



**LINCOLNSHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY
FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE
27 APRIL 2011
10.00AM – 1.30PM**

PRESENT:

Members: Mr R Must (Chairman), Mr K Smith (Vice-Chairman), Mr J Atter, Mr A Dezonie, Mr J Walker, Mr B Young

Apologies: Mr G Dark, Mr C Underwood-Frost

Secretariat: Mr M Burch (Chief Executive), Ms J Flint (Treasurer), Mr H Hunt (Deputy Chief Executive), Mr J King (Committee and Administration Officer), Miss V Mason (Research and Performance Officer)

Force Officers: Mr N Rhodes (Deputy Chief Constable), Mr P Steed (Assistant Chief Officer – Director of Resources), Chief Inspector S Craft (Force Control Room), Mr S Croft (A/Performance Manager)

76/10 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL AND/OR PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

None.

77/10. MINUTES – 10 FEBRUARY 2011

The Chairman clarified his comments in relation to paragraph 69/10 of the minutes, stating that the focus of income generation appeared to be geared towards distributing income.

Resolved	Responsible Officer
1. That the Minutes of the Finance and Performance Committee meeting held on 10 February 2011 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.	-

78/10 ACTION SUMMARY

Resolved	Responsible Officer
1. That progress with the Action Summary be noted.	-

79/10. COMMITTEE WORKPLAN

The Chairman referred to action (8) in the work plan 2011/2012 concerning the development of an approach that would link financial allocations with performance outcomes. He advised that the action had been carried forward from 2010/2011, and emphasised his desire to see further progress made with the initiative over the course of the year.

Resolved	Responsible Officer
1. That progress with the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 work plans be noted.	-

80/10. FORCE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK 2011/2012

The Deputy Chief Constable provided the Committee with a detailed overview of how the Force proposed to manage performance in 2011/2012. It was explained that the current Force structure had created a silo approach to managing performance within each of the three Divisions, Crime Support and Operational Support. Each business area had developed individual methods for monitoring performance, which did not encourage the sharing of good practice. The new performance framework was intended to prevent silos from being re-created with a corporate governance of how performance was managed. The re-design was 'forward focused' rather than 'reflective' providing more capability to plan and react effectively to challenges. Performance management data would in future be provided across three layers of the organisation; at a strategic, tactical and operational level. He also extended an invitation to the Research and Performance Officer to attend monthly Force Performance meetings to further improve the flow of information.

The Chief Executive suggested that the provision of data at a District level (following the removal of Divisional Boundaries) would be at the right strategic level for Members. He referred to the new local crime and policing website which provided a detailed focus on performance at a Neighbourhood (or operational) level.

The Research and Performance Officer referred to the list of key performance indicators appended to the report and to the development of an indicator for consideration by the Committee in respect of the Force's contribution to the number of 'offences brought to justice' in the County. The Deputy Chief Constable explained that the Force worked in partnership with a number of other agencies such as the Crown Prosecution Service and HM Court Service to achieve results in relation to offences brought to justice. This would make it difficult for the Force to influence what would effectively be a partnership indicator. He advised that whilst sanction detections were well policed, offences brought to justice were normally "3 months behind the picture." He suggested that a future meeting of the Committee receive a paper setting out the key differences between sanction detections and offences brought to justice so that the Committee could take an informed view.

The Chief Executive questioned the development of an indicator in respect of Value for Money/Efficiencies for inclusion within the performance pack. The Treasurer undertook to discuss the issue with the Assistant Chief Officer and Head of Finance. The Deputy Chief Constable had no objection to the principle of having such an indicator in the performance pack but suggested that it be kept separate from operational performance.

Resolved	Responsible Officer
<p>That</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the framework to enable the Authority to monitor Force performance be agreed; 2. the Force's wider performance management framework for 2011/12 be noted; 3. a key performance indicator for Value for Money/Efficiencies be developed; 4. a report on sanction detections and 'offences brought to justice' be presented at a future meeting of the Committee. 	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>T / ACO / HoF</p> <p>DCC</p>

81/10. FORCE PERFORMANCE ANNUAL REVIEW

The Committee focused its attentions on those areas of Force performance where there were negative exceptions or concerns, specifically in relation to 'All Crime', 'Less Serious Violence against the Person' and 'Violence against Person Crimes'.

Robbery

Nationally the Force was still one of the top 10 performing forces in the Country. There had been 14 additional robberies over the last 12 months compared with 2009/10 with no specific patterns or trends identified. The Deputy Chief Constable reported that every robbery incident was managed at the relevant Tasking meeting.

Burglary

There had been 296 more burglary dwelling offences in 2010/11 compared with 2009/10. However the Force remained in the top half of performing Forces nationally. There had been a notable spike in performance caused by a serial burglar (which had been well documented in the media) who had been responsible for 201 offences, albeit that not all were committed in Lincolnshire. This had also accounted for a slight dip in the sanction detections rate although the Force remained above target. The Deputy Chief Constable accepted that this would need to be an area of particular focus for the coming year and made reference to a previous presentation by D/C/Superintendent Roger Bannister in which a number of initiatives and tactics were detailed for tackling criminality in this area. He assured Members that Chief Officers would continue to push hard for improvements in performance and cited the "Back to the Floor" day as an example of their determination.

Most Serious Violence against the Person

Members noted that there had been a 6.6% increase (15 offences) in incidents of serious violence against the person. The Deputy Chief Constable accepted that the Force needed to focus on improving detection rates in this area. The Research and Performance Officer referred to IQuanta data which indicated that Lincolnshire was still within averaging parameters despite being in a high performing MSF group.

Violence against the Person – Sanction Detections

The Deputy Chief Constable accepted that the Force had to improve the sanction detection rate in this area. He suggested that the re-structuring of the Force would help to deliver better results as the year progressed as new working practices became embedded.

Serious Sexual Offences

Whilst involving relatively small numbers the Deputy Chief Constable was pleased to see an increase in reporting following the opening of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre. Dedicated investigative capacity had been created for serious sexual offences called “Emerald Team” which would help to deliver a better detection rate as the year progressed. The Deputy Chief Constable accepted that the sanction detection rate in this area had to improve.

Killed and Seriously Injured

There had been a slight increase in the numbers of Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) compared with 2009/10. However, the long term trend indicated an overall reduction with occasional seasonal spikes such as those experienced during half term holidays. The Force continued to work closely with key partners and agencies such as the Road Safety Partnership, to take forward various initiatives. The Deputy Chief Constable stated that a large element of roads policing was around the targeting of criminals who used the road network. However, with less funding and reductions in the numbers of police officers he suggested that the Authority would need to consider whether its expectations in this area were realistic.

Incident Attendance

A lengthy discussion ensued about the Deputy Chief Constable’s proposal to unify the response times for Urban and Rural areas into a single 20 minute indicator. C/Inspector Simon Craft detailed a number of initiatives that were being put in place to improve incident attendance such as “Task don’t Ask”, which involved resources being despatched to attend incidents rather than seeking availability. This approach avoided officers “cherry picking” incidents. In addition, incidents were being managed more effectively on the ground which would reap benefits going forward. It was suggested that public trust and confidence could be affected if the target for responding to incidents was raised to 20 minutes. The Chairman suggested that the issue be deferred to a future Committee meeting to allow time for the Force to prepare a more detailed paper on their proposal.

The Treasurer questioned what benefits had been achieved from the roll out of Blackberry mobile telephone devices. The Deputy Chief Constable advised that C/Inspector Mark Housley was currently preparing a benefits realisation report, which would be shared with the Authority in due course.

Resolved	Responsible Officer
<p>That</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Force performance be noted; 2. action being taken by the Force to address areas of underperformance be noted; 3. areas of exceptionally good performance be acknowledged; 4. media releases be produced to share results of the performance review with members of the public and partners; 5. a report on Incident Attendance be prepared for a future meeting of the Committee. 	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>MMO</p> <p>DCC</p>

82/10. ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Research and Performance Officer invited the Committee to consider the level of assurance it had with regard to Finance and Performance related key issue areas.

As portfolio holders for Serious and Organised Crime, the Chairman and Vice Chairman advised that the Association of Police Authorities had published guidance that would assist them in taking a more structured approach to determining a level of assurance for consideration by the Committee.

The Portfolio holder for ICT advised that he was liaising directly with the Deputy Chief Constable with regards to the revised Force ICT Strategy. Until the Strategy was delivered he recommended that the level of assurance remain as 'Limited'.

The Chairman suggested that it would be difficult to determine a level of assurance around Roads Policing as the Committee only received data around KSIs and partnership activity, which were aspects of roads policing. The Deputy Chief Constable considered roads policing and road safety as two separate areas of business and recommended that the Committee focus on just one. The Committee agreed that road safety and KSIs were the most relevant indicators and requested that a report be brought back to the Committee defining the success criteria for consideration.

Resolved	Responsible Officer
<p>That</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a "Satisfactory" level of assurance with a "Static" direction of travel for Sanction Detections be endorsed; 2. the "Limited" level of assurance with "Static" direction of travel received from the Portfolio Holder with regards to ICT, be endorsed; 	<p>RPO</p> <p>RPO</p>

3. a "Limited" level of assurance with an "Improving" direction of travel for Response Times be endorsed;	RPO
4. success criteria for the key issue of 'Road Safety' be prepared for a future meeting of the Committee.	RPO

83/10. ICT STRATEGY

Resolved	Responsible Officer
1. That the oral update be noted.	-

84/10. POLICE AUTHORITY RISK REGISTER UPDATE

The Research and Performance Officer suggested that the Mobile data benefits realisation report commissioned by Force be included in the Register in addition to the development of a key performance indicator for Value for Money/Efficiencies.

The Assistant Chief Officer referred to the overall risk score for critical risk C12 which suggested that there was a strong likelihood of Home Office intervention and associated negative reputation consequences through media coverage. He considered that the likelihood of such an intervention was low and therefore queried whether the risk score accurately reflected the position. The Treasurer suggested that as the lack of general funding for policing services was now a reality, Members might consider it to be an "issue" rather than as a risk. The Deputy Chief Constable considered that the risk had been accurately scored and could only move from being a risk to becoming an issue if measures were put in place to deliver a fairer share of national funding. He further suggested that it would be unwise to downgrade the risk at the current time whilst there were still uncertainties around future funding and precept levels.

Resolved	Responsible Officer
1. That the mobile data benefits realisation report and the development of a key performance indicator for Vfm/Efficiencies be reflected within the Risk Register.	RPO

85/10. FORCE RISK REGISTER

The Portfolio Holder for ICT confirmed that he had spoken with the Deputy Chief Constable concerning a critical risk (1) relating to custody data, which had been previously raised by the Professional Standards Committee. He had been assured that the matter was not as

critical as was first thought and that the risk had been subsequently downgraded. The Treasurer queried why the risk score had not been amended on the Force Risk Register and questioned how regularly the Register was being reviewed. The Deputy Chief Constable acknowledged that the Register should have been amended and was surprised to learn that it had not been. He undertook to ensure that critical risk (1) was amended accordingly.

Resolved	Responsible Officer
<p>That</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the Force Risk Register be noted; 2. the risk score for critical risk (1) relating to custody data be downgraded. 	<p>- DCC</p>

86/10. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING 2010/11

The Treasurer advised that the Committee would not normally receive a Budget Monitoring report so early on in the year. However, there were issues around the proposed funding of the Business Transformation project that needed to be brought to the attention of the Committee. The paper also provided an early indication of spend from the revenue account for the period ending February 2011.

The Assistant Chief Officer advised that the costs around Business Transformation were currently being assessed in terms of consultancy and legal fees, accommodation, travel and other costs associated with the project. He referred to the anticipated spend of £125k on accommodation costs for the Bidding teams which had been based on the cost of providing of porta-cabins. However, Members were advised that the teams would now be housed in the second tier of the Information Management Unit building which would generate a significant cost saving. This would be reflected in the re-worked budget for the project. The Committee was advised that £50k had already been spent from the budget for 2010/2011. The Treasurer emphasised the importance of ensuring that the Authority approved allocations to the budget.

Resolved	Responsible Officer
<p>That</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the report be noted; 2. the balance of the £100k Policing Change Funding be established as a revenue budget in 2011/12; 3. the earmarking of a further £250k towards the costs of development work associated with the Business Transformation Project be approved; 4. £50k be allocated to the revenue budget for 2010/11 from 	<p>- - - -</p>

<p>the Business Transformation Project Reserve;</p> <p>5. the balance of £700k from the Business Transformation Project Reserve be established as a revenue budget in 2011/12 the detailed breakdown of which to be approved by Strategic Planning Committee.</p>	-
---	---

87/10. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

<p>Resolved:</p> <p>That the press and public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that the following items involved the disclosure or likely disclosure of exempt information as detailed in paragraph 7 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).</p>	<p>Responsible Officer:</p> <p>-</p>
--	---

88/10. SCRUTINY OF SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME

<p>Resolved</p> <p>1. That the oral update be noted.</p>	<p>Responsible Officer</p> <p>-</p>
---	--

Chairman