

**LINCOLNSHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY  
AUTHORITY MEETING**

**Approved at 25<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2008** (with ethical considerations added to guide)

SUBJECT		NEW APPROACH TO SCRUTINY
REPORT BY	CHIEF EXECUTIVE	
CONTACT OFFICER	GINNY MASON, RESEARCH AND PERFORMANCE OFFICER TELEPHONE: (01522) 558016	
<b>SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF REPORT</b>		
To propose a new approach to the way in which the Authority carries out scrutiny work.		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<p><i>That:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Approval be given to the revised Scrutiny methodology.</b></li> <li><b>2. Members adopt the Scrutiny Selection Guide to assess the value of potential scrutiny topics.</b></li> </ol>	

## A. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Under statute, Lincolnshire Police Authority has a duty to secure the maintenance of an effective and efficient police force<sup>1</sup>, achieve continuous improvements in policing performance<sup>2</sup> and obtain the views of local people on policing matters<sup>3</sup>.
- 1.2 In order to fulfil the responsibilities detailed above, the Police Authority has a role in monitoring the performance of the Lincolnshire Police Force. The Authority also has a crucial scrutiny role to hold chief officers to account on behalf of the local community<sup>4</sup>. The Authority provides a key link between the police and the community by overseeing and monitoring local police performance.
- 1.3 The scrutiny process ensures that the Authority can take an in-depth look into particular aspects of the Force's performance.
- 1.4 In recent years, some Police Authorities<sup>5</sup> have developed their scrutiny processes in line with revised local authority scrutiny functions (reviewed as part of the local government modernisation process). This has led to new robust processes to hold service providers and decision makers to account for the services provided, performance and policies.
- 1.5 Effective scrutiny is a key factor in good governance. One of the CIPFA Good Governance Framework core principles includes 'taking informed and transparent decisions which are subject to effective scrutiny'.

<sup>1</sup> Police Act 1996 section 6

<sup>2</sup> Local Government Act 1999, section 3

<sup>3</sup> Police Act 1996 section 96

<sup>4</sup> Detailed in the Home Office's 2004 police reform policy paper, Building Communities, Beating Crime.

<sup>5</sup> For example Greater Manchester Police Authority, Metropolitan Police Authority

## **2. EFFECTIVE SCRUTINY**

- 2.1 Effective scrutiny can be achieved through the robust, constructive and challenging review of Force and Authority performance. Scrutiny work comprises detailed, evidence-based assessment of particular services or issues of local concern that can be developed or improved.
- 2.2 It is important that the impact and effectiveness of scrutiny sessions is also monitored. Scrutiny work should not be seen as a 'one off'.
- 2.3 As part of the Authority's responsibility to ensure value for money and in conjunction with the Finance and Strategy Committee, the Scrutiny process will consider the Authority and Force's ability to manage resources effectively.
- 2.4 Scrutiny is one method by which the Authority can measure the effectiveness of the Force in converting its aims and targets into achievements. Scrutiny is concerned with improving performance and ensuring that the people of Lincolnshire are served well.

## **3. HISTORY OF THE SCRUTINY PROCESS**

- 3.1 In the past, the Authority has conducted scrutiny work in various ways. The first scrutiny took place in February 2002 on Repeat Domestic Violence. Since then, eleven further scrutiny and scrutiny reviews have taken place in the following subject areas:

- Repeat Youth Offending
- Roads Policing
- Training
- National Intelligence Model
- Property Management
- Level 2 Criminality
- Stop and Search
- Finance Department
- Child Protection
- Police National Computer and most recently
- Customer Satisfaction.

- 3.2 There have been a number of modifications to the way the Authority manages the scrutiny process and how scrutiny sessions are conducted during the last few years.

## **4. PRINCIPLES OF GOOD SCRUTINY WORKING<sup>6</sup>**

- 4.1 Scrutiny should be:

- |                   |                 |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| ▪ Deliberative    | ▪ Investigative |
| ▪ Evidence based  | ▪ Influencing   |
| ▪ Inclusive       | ▪ Open          |
| ▪ Transparent     | ▪ Accountable   |
| ▪ Flexible        | ▪ Responsive    |
| ▪ Outward-looking | ▪ Proactive     |

---

<sup>6</sup> Snape, S. and Taylor, F. (2001) A Hard Nut to Crack? Making Overview and Scrutiny work. INLOGO/Improvement and Development Agency

- 4.2 To ensure effective scrutiny, Member involvement is vital. Members need to be engaged and participate proactively in the scrutiny work.
- 4.3 To ensure that the Authority conducts scrutiny sessions that are challenging to the Force and that are of value to Members, there will be a maximum of three planned scrutiny sessions each financial year.
- 4.4 However, scrutiny work programmes should be flexible to enable the Scrutiny and Audit Committee to direct a quick review on an issue of concern that may arise suddenly, for example, the unexpected deterioration in a particular service or business area.
- 4.5 If the Committee decide that additional scrutiny sessions are required, Members should consider the opportunity costs of conducting the scrutiny in-house and the option of engaging with alternative suppliers, for example, internal audit providers.
- 4.6 Scrutiny sessions should not replicate any work already carried out.

## **5. SCRUTINY METHODOLOGY**

- 5.1 It is suggested that the Authority adopts the methodology shown below and in the flowchart attached at **Appendix 1**.
- 5.2 The revised method contains a number of changes to the way the Authority conducts scrutiny work. These are:
- Member involvement in fieldwork and research
  - Use of Scrutiny Panels (member volunteers)
  - Refined guidelines to select scrutiny topics
  - Scrutiny sessions discontinued
  - Robust follow up and review of recommendations.

The key driver of these changes was to ascertain how and where the Authority could add value to the scrutiny process.

### **Selecting Scrutiny Topic**

- 5.3 The Scrutiny and Audit Committee should first select and agree a scrutiny topic formally. In some cases, it may be more practical to agree a topic offline and the Chief Executive, Treasurer, appropriate Chief Officer, Chair and Vice-Chair of the Scrutiny and Audit Committee should be involved in this process.

### **Appointing Scrutiny Panel**

- 5.4 It is suggested that the Scrutiny and Audit Committee appoint a panel of 3 or 4 Members to carry out the scrutiny work. All Members of the Authority are eligible to join the Panel if they have an interest or some expertise in the subject that is being scrutinised. Membership on the Panel will be time limited for each particular scrutiny. At least two members of the Scrutiny and Audit Committee should be included on the Scrutiny Panel.
- 5.5 To ensure that the Panel works as effectively as possible, one Member should be appointed as a 'Panel Lead'. The 'Panel Lead' will be responsible for the outcomes of the scrutiny.
- 5.6 In order to maximise the expertise and breadth of option within the Scrutiny Panel, the Scrutiny and Audit Committee can, where appropriate, consider co-opting other members and other representatives from external organisations to the Panel to add value to the work.

## **Drafting the Scope and Terms of Reference**

- 5.7 It is the responsibility of the Scrutiny Panel to draw up the draft terms of reference for each particular scrutiny. The terms of reference should be explicitly clear about the purpose, scope, specific objectives and timescale of the scrutiny. The document should provide a framework to which the Panel can work and include the following key headings:

<b>Heading</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
▪ Title	Provide the name of the scrutiny.
▪ Purpose	Explain why the panel conducting the scrutiny.
▪ Objectives	Give details to explain what the panel hopes to achieve from the scrutiny.
▪ Scope	Explain what will be included in the scrutiny.
▪ Approach	Provide details about how the scrutiny will be conducted. The methodology may include: a literature review, roles and responsibilities of the panel, desk research, Force performance information, MSF analysis, budget data, consultation results, focus group results, statements from key individuals or groups, evidence from interviews, workshops, report writing and presentation.
▪ Derivation	Give details about where the information and evidence will be sourced. This may include Force Staff or Officers (strategic and operational), key stakeholders, partners, regional and national Authority colleagues, APA, HMIC, ACPO or members of the public.
▪ Composition	This will vary according to the type of scrutiny. Ascertain what the scrutiny will contain e.g. aim to list the contents, chapters or sections of the document, the key headings in the presentation or report.
▪ Format	Give an indication about any standard appearance of the scrutiny work (e.g. the report or presentation).
▪ Exclusions	To ensure that the scrutiny remains focussed and deliverable with the time constraints, give details about any key areas of work that are excluded from the scope of the scrutiny.
▪ Timescales	Give details about the expected timelines and deadlines for completion of each aspect of the scrutiny. Allocate specific deadlines to each Panel member.
▪ Membership	Provide names of who is involved on the panel and in the scrutiny work. Indicate the name of the Member who has been appointed as the 'Panel Lead'.

- 5.8 Additional information such as definition, focus, interfaces, themes and bibliography should be used as necessary depending on the type of scrutiny that is being carried out.

- 5.9 Members may wish to explore the Scrutiny section of the Metropolitan Police Authority website at [www.mpa.gov.uk](http://www.mpa.gov.uk) (select 'Reports' then 'MPA Scrutinies').

#### **Agreeing Terms of Reference**

- 5.10 The Draft terms of reference should be agreed with the Chief Executive, Treasurer, Chair of the Scrutiny and Audit Committee and the relevant Chief Officer from the Force.

#### **Conducting Fieldwork**

- 5.11 It is proposed that Members will carry out agreed work plans to feed into the scrutiny report or presentation. This may include gathering evidence from Force staff and officers, conducting interviews with appropriate personnel, carrying out a literature review, researching good practice, liaising with regional and national colleagues, analysing Force performance information, reviewing budgetary data and examining results from consultations or workshops. The role of the Research and Performance Officer will be to support Members in the process, co-ordinate the work and draft the reports.

- 5.11 To ensure that scrutiny work is effective and adds value, it is important that:

- Members are engaged and participate in scrutiny proactively;
- Good relationships are developed between the Members/Officers on the Scrutiny Panel and Force staff and Officers
- All Members/Officers involved with the scrutiny are responsive and forthcoming with information and advice; and
- Across the board there is a sense of respect and understanding about all aspects of the Authority's corporate governance arrangements.

#### **Producing Draft Report for Scrutiny and Audit Committee**

- 5.11 On completion of the fieldwork, the Panel will draw up a draft report. Once the Chief Executive and appropriate Chief Officer have approved the draft, the Scrutiny and Audit Committee will consider the Scrutiny Panels' findings and recommendations. The report will form part of the regular Scrutiny and Audit Committee Agenda and will typically have a one-hour timeslot in which the Committee can consider any presentations/reports/recommendations resulting from the Scrutiny.

- 5.12 The distinct Scrutiny sessions that have been previously been arranged on 2 April 2008, 19 June 2008 and 27 November 2008 are now cancelled.

#### **The Follow up Meeting**

- 5.13 In approximately 6 – 8 weeks after the Scrutiny and Audit Committee, the Research and Performance Officer will arrange a follow up meeting with the key personnel from the Force, the Scrutiny and Audit Chair and Vice Chair, the Chief Executive and Treasurer and the 'Panel lead'. The purpose of this meeting will be to assimilate and rationalise information following the Scrutiny and Audit Committee consideration of the scrutiny work.

#### **The Final Report**

- 5.14 A Final Report will be produced that draws together the collective recommendations and considerations of the Panel and any additional comments from the Scrutiny and Audit Committee and the Follow up meeting. Members should note that this could be the same stage as the 'producing the draft report' if applicable. If it is deemed necessary, Scrutiny and Audit Committee can propose that an additional review or a re-visit of a particular topic be instigated.

## 6. SCRUTINY SELECTION

- 6.1 Members will be aware that the process of selecting topics for scrutiny has been under review.
- 6.2 It is important that the scrutiny framework adopted by the Authority is robust, consistent, transparent and able to withstand audit.
- 6.3 A draft Scrutiny Matrix was developed based around the PPAF domains whereby potential scrutiny topics could be assessed against the following selection criteria headings - performance, risk, resources, inspection and priorities. In October 2007, Members of the Scrutiny and Audit Committee and Authority Officers took part in a workshop to trial the matrix methodology. The group tested two subject areas in the matrix. There was a discussion around:
- The weighting system used to recognise importance of a particular topic.
  - The use of the PPAF headings as a starting point to identify business areas in the Force.
  - The fact that the matrix did not solve the problem of making the scrutiny selection process more scientific and less intuitive.
- 6.4 The group agreed that the matrix required further development in conjunction with the Force.
- 6.5 The RPO met with the Force Performance Manager in December 2007 and during the course of the discussion, it was agreed that the scrutiny selection methodology would benefit from:
- The use of broader business area headings
  - The inclusion of local priorities domain areas
  - The use of a flowchart or rules to help frame judgements
  - Further development based on any good practice from other Authorities.
- 6.5 Reflecting on the comments and suggestions highlighted at the workshop and in the meeting noted above, good practice highlighted by the APA in Greater Manchester Police Authority and the Metropolitan Police Authority, and other research from the London Borough of Merton, the Scrutiny Selection Guide (see Section 7 below) has been developed for consideration.
- 6.6 During the course of the research, Members should note that it is acknowledged as good practice to seek suggestions for review topics from a wide range of sources. A key feature of the scrutiny programme at Merton Local Authority is the involvement of local people, partner organisations and community groups in the process. The local community are encouraged to suggest topics for review and the process is open and transparent.
- 6.7 Greater Manchester Police Authority believes that 'Members' representative roles are an essential feature of Scrutiny. They are the eyes and ears of the public, ensuring that the policies, practices and services delivered to the citizens of Greater Manchester, by both the Police and Partner organisations, are meeting local needs and to an acceptable standard. The concerns of local people should therefore influence the issues chosen for Scrutiny'<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.gmpa.gov.uk/site/whatdowedo/scrutiny.htm>

- 6.8 In light of this, it is suggested that Members promote the scrutiny work the Authority carries out. This could be achieved by members via the various public meetings they attend, and ensuring that information is included on the Authority's website to encourage suggestions from the public.

## **7. SCRUTINY SELECTION GUIDE**

- 7.1 The Scrutiny Selection Guide is attached at **Appendix 2** and should be used to assess the value of potential scrutiny topics.
- 7.2 The selection criteria can be used to evaluate the potential scope for each suggestion and to prioritise the topics according to the benefits and value each scrutiny could bring about.
- 7.3 A Scrutiny Selection Flowchart is attached at **Appendix 3** and the amended Scrutiny Matrix is attached at **Appendix 4** to assist Members in helping to formulate potential scrutiny topics.

## **8. THE WAY FORWARD**

- 8.1 It is suggested that Members approve the new way of selecting topics for scrutiny and conducting scrutiny activity.

## **B. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

There are financial implications arising from the report such as the additional claims from Members on the Scrutiny Panel, any costs associated with any external work commissioned. The Chief Executive and Treasurer will monitor and manage the cost analysis following any decision made.

## **C. LEGAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS CONSIDERATIONS**

Scrutiny is one method by which the Authority meets its duty in section 6 of the Police Act 1996 to secure the maintenance of an efficient and effective police force.

## **D. PERSONNEL, EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES**

None specific.

## **E. REVIEW ARRANGEMENTS**

None planned.

## **F. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>File</b>
May 2006	London Borough of Merton, Overview and Scrutiny Handbook	PA Office
2007	Greater Manchester Police Authority, Thematic Scrutiny Prioritisation Guide & Website	PA Office PA Office
2007	Metropolitan Police Authority Website	Internet
2007	Centre For Public Scrutiny	Internet

## Appendix 1 - Scrutiny Methodology Flowchart



## Appendix 2 - Scrutiny Selection Guide

Members should use the Scrutiny Matrix (Appendix 4) to help to identify potential topics for scrutiny, then use the following Selection Criteria to help inform and frame their judgement. Members should consider what evidence is there to support their view to scrutinise the topic. The Scrutiny Selection Guide Flowchart (in Appendix 3) can be used to assist Members in determining topic areas.

### **Performance**

Scrutiny is concerned with the improvement of performance and ensuring that the local communities are served well. Therefore members should give consideration to how the Force is performing in particular areas. Information from Police Performance Assessments, HMIC and local performance data should be used to assist in the decision making process.

- Consider the most recent HMIC grading (i.e. does the issue fall within an area that has received a 'poor' or 'fair' grading? Is performance in the area 'deteriorating'?)
- Has the issue been identified as an 'area for improvement' within an inspection or review?
- Is there other evidence to suggest that this is an area in which performance improvement is required?

### **Risk**

The Force and Authority maintain separate risk registers. Any subject listed in the risk register is clearly an area that has been highlighted for concern and action. If the overall residual risk is considered to be 'high', there should be further exploration of the business area as a potential scrutiny topic.

- Consider the severity, impact and likelihood of the risks.
- Is the residual risk rating improving or deteriorating?

### **Resources**

Members may wish to consider the resource implications of potential scrutiny topics.

- How much money does the Force spend on one particular area in relation to another? Is this adequate? (The Matrix shows indicative spend under broad business headings.)
- Is there scope for efficiencies?

### **Inspection**

Members should give consideration to recent or planned inspections of the potential scrutiny topic in the Force.

Has there been any of the following:

- previous scrutiny work carried out by the Authority
- thematic inspections carried out by HMIC
- reviews conducted by Internal Audit or
- any strategic assessment made by the Force.

### **Priorities/Objectives**

Members should consider if the scrutiny topic is related to any Force or Authority priorities or objectives. The Authority and Force publish an Annual Policing Plan that details the priority targets and specific objectives for that year. In addition, there is a three year Strategic Plan (the latest is 2006 – 2009) that identifies strategic aims and detailed objectives. The Force and Authority priorities and objectives are detailed on page 9. the Annual Policing Plan priorities and the three year strategic aims are referenced in the Matrix).

- Is the issue within an area that has been identified as a current priority for the Authority/Force?
- Is the issue within an area that has been identified as a current priority through consultation with the public or partner organisations?

### ***Impact on local communities***

Members should give consideration to any evidence that demonstrates or suggests that the topic could or has had an impact on one or more sections of the community (e.g. young people, older people, people with disabilities, people from minority ethnic groups).

- Has the issue had or might it have the potential to impact on public confidence?
- Does this issue have a potential impact on one or more section(s) of the population?

### ***National Policy***

Consideration should be given to whether or not the topic links to an area in which the Force needs to develop to comply with national policy.

### ***Strategic and significant***

Members should consider if the issue is cross-cutting and sited at a strategic level (i.e. it is not just confined to a particular local area but has implications force wide or at force level).

Consider the significance of the issue by:

- evaluating the evidence relating to the impact of the issue on the local community
- considering if the issue has substantial financial implications; and,
- ascertaining if the issue is focused on or linked to the prevention or reduction of crime, disorder or fear of crime.

### ***Added Value***

It is useful to consider if the scrutiny will add value to the Force's overall performance and think about the likelihood of the scrutiny leading to effective outcomes. Members should consider the desired and anticipated outcomes from scrutiny of the issue using SMART<sup>8</sup> objectives.

- What are the issues that scrutiny is focused on changing and/or improving?
- How is it intended to have a positive impact on performance?
- Will it improve value for money?
- Which performance indicators or measures could be used to gauge success?

### ***Duplication***

Members should consider if the scrutiny would duplicate work that is already taking place.

- Identify whether there is work already going on that is aimed at exploring and/or addressing the issue.
- Assess whether the proposed scrutiny will duplicate or complement any existing work either in part or in its entirety.

### ***Stakeholders***

There needs to be some consideration about the extent to which the topic is a concern to partners, stakeholders and/or the public.

<sup>8</sup> SMART objectives are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time specific

- Collate any evidence to suggest that the issue is of concern to partner organisations, other stakeholders and/or members of the public.
- Use the evidence to outline specifically the nature of such concerns as this will help to shape the direction of any subsequent scrutiny activity.
- Try to assess how 'engaged' partner organisations might be with the scrutiny work; consider 'what's in it for them'?

### **Capacity**

Members need to assure themselves that there is adequate capacity and enough resources identified to undertake the scrutiny activity and do it well.

- Identify what staff capacity there is available to undertake the scrutiny activity and the time that may be required to scope, undertake and complete the anticipated work.
- If capacity is limited, consider whether the scope of the proposed work could be narrowed, the timescales extended or the work postponed until there is sufficient capacity available.
- Consider what other resources may be required (e.g. involvement of staff from the Force; use of existing panel/other consultation mechanisms; external consultants).

### **Timely**

The timeliness of the scrutiny is a key question. Consider whether this is the right time to undertake scrutiny of the particular issue. Members must be aware of any political sensitivity around the issue being considered.

- Is there significant development and/or improvement activity going on within the Force or nationally that is focused on the area under discussion?

### **Ethical Considerations**

Members should consider any ethical considerations when considering potential topics for scrutiny.

**Next steps: scope in more detail and in conjunction with the Force.**















#### Authority priorities for 2007/08:

- **Performance** - To maximise performance through effective monitoring of PPAF, HMIC Baseline Assessment, Policing Priority Targets and other areas of Force performance as appropriate.
- **Finance** - Continued sound financial management and securing an improved funding base.
- **Community Engagement** - To engage communities through effective communication and consultation.
- **Collaboration** - To collaborate with partners to secure a more efficient use of resources and strengthen protective services.

#### Force priorities detailed in the Annual Policing Plan 2007/08:

- To achieve a satisfaction level of 70% for keeping victims informed and to increase overall satisfaction to 85%.
- To reduce BCS Comparator Crime\* by 9% when compared to 2006/07.
- To achieve at least 14,181 sanctioned detections and a sanctioned detection rate of at least 25%.
- To record fewer Violent Crimes (excluding harassment offences dealt with by way of Fixed Penalty Notice) than in 2006/07.
- To reduce the number of people under the age of 16 suffering fatal or serious injury as a result of road traffic collisions by 10% and to sustain overall reductions.
- To achieve 70% agreement that the police deal with things that matter to the local community.

*\*(dwelling burglary, robbery, wounding, common assault, criminal damage, vehicle theft, cycle theft and theft from person*

<b>Appendix 3 – Scrutiny Selection Guide Flowchart</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>1 Performance</b>	Is Force performance poor or deteriorating?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>2 Risk</b>	Is the topic detailed on the risk register? Is it a high risk area?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>3 Resources</b>	How much money is spent in this area? Is it high cost?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>4 Inspection</b>	Has there been a recent or planned inspection? Consider if the topic warrants a follow up?	 RECONSIDER	✓
<b>5 Priorities/Objectives</b>	Has it been identified as a current priority or objective for the Authority and Force?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>6 Impact on local communities</b>	Does it have a potential impact on one or more section(s) of the population?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>7 National Policy</b>	Does it link to an area in which the Force needs to develop to comply with national policy?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>8 Strategic and significant</b>	Are the implications Force wide? Is it cross cutting?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>9 Added Value</b>	Will it add value to the Force's overall performance and lead to effective outcomes?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>10 Duplication</b>	Will scrutiny duplicate work that is already taking place?	 RECONSIDER	✓
<b>11 Stakeholders</b>	Is the issue of concern to stakeholders, other partners and/or the public?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>12 Capacity</b>	Can resources be identified to undertake the scrutiny activity and do it well? (both in the Force and Authority)	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>13 Timeliness</b>	Is the scrutiny activity timely?	✓	 RECONSIDER
<b>14 Ethics</b>	Is the scrutiny ethical?	✓	 RECONSIDER

## Appendix 4 - Amended Scrutiny Matrix

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance		Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities		
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity? * % of overall spend detailed	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority? PT – Priority Target (07/08) SP – Strategic Plan Aim (06/09) LPP – Local Policing Plan Objective (07/08)	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
Citizen Focus	Fairness and Equality in Service Delivery	HMIC Baseline 2004 - Fair 2005 - Fair 2006 - Fair	<i>Citizen Focus:</i> 2004/05 - Fair 2005/06 - <b>Poor</b> 2006/07 (Satisfaction & Fairness) - Fair  Fairness & Equality 04/05 - Fair 05/06 – Fair  Fairness of stop and search towards MEG 2006/07 – Good/excellent		Force: Appointment of diversity officers (open risk) Sept 2007	No staff are allocated to this area specifically, neither is any bespoke budget.	PA Stop and Search Scrutiny Sept 2006	APP 2. Establish a Community Engagement Strategy for cohesive communities.  APP 3. Develop the diversity scheme to meet the needs of our communities  SP 1a. Implement a citizen focused plan for delivering our services  SP 1d. Contribute to the countywide community cohesion agenda.	
	Neighbourhood Policing and Problem Solving	2004 - Not Graded, 2005 – Fair 2006 - Fair	<i>Local Policing:</i> 04/05 Fair 05/06 Poor  <i>Neighbourhood Policing &amp; Problem Solving</i> 2004/05 - Fair 2005/06 - Fair  <i>Implementing NP</i> 2006/07 - Good		Auth: Comm Engagement - ineffective consultation  Auth: Comm Engagement - NP Auth: Resource Man - PCSO funding  Force: Managing partner & public expectation re NP (open risk) Sept 2007  Auth: NP  Auth: Comm Engagement - PA awareness  Auth: Performance - not measured	£3,476,340  3.4%	Neighbourhood Policing Oct 2007  Going local East Division Sept 2007  Going local East Division 2004	PT. Achieve 70% agreement that police deal with things that matter to local community.  SP 1b. Establish community policing teams across the county	To engage communities through effective communication and consultation

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity?*	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority?	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
Customer service and accessibility	2004 - Not Graded 2005 - Fair 2006 - Fair	<i>Customer Service</i> 2004/05 - Fair 2005/06 - Fair	Overall satisfaction Sept 07 - 77% MSF 8 <sup>th</sup> out 8  Kept informed Sept 07 - 64% MSF 5 <sup>th</sup> out 8	Force: Victim and witness needs (open risk) Sept 2007	£292,660  0.28%	PA Customer Satisfaction Nov 2007 Ext Audit 2007: user sat data testing - excellent	APP 1. Increase satisfaction against the Quality of Service Commitment, focussing on minority groups  SP1c. Our Quality of Service commitment in place  SP4b. Implemented a training programme in respect of customer care  SP4c. Introduced new arrangements for keeping victims informed		
Professional standards	2004 - Fair 2005 - Not Graded 2006 - Fair	<i>Professional Standards</i> 2004/05 - Not graded 2005/06 - Fair		Force: Process testing for professional standards (open risk) Sept 2007  Force: National changes to Police Disciplinary arrangements (open risk) Sept 2007  Policies and protocols for integrity (open risk) Sept 2007	£544,520  0.54%	PA Customer Satisfaction Nov 2007			
Local Priorities	Access Contact NPT		<i>Local Priorities</i> 2006/07 - <b>Poor*</b>  <i>Residents Fear of Crime (burglary, car crime and violent crime)</i> 2006/07 - Fair	MSF position not available					
	Influence 'police understand local issues'			MSF (Nov 07) 5 <sup>th</sup> out 8 (BCS)			SP3b. Ensure local people are involved in their local police service and are able to hold us to account for dealing with local problems		

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity?*	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority?	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
	Interventions 'police dealing with things that matter'			MSF (Nov 07) 5 <sup>th</sup> out 8 (BCS)					
	Answers Perception ASB 'think police are doing a good job'		<i>Perceptions of ABS</i> 2006/07 – Fair  <i>Residents perception of police performance</i> 2006/07 – <b>Poor</b>	MSF (Nov 07) ASB – 2 <sup>nd</sup> out 8  MSF (Nov 07) BCS Comp Crime – 6 <sup>th</sup> out 8  MSF (Nov 07) Doing a good job – 6 <sup>th</sup> out of 8.				APP 18. Increased public confidence	
<b>Reducing Crime</b>	Volume crime reduction	2004 - Fair, 2005 - Fair, 2006 - Fair	<i>Reducing Crime:</i> 2004/05 - Fair 2005/06 - Good 2006/07 (Tackling Crime) - Good  <i>Reducing Volume Crime</i> 2004/05 - Fair 2005/06 - Fair	BCS Comp Crime Nov 07 (target reduce by 9%) 9.8% improvement on last year	Force: Crime and Intelligence Project (open risk) Sept 2007  Auth: Performance - not measured	£2,841,760  0.03%		PT. Reduce BCS comparator crime by 9%  SP2b. Reduced volume crime focusing on those categories that are a priority for the public.  APP 14. Implement a detailed plan for crime reduction	
<b>Investigating crime</b>	Managing critical incidents and major crime	2004 - Not Graded, 2005 - Fair, 2006 - Fair	<i>Investigating Crime:</i> 2004/05 - Fair 2005/06 Fair 2006/07 (Serious Crime and Public Protection) – Fair  <i>Managing Critical Incidents &amp; Major Crime</i> 2004/05 - Not inspected 2005/06 - Fair	Violent Crime Nov 07 8.2% improvement on last year	Force: Interoperability of internal intelligence systems (open risk) Sept 2007  Force: Homicide prevention strategy (open risk) Sept 2007	£2,532,830  0.02%	PA Level 2 criminality May 2007	PT Record fewer violent crimes than 2006/7  APP 21. Ensure the provision of protective services as part of the East Midlands region  APP22. Ensure capacity for dealing with major incidents and specialist functions.	

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity?*	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority?	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
Tackling serious and organised criminality	2004 - Not Graded 2005 - <b>Poor</b> , 2006 - <b>Poor</b>	<i>Tackling cross border crime</i> 2004/05 - <b>Poor</b>  <i>Tackling serious and organised criminality</i> 2005/06 - <b>Poor</b>		Force: Collaboration (open risk) Sept 2007  Auth: Poor results from inspection, collaboration (diversion)	£2,508,250  0.02%	Tackling serious and organised crime Sept 2007 ongoing  Counter terrorism & domestic extremism (Specialist 2006 & 2005)  PA Level 2 criminality May 2007	APP 11. Ensure our capacity for working with the Serious and Organised Crimes Agency  SP2a. A fully integrated approach to cross border, serious crime and organized criminality with other forces in the East Midlands region		
Volume crime investigated	2004 - Fair, 2005 - <b>Poor</b> , 2006 - <b>Poor</b>	<i>Volume Crime investigation</i> 2004/05 - <b>Poor</b> 2005/06 - <b>Poor</b>	Nov 07 Sanctioned detection rate 1.6% above target of 25%	Auth: Poor results from inspection  Force: HMIC Inspection of detections (open risk) Sept 2007	£20,090,360  19.8%		PT. Achieve 14181 sanctioned detections and 25% rate.  APP 9. Make effective use of pre-court sanctioned detections (cautions, conditional cautions, Fixed Penalty Notices and formal warnings)		
Improved forensic performance	2004 - Good, 2005 - Good, 2006 - Good	<i>Forensic Management</i> 2004/05 – Good/Improving  <i>Forensic Performance</i> 2005/06 - Good			£2,474,810  0.02%				

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity?*	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority?	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
	Criminal justice processes	2004 - Poor, 2005 - Fair, 2006 - Good	<i>Criminal Justice process</i> 2004/05 - Fair 2005/06 - Good	90% A/S entered on PNC Aug 07 – 92% Sept 07 – 91% Oct 07 – 87%  75% of disposals entered on to PNC within 10 days of result Aug 07 – 77% Sept 07 – 63% Oct 07 – 59%	Force: Data quality (open risk) Sept 2007  Force: Digital prisoner imaging (open risk) Sept 2007  Force: NCPE guidance on safer detention (open risk) Sept 2007  Force: PNC (open risk) Sept 07	£2,673,910  0.02%	PA PNC June 2007 Data integrity, PNC Recording - Internal Audit 2005/06  July 2002* Review: Jan, April, Oct 2004 Specialist PNC Compliance 2004 PA PNC June 2007	SP2c. Built confidence in our ability to bring offenders to justice by working with the Local Criminal Justice Board to achieve stretching targets for sanctioned detections.  APP8. Work with partners to fast track prolific offenders into the justice system  APP34. Ensure data quality for the Cross Regional Information Sharing Project	

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity?*	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority?	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
Promoting Safety	Reducing anti-social behaviour	2004 - Not Graded, 2005 - Good, 2006 - Good	<i>Promoting Safety:</i> 2004/05 - Good, 2005/06 – Fair 2006/07 (Protecting Vulnerable People) – Fair  <i>Reducing ASB</i> 2004/05 - Fair 2005/06 – Good	Iquanta April 07 Perceptions of ASB MSF 3 <sup>rd</sup> out 8  Up to Nov 07, fewer ASB incidents than last year	Force: ASB hotline (open risk) Sept 2007	£12,175,990  12%		SP2d. Reduced the harm caused by offenders who have drug dependency problems by working with the DAAT combining enforcement activity with treatment.  SP3a. Further enhanced our working arrangements with partners to reduce incidents of crime, disorder and ASB  APP7. Reduce the harm caused to communities by drug misuse  APP15. Test purchases for alcohol to tackle underage drinking  APP16. Developing a safe night-time economy, working with partners to tackle alcohol and other drug misuse.  APP17. Tackling ASB by developing local solutions and building respect in communities	
	Protecting vulnerable people	2004 - Not Graded, 2005 - Not Graded, 2006 - <b>Poor</b>	<i>Protecting Vulnerable People</i> 2005/06 - <b>Poor</b> 2006/07 - Fair  <i>Child Abuse Investigation</i> 2006/07 Fair  <i>Domestic Violence</i> 2006/07 - Fair  <i>Missing Persons</i> 2006/07 - Fair		Auth: Poor results from inspection  Force: Rape and sexual offences (open risk) Sept 2007	£2,200,450  0.22%	Protecting vulnerable people Oct 2007,  PA Child Protection March 2007 PA Feb 2002	APP6. With partners, deliver the national plan for domestic violence, to include protecting high risk victims.	

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity?*	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority?	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
Providing assistance	Contact management	2004 - Fair, 2005 - Good, 2006 - Good	<i>Providing Assistance:</i> 2004/05 - Good, 2005/06 - Good, 2006/07 (Serious Crime and Public Protection) - Fair  <i>Call Management</i> 2004/05 - Good  <i>Contact Management</i> 2005/06 - Good	Call handling 90% of All External Emergency Calls (999) to be answered within 10 seconds Jul 07 – 92% Aug 07 – 91% Sept 07 – 92%  90% of ALL external Non-Emergency Calls to be answered within 30 seconds Jul 07 – 70% Aug 07 – 61% Sept 07 – 65%		Providing Assistance: £12,456,960  12.3%  Contact Management: £5,532,270  5.4%	PA Customer Satisfaction Nov 2007 (part)  PA Customer Satisfaction Nov 2007 (part)	SP4a. Introduced the National Call Handling Standard  APP20. Monitor calls against the quality assurance mark  APP23. Explore a regional back up for 999 calls	
	Providing specialist operational support	2004 - Not Graded, 2005 - Fair, 2006 - Fair	<i>Specialist Ops Support</i> 2004/05 – Fair, 2005/06 – Fair, 2006/07 - Fair		Auth: policies scales of charges	£3,000,090  2.95%			
	Strategic roads policing	2004 - Fair, 2005 - Good, 2006 - Good	<i>Strategic Roads Policing</i> 2004/05 - Good, 2005/06 – Good, 2006/07- Good	Reduce under 16s KSIs by 10%, Nov 07 – 5 more than last year (20%)  sustain overall reductions Nov 07 – 1 more than last year (0.4%)	Force: Roads policing and armed response (open risk) Sept 2007 Force: RTC collision customer satisfaction (open risk) Sept 2007  Auth: relationship with partners, Comm engagement - partnership working	£4,820,590  4.7%	PA Road Safety March 2003  PA March 2003 Review: Jan 2004, Sept 2004. Joint Scrutiny Dec 2006	PT. Reduce under 16s KSIs by 10%, sustain overall reductions  SP3c. Continued to deliver the Government strategy on road safety  APP19. Further develop our roads policing strategy.	

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity?*	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority?	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
Resource Use	Human resource management	2004 - Poor, 2005 - Fair, 2006 - Fair	<i>Resource Use:</i> 2004/05 - Fair, 2005/06 - Fair, 2006/07 (Resources and efficiency) - Fair  <i>HRM</i> 2004/05 - Fair 2005/06 - Fair	Absence management (8 days/employee) Nov 07 Officers 8.39 Staff 7.04	Force: ICT skills and capacity (open risk) Sept 2007  Force: Job evaluation (open risk) Sept 2007  Auth: Performance - not measured	£1,980,040  1.9%  % of overall spend detailed	HR/Diversity Sept 2007 ongoing HR Shared Service Centre Review - Internal Audit 2006/07	SP5a. A workforce which is skilled, is highly motivated, well led, feels supported and valued, is representative of our communities  SP5b. The ability to recruit & retain excellent people  SP5c. An excellent HR service & HR framework for the force  SP5d. Attendance levels that are amongst the best of all forces in the country  APP24. Improving recruitment practices  APP25. Continued working towards IIP  APP26. Addressing the outcomes of the staff survey  APP27. Managing attendance  APP40. Address organisational issues arising from the staff survey	
	Training, development & organisational learning	2004 - Fair, 2005 - Fair, 2006 - Good	<i>Training and Development</i> 2004/05 - Fair  <i>Training, Dev and Organisational Learning</i> 2005/06 - Good		Force: PST training all operational officers (open risk) Sept 2007  Force: Learning and development (open risk) Sept 2007	£2,626,820  2.6%	PA 01/02/2005	SP4b. Implemented a training programme in respect of customer care  APP4. Deliver customer focused training	

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity? * % of overall spend detailed	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority? PT – Priority Target (07/08) SP – Strategic Plan Aim (06/09) LPP – Local Policing Plan Objective (07/08)	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
	Race and diversity	2004 - Fair, 2005 - Fair, 2006 - Fair	<i>Diversity</i> 2004/05 – Fair  <i>Race and Diversity</i> 2005/06 – Fair  <i>Minority Ethnic Officer recruitment</i> 2006/07 – <b>Poor</b> (did not recruit this year)		Force: Training IAGs (open risk) Sept 2007 Force: Under rep groups (open risk) Sept 2007 Force: Women's development (open risk) Sept 2007 Auth: Performance - not measured	No additional staff are allocated to this area specifically, neither is any bespoke budget.	HR/Diversity Sept 2007 ongoing		
	Managing financial and physical resources	2004 - <b>Poor</b> , 2005 - <b>Poor</b> , 2006 - Fair	<i>Resource Management</i> 2004/05 – <b>Poor</b>  <i>Managing financial and physical resources</i> 2005/06 - Fair		Force: Sustainable funding (open risk) Sept 2007 Auth: Strategic - Sustainable funding, collaboration, Resource - efficiency savings  Force: Use of Activity Analysis to inform decision making (open risk) Sept 07  Auth: Resources – PURE  Force: Estates – fit for purpose (open risk) Sept 07  Force: Finance & business systems (open risk) Sept 07  Force: Development of a procurement model (open risk) Sept 07  Force: Procurement facilities to be improved (open risk) Sept 07  Force: Energy Strategy (open risk) Sept 07	£8,017,160  7.9%	Finance Act (Finance & Resources) 2005 Finance Act (Finance & Resources) 2003 Review of ABC - Internal Audit 2005/06  PA Finance Scrutiny Dec 2006  PA Estates Scrutiny January 2006 Review Feb 2007,  Finance Scrutiny December 2006, review February 2007  Internal Audit: Management of Financial Resources 2005  Fleet Management 2005/06	SP6a. Ensure that resources are managed in an efficient & effective manner to support the policing strategy.  SP6b. Establish comprehensive financial services & management info to the force  SP6c. Implement an effective system of checks and balances that secure sound corporate governance arrangements  APP12. Make full use of asset recovery powers  APP28. Develop our procurement strategy  APP30. Renew the estates strategy to take account of the Fit for Purpose survey  APP31. Establish an energy strategy for efficiency and environmental issues  APP32. Use activity analysis to target resources	To collaborate with partners to secure a more efficient use of resources and strengthen protective services

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity?*	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority?	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
Information management	Information management	2004 - Not Graded, 2005 - Good, 2006 - Good	<i>Information Management</i> 2005/06 - Good	No info available on intranet pending ICT review	Force: RRD Volume for work for MOPI (open risk) Sept 2007  Force: ICT disaster recovery (open risk) Sept 2007	£4,546,210  4.5%	Programme Impact - Internal Audit 2006/07	SP7c. Be fully compliant with the Bichard recommendations  APP13. Develop plans for the MOPI  APP33. Improvements to the help desk facility.  APP35. MOPI Project  APP36. The installation of a replacement crime system	
	National intelligence model	2004 - Not Graded, 2005 - Fair, 2006 - Fair	<i>NIM</i> 2005/06 - Fair 2006/07 - Fair  <i>Intelligence Collection and Use</i> 2004/05 - Fair		Force: ICT for community intelligence (open risk) Sept 2007	£1,925,070  1.9%	PA June 2004, Review January 2005		
Leadership and direction	Leadership	2004 - Fair, 2005 - Good, 2006 - Good	<i>Leadership:</i> 2004/05 - Good 2005/06 - Good		Auth: Recruitment COs	£3,331,320  3.2%		SP7a. Implemented the Core Leadership Development Programme  APP29. Prioritise areas of work for collaboration  APP38. Build our partnership working through the LAA.  APP39. Expand the Leadership Charter to incorporate core values for the Force	

Business Areas (based on PPAF Domains)		Performance			Risk	Resource	Inspection	Priorities	
		How is the Force performing? (HMIC Baseline)	How is the Force performing? (Police Performance Assessment)	How is the Force performing? (Local performance data)	Is the topic detailed on the Force/ Authority Risk Register?	How much money are we spending on this activity?*	When was the last inspection? (Auth, HMIC & internal audit)	Is the topic related to a Force priority? PT – Priority Target (07/08) SP – Strategic Plan Aim (06/09) LPP – Local Policing Plan Objective (07/08)	Is the topic related to an Authority priority?
	Performance management and continuous improvement	2004 - Good, 2005 - Good, 2006 - Good	<i>Performance Management and Cont Improvement</i> 2004/05 – Good 2005/06 – Good 2006/07 - Good		Auth: Perf not monitored, perf info not linked in with planning process  Auth: Poor results from inspection	£1,546,340  1.5%	Performance Management Oct 2007	SP7b. Improved our Baseline Assessment  APP37. Develop strategies to address the major issues for Lincolnshire Police	Maximise performance through effective monitoring

Total

£101,594,750

\* Local priorities proposed by Forces can only be included in HMIC assessments if they have passed a stringent national moderation exercise (by HMIC). For 2006/07 the Force set a local priority for Serious Violent Crime. However, this proposed priority failed to pass national moderation and therefore could not be included in this assessment. The grading for the Local Priorities domain was therefore based entirely on two indicators, both of which relate to public perception

Note: The East Midlands Collaboration Planning Team are looking at a number of business cases (e.g. demand management) Members may wish to take account of the timing of collaborative work when prioritising areas for scrutiny.

Resources – only refers to 'spend' this includes the cost of staffing.

LPP not included on table:

- Implement phase 1 of Professionalising the Investigation Programme.
- Appoint a Vetting Officer to develop joint procedures regional