Policing Excellence

NIM National Intelligence Model

NPIA National Policing Improvement Agency

NPM Northamptonshire policing model

NQoSC National Quality of Service Commitment

NSPIS National Strategy for Police Information Systems

O

OASys offender risk assessment system

OPU operational performance unit

P

PA police authority

PCSD Police and Crime Standards Directorate

PCSO police community support officer

PMB	programme management board
PPU	public protection unit
PRINCE	Projects in Controlled Environments
PSU	police standards unit
PVP	protecting vulnerable people

R

RM 2000	Risk Matrix 2000
RSO	registered sex offender

S

SARS	suspicious activity reports
SC	special constable
SCT	safer community team
SGC	Specific Grading Criteria
SIB	strategic improvement board
SMART	specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, timely
SMB	strategic management board
SOCA	Serious Organised Crime Agency
SOP	standard operating procedure
SOPO	Sexual Offences Prevention Order

T

TC&G	tasking and co-ordination group
------	---------------------------------

V

VANTAGE	force command and control system
ViSOR	Violent and Sex Offenders Register