

ORIGINATOR: CHIEF CONSTABLE

PAPER NO:

AP20/33

**SUBMITTED TO: ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE PANEL -
3 JULY 2020**

SUBJECT: PROGRESS AGAINST HMICFRS INSPECTION RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY:

1. This report provides an overview of progress made by the Constabulary against a number of 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 This report provides an update on the outstanding recommendations for Suffolk Constabulary as identified by HMICFRS through their inspection activity. This paper focuses specifically on the HMICFRS reports published since the last APP report in November 2019. There are currently 34 live recommendations and 10 AFI's which are being worked on. The force has made good progress since November 2019, with 29 being reviewed by HMICFRS and identified as complete.
- 1.2 All reports published by HMICFRS, whether they are specific to Suffolk or applicable at a national level, require comment from the Chief Constable on how the force intends to progress any recommendations.
- 1.3 The current reports, published since November 2019, containing recommendations for the Chief Constable are:
 - a) An inspection by HM Inspectorate of Probation and HMICFRS: A joint thematic inspection of IOM (Integrated Offender Management)
 - b) HMICFRS: National Child Protection Inspections – 2019 thematic report
 - c) HMICFRS: PEEL spotlight report: Diverging under pressure – Overview of themes from PEEL inspections 2018/19
 - d) HMICFRS: Both sides of the coin. An inspection of how the police and NCA consider vulnerable people who are both victims and offenders in County lines drug offending
 - e) HMICFRS: Suffolk Constabulary Crime Data Integrity inspection 2019
- 1.4 **An inspection by HM Inspectorate of Probation and HMICFRS: A joint thematic inspection of IOM (Integrated Offender Management)**
 - 1.4.1 This inspection aimed to examine how IOM has been operating since the implementation of Transforming Rehabilitation and in a climate of reduced police numbers. HMI Probation and HMICFRS visited seven different IOM schemes in England and Wales, selected to provide a cross-section of urban and rural locations.
 - 1.4.2 Specifically, HMICFRS wanted to know the following:
 - Does the leadership support and promote the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all service users supervised by IOM?
 - Are staff working within IOM empowered to deliver a high-quality, personalised and responsive service to those supervised by the scheme?
 - Is there a comprehensive range of high-quality services in place, supporting a tailored and responsive service for all those supervised by IOM?
 - Are timely and relevant information available and appropriate facilities in place to support a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all those subject to IOM?
 - How well does IOM support desistance from offending behaviour?
 - How effective is IOM at keeping people safe?
 - 1.4.3 There are no recommendations specific to Suffolk in the report, however, there are a number for all Chief Constables. These recommendations are newly allocated;

- 1.4.4 The Norfolk & Suffolk IOM Scheme is in a strong position when compared nationally and specifically when considered against the recommendations from the report. The governance to the scheme will continue to identify best practice examples and implement them locally and as other recommendations are progressed by the owners we will seek to exploit opportunities to improve the local service we offer.
- 1.4.5 **Recommendation 1:** Operating model -The Norfolk and Suffolk ‘Bridge model’ is clearly defined and a number of other forces have been in contact to understand our methodology and use it as a basis for their own schemes. It was nominated for a World Class Policing Award in 2019. There is clear guidance available on the procedures for scoring new offenders for adoption onto the scheme, offender management pathways, strategy meetings in a multi – agency setting and the process for deregistration. It is recognised that a review of the model may be required in the future due to the forthcoming reunification of Probation Services. This will be undertaken in partnership with colleagues in the National Probation Service.
- 1.4.6 **Recommendation 2:** Recording - All partners involved in the joint Norfolk and Suffolk IOM use E-CINS to record information about the cohort members that they are supervising so that information can be easily shared and risks managed. There is also an information sharing agreement in place to allow the exchange of data in line with GDPR.
- 1.4.7 **Recommendation 3:** Training needs – It is recognised that in order to respond effectively to the complex needs of the IOM cohort, that staff need to have sufficient training. An extensive training programme is being rolled out with consideration being given to how this can be developed in the future. Training sessions such as Thinking Skills, Building Better Relationships and Motivational Interviewing have all been recently delivered.
- 1.4.8 **Recommendation 4:** Service user communication – Recent work has been undertaken by operational Sergeants to highlight the benefits of IOM to our partner agencies and more specifically, the Probation Service. Offender managers are best placed to identify offenders on their workload who would benefit from being managed by a multi – agency approach and can make referrals into the IOM.
- 1.5 **HMICFRS: National Child Protection Inspections – 2019 thematic report**
- 1.5.1 The HMIC report distils the findings that have been gathered from 64 previous inspections, into key themes and use these to explore opportunities for police leaders and partners to improve the protection of vulnerable children. These themes can be divided into five broad areas;
- The role of leaders and leadership
 - The recognition of risk and vulnerability
 - The response to risk and vulnerability
 - Protecting children from those who pose a risk to them
 - The detention of children in police custody.
- 1.5.2 Suffolk has not been inspected in relation to Child Protection. There is no specific mention of Suffolk in the report.
- 1.5.3 There are a number of recommendations for Chief Constables within the report, with extensive progress made against this key area.
- 1.5.4 **Recommendation 1:** Unnecessary criminalisation of children – There are a number of key workstreams being progressed with Police and partners to ensure we minimise the criminalisation of children, with governance delivered through the Children and Young

Persons strategic board chaired by ACC Cutler. Partnership activity is coordinated through the Youth Justice Management Board chaired by Suffolk County Council. Good progress has been made against this recommendation.

- 1.5.5 **Recommendation 2:** Performance/Quality assurance of assessment/decision making – The Constabulary has a strong approach to internal QA and audit process with quarterly ‘deep dive’ reporting around child abuse investigation standards. There are more than 300 crimes audited on a monthly basis by managers with safeguarding activity reported on in addition to the standards within the work and this material is routinely reported to the Performance Board. There is regular performance reporting from the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) to its strategic board and this includes statistical analysis of trends and patterns within child protection referrals.
- 1.5.6 **Recommendation 3: Identify and implement good practice:** Ongoing review work is undertaken within CSIM to monitor all Joint Targeted Area Inspections (JTAI) reports and in particular those that relate to MSF grouping. There have been several items of best practice identified through the last 12 months and implemented locally. A number of new initiatives have been implemented as a result of best practice research, including the “witness under 10 protocol”, CPD training for all practitioners on child demeanour during interview as well as investment in supervision of the MASH.
- 1.6 **HMICFRS: PEEL spotlight report: Diverging under pressure – Overview of themes from PEEL inspections 2018/19**
- 1.6.1 This report gives an overview of HMICFRS inspection reports into all 43 police forces in England and Wales. There are no recommendations arising from this report.
- 1.6.2 Key findings from the report identified that the effectiveness of forces is improving but significant risks remain, particularly in relation to the victim experience and investigation standards.
- 1.6.3 Force performance varies widely in their efficiency grades and they need to have a deeper understanding of demand and capacity, to improve future planning.
- 1.6.4 Police also need to give more effort to drive improvements in legitimacy, particularly with regard to the disproportionate use of police powers in the BAME communities.
- 1.7 **HMICFRS: Both sides of the coin. An inspection of how the police and NCA consider vulnerable people who are both victims and offenders in County lines drug offending**
- 1.7.1 In 2019, HMICFRS inspected how county lines drug trafficking is dealt with at local, regional and national levels. We concentrated on how the police and National Crime Agency identify and treat children and other vulnerable people involved in county lines offending.
- 1.7.2 For this inspection, HMICFRS:
- analysed documents and data;
 - visited the national county lines co-ordination centre, three regional organised crime units and ten police forces;
 - visited British Transport Police (which polices the rail network across Great Britain) because rail travel is a common feature of county lines offending;
 - interviewed relevant staff in each location; and
 - consulted representatives from other bodies
- 1.7.3 There were a number of recommendations for the Home Office, Department of Education and College of Policing arising from the report but none for Chief Constables.

1.8 HMICFRS: Suffolk Constabulary Crime Data Integrity inspection 2019

- 1.8.1 The Crime Data Integrity Group, chaired by the ACC for local policing, has driven significant improvement in the force's compliance against crime recording. A comprehensive action plan details the activity that has been undertaken. This has been provided to the HMICFRS as part of the September inspection of Suffolk Constabulary's current compliance. The inspection report has now been published and this is being used as a foundation for future actions.
- 1.8.2 Since the 2014 inspection of CDI HMICFRS found that Suffolk Constabulary had made a concerted effort to record crime more accurately. We found that officers and staff had a greater understanding of the importance of crime recording standards and of putting the victim at the centre of their crime recording decisions.
- 1.8.3 There were, however, a number of recommendations and AFI's arising as a result of the inspection.
- 1.8.4 **Recommendation 1:** identify and record violent crime – awareness training has taken place for all staff in respect of violence, as well as themed audit for three months with the involvement of area champions. Updates also provided to CCR staff.
- 1.8.5 **Recommendation 2:** MARAC crime recording – The DS now reviews every set of minutes from the MARAC meetings. A recent audit has identified a very high compliance in recording DA related crimes.
- 1.8.6 **Recommendation 3:** Training for IMU staff in the MASH – Training provided to IMU MASH supervisors which has been cascaded to staff.

1.9 Strategic oversight and governance

- 1.9.1 All recommendations arising from HMICFRS reports, both Suffolk specific and national, are recorded onto a spreadsheet and allocated to strategic leads. There is also an online tracker where all forces can access updates on progress nationally.
- 1.9.2 The DCC chairs a monthly meeting to monitor progress of these actions and ensure that progress matches recommended time-scales.
- 1.9.3 Appendix A is a copy of the recommendations with recorded progress.

2. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- 2.1 Where there are financial implications associated with recommendations these are reviewed through departmental or organisational structures and escalated as necessary to ensure these are understood and managed.

3. OTHER IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS:

- 3.1 None

