

ORIGINATOR: CHIEF CONSTABLE

PAPER NO: AP18/19

**SUBMITTED TO: ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE PANEL -
27 APRIL 2018**

**SUBJECT: PROGRESS AGAINST HMICFRS INSPECTION AREAS FOR
IMPROVEMENT (AFIs) AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

SUMMARY:

1. This report provides an overview of progress made by the Constabulary against a number of Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and Recommendations set by the HMICFRS as a result of recent inspections.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Accountability and Performance Panel is asked to note the contents of this report.

DETAIL OF THE SUBMISSION

1. KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION:

Overview of Inspections

- 1.1 HMIC is now known as HMICFRS (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services) since they also took on responsibility for inspecting the Fire Service in 2017.
- 1.2 This report is intended to provide an overview of the process for managing and responding to recommendations and areas for improvement for Suffolk Constabulary as identified by the HMICFRS through their inspection activity. This paper focuses specifically on the HMICFRS reports into Efficiency, Legitimacy, Leadership and Effectiveness (collectively known as PEEL).
- 1.3 Each HMICFRS inspection considers a core set of questions and results in an overall grading and a series of recommendations and 'areas for improvement' (AFI) which forces are required to act on and report back to HMICFRS in future inspections.
- 1.4 The HMICFRS PEEL police Efficiency inspection was published in November 2017. This inspection examined how well each force in England and Wales understood the demand for its service, how well each force uses its resources and how well each force is planning for the future.
- 1.5 Suffolk Constabulary achieved a 'good' rating, recognising that the organisation has a good understanding of the current and likely future demand for its services that is based on research and analysis. It has a good understanding of more complex crime and hidden demands and has impressive joint working practices with other police forces and external organisations. It also has a good record of making necessary savings through innovation and evidence based decisions.
- 1.6 The HMICFRS PEEL police Legitimacy inspection was published in December 2017, and looked at the extent to which forces treat people with fairness and respect as well as the extent to which they ensure their workforces act ethically and lawfully; and further, it looked at the extent to which those workforces themselves feel they had been treated with fairness and respect.
- 1.7 Suffolk Constabulary achieved a 'good' rating, recognising that the organisation was good at treating its workforce with fairness and respect and is good at ensuring its workforce behaves ethically and lawfully. It is also good at treating its workforce with fairness and respect.
- 1.8 The HMICFRS police Leadership inspection is now included as a key theme of both the Effectiveness and Efficiency pillars of PEEL. There are no specific gradings awarded for Leadership, although a national report was published in February 2018 which contains a number of recommendations for all forces.
- 1.9 The HMICFRS PEEL police Effectiveness inspection is due to be published in March 2018. This was a risk based inspection, meaning Suffolk was only inspected against vulnerability and Specialist capabilities using the following questions;

How effectively does the force protect vulnerable people and support victims?
How effective are the force's specialist capabilities?

- 1.10 Annually, HMICFRS also publish a national Effectiveness and Efficiency report to give an overall picture of policing on a more strategic basis. These reports do not comment on individual force performance and forces will not receive an additional grading, but will rather summarise good practice or gaps in service, gathered from all 43 individual force reports.
- 1.11 AFIs and recommendations for all forces can also arise from the national reports. These do not just relate to police forces and are usually higher level which can relate to changes in practice and policy, for example recommendations for the College of Policing to publish guidance or authorised professional practice on a particular subject matter.
- 1.12 Alongside the PEEL process, HMICFRS will also inspect forces on key thematic areas, usually requested by the Home Office. These usually relate to crime types where there have been concerns raised about the level of service provided, or triggered by a national event. Thematic inspection reports will not usually result in a force receiving a grading but there will be AFIs and recommendations arising, where appropriate. Suffolk Constabulary was inspected in March 2018 on Hate Crime with a specific focus on Disability. The report will be published in June 2018.

Management of AFIS and recommendations

- 1.13 Locally, the AFIs and recommendations are managed through the monthly force performance meeting with strategic oversight provided by DCC Jupp. Part two of this meeting is concerned with continuous improvement and HMIC inspections and is the means by which allocation and review of progress of the AFIs and recommendations takes place.
- 1.14 When a new report is received in force, the Force Liaison Officer (FLO) and Deputy Chief Constable Steve Jupp will arrange a meeting to review the AFIs and recommendations contained within, to identify those which need progressing. An appropriate owner will also be identified at this point. Discussion also takes place around progression of existing AFIs to review any which are overdue.
- 1.15 Chief Superintendents and relevant Heads of Department attend the performance meetings, chaired by Deputy Chief Constable Jupp. New AFIs and recommendations are allocated to the most appropriate business owner and ongoing review and update of existing ones take place, with the Deputy Chief Constable holding the action owner to account where insufficient progress has been made. Ongoing review then takes place in this way until the AFI is ready for sign off.
- 1.16 To link in with local practices, HMICFRS are currently developing a robust process for the oversight and governance for AFIs and recommendations, which has previously been a gap in the system.
- 1.17 Their proposal is to have an online force register of AFIs and recommendations, which will be accessible to the public, and which will report on progress made against each one. Each force will have an individual register.
- 1.18 Before publication of the updates, the PCC will be invited to comment on the progress the force has made against each area, which will also be made available for public consumption. This process will be administrated by the Force Liaison Lead (FLL) and the Force Liaison Officer, whereby, they will agree the updates prior to them being published online, or ask for further work to be done, where appropriate.

- 1.19 The governance via HMICFRS is not yet in place although the AFIS and recommendations are currently under review by the FLL. It is envisaged that the online registers will be fully implemented by spring 2018.
- 1.20 In future, updates on progress against the AFIs and recommendations will be appended to reports to the Accountability and Performance Panel.
- 1.21 Attached at Appendix A is the current “live” recommendations and AFI’s for Suffolk with updates on progress,

2. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- 2.1 All of these streams of work will have financial implications for the Constabulary, which are managed by the departments assigned to ownership of each of the identified AFIs or recommendations.

3. OTHER IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS:

- 3.1 None

ORIGINATOR CHECKLIST (MUST BE COMPLETED)	PLEASE STATE 'YES' OR 'NO'
Has legal advice been sought on this submission?	No
Has the PCC's Chief Finance Officer been consulted?	No
Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered including equality analysis, as appropriate?	Yes
Have human resource implications been considered?	No
Is the recommendation consistent with the objectives in the Police and Crime Plan?	Yes
Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?	Yes
Has communications advice been sought on areas of likely media interest and how they might be managed?	No
Have all relevant ethical factors been taken into consideration in developing this submission?	Yes