

## ACCOUNTABILITY & PERFORMANCE PANEL – 31 OCTOBER 2013

### QUESTIONS IN ADVANCE OF MEETING TOGETHER WITH CONSTABULARY RESPONSE

#### AP13/47 – SPEED ENFORCEMENT

- 1. In relation to the table in para 2.3, are we continuing to apply the limits and tolerances shown and could an explanation be given as to the approach to the speeds between columns 3 and 4 (ie 43-49 mph on the 30 mph line).**

Yes, we continue to apply these thresholds in line with ACPO guidelines. To comply with the national Speed Awareness Scheme we can only offer speed awareness courses for those who are detected at speeds up to and including 10% + 9 mph over the respective limit. Those at 10% + 10 mph above the limit up to the point where they have to go direct to court, as per the last column, are offered fixed penalty or court as part of their conditional offer.

- 2. How is it intended to communicate the revised approach described in the report to the public?**

The proposed media strategy is designed to offer the public access to both the list of sanctioned sites and a weekly update of where enforcement will take place for the following seven days. This will be published on the Constabulary website.

It is the intention to publish both the enforcement list and enforcement locations for the next 7 days on the Constabulary web page as soon as required.

Roads Policing Unit (RPU) activity will continue to be published by social media.

The Press Office is aware that Mr. Paxton may wish to make his own announcement in the Press and has been asked to prepare some briefing points should they be required.

- 3. Under para 3.1 are there stats available to the end of September 2013 to get a projected year-end figure?**

Statistics up until the end of September are available but to extrapolate properly an examination of average % carried out in each month would be necessary. Treating it simply as  $\frac{3}{4}$  could give an estimation. 29,878 to the end of September would equate to 39,837 for the full year, based on the simple pro rata calculation.

- 4. It states in para 2.5 that 55% of offending drivers take the speed awareness course – what does this mean in actual numbers and how are the costs broken down including percentage that comes to the Constabulary?**

The 55% quoted relates to the take up of the National Driver Offending Retraining Scheme (NDORS) where it is offered as an alternative to a fixed penalty notice. This is 23,634 for 2012.

- 5. There are three mobile camera vans – is this regarded as the optimum number or is there a case for two vans and using funding for other linked initiatives such as speedwatch?**

This will be subject of an operational review.

**6. When will the results of the review of CSW be known (para 4.11)? Do we keep an inventory of speed devices and is there a case for having more such equipment available?**

The detail of what is required from this review has yet to be agreed by Mr. Paxton so there is currently no timescale for results. Most of the Speedwatch equipment within Suffolk is owned by the Parish Councils and shared between each of the 47 schemes. The Constabulary own three cameras. The inventory and audit in relation to these three cameras is held by the Community Safety Manager at Landmark house.

**7. At the public forums and through the PCC's correspondence the bureaucracy linked to the Speedwatch schemes has been raised – is it possible to make the process easier?**

The vetting process has been raised and is being addressed by the Community Safety team.

There is a meeting next week to discuss some of the issues including the potential for reduction in bureaucracy around vetting.

**8. More enforcement of speed limits has been raised at the public forums, including 20 mph limits – could this influence tasking?**

ACPO guidelines for speed enforcement state that routine enforcement of 20mph limits will not take place unless that limit is clearly set out by additional engineering solutions to support the signs. Requests could affect tasking.

**9. Will the assessment of the cost of keeping our roads safe be available to inform discussions on next year's budget (para 6.1)? When reporting back on that assessment could a comprehensive statement be included on how the service is currently financed?**

Budgets for safety camera operations in Suffolk are separate from the main Constabulary budget as they are self-funding. The service is funded through the income arising from the completion of Speed Awareness courses.

Efforts will be made to provide details of the operational requirement at the earliest opportunity, and ideally to influence the 2014/15 budget decisions.

**10. With regard to para 8.1 what specifically has shaped the new policy?**

Chief Constable's desire for greater transparency in respect of enforcement site selection.

## AP13/48 - PERFORMANCE PRIORITIES

- 1. While noting the explanation as to reasons why the solved rate for Violence with Injury may have suffered, it is a 'red' grading so are there plans in place to address this? We note the increase in Domestic Abuse related violence with injury incidents; does the Constabulary feel enough is being done to support victims?**

The significant reduction of recorded violent crime with injury (134 less offences from this time last year and 313 offences less than 3yr average) can be attributed to increased pro-activity and focus on Night Time Economy issues (there is a crossover with Q6 in that respect). This has affected the solved rate as the proportion of crimes involving a domestic element has increased as part of the overall reduction. By definition these can be more difficult to 'detect' as the primary objective is around safeguarding the victim. Nevertheless analysis has shown that a couple of LPC's (Lowestoft and Haverhill) do appear to have an unusually lower than expected solved rate so work has been commissioned in both these areas to improve the detection rate. This work includes a full audit of all undetected Violence with Injury offences by a D/Inspector and a revision of investigative plans. Achieving this objective will bring the Constabulary back into line with the target rate.

- 2. The PCC would like to acknowledge the improvements in relation to domestic burglary and would like an assurance that efforts in that regard will be maintained. Are the reasons for the improvement clear?**

The Constabulary is performing well now with regard to Domestic Burglary both in terms of reduction and detection. Operation Drawbridge remains the over-arching operation for all Burglary Dwelling activity and has just had its first anniversary. This provided the Constabulary with an opportunity to publicise the good news to date but was also timely as we enter a period of anticipated high demand following the change to GMT. We have already identified 5 pro-active days over the next 12 months that will be used to continue high-profile enforcement of burglary/handling offences. There is a structured plan in place to engage with all known prolific burglars and there are no plans to reduce this activity.

- 3. What is the background to the reduction in robbery offences – why are the crimes recorded so low?**

In simple terms there is a definite correlation between the 21% reduction in robbery offences and the high solved rate. Ipswich was the 'hotspot' in terms of robbery and the focussed activity of the Priority Crime Team has led to the current solved rate of 42.4% and a reduction of nearly 30% in the town. A number of offenders are now serving custodial sentences and are therefore not in a position to re-offend.

- 4. We believe that an exception report should be provided to the Panel in December on Serious Sexual Offences. It should include information on :**

- **The response to the College of Policing findings;**
- **The completion of the SSO problem profile;**
- **The impact of the new CPS team;**
- **The impact of Evidenced Based Policing**

**In the meantime could the College's report be made available to the PCC and could you comment on the role of the SARC strategic board including its membership?**

The exception report regarding Serious Sexual Offences will address in detail the current improved position and the Force response to the College of Policing review. We are now starting to see detections coming through from the first wave of historic offences that were reported as a consequence of Operation Yewtree (the Saville affect). The current solved rate of 29% has been maintained for over a month now and we are on course to exceed the target solved rate. It should be reiterated that as the overall numbers are very low percentages can be volatile in this area of work. Additionally the offender/suspect is known to the victim in 92% of all Serious Sexual offences so the current analysis being conducted by the Performance Unit is identifying the reasons why the majority of offences do not lead to formal 'detections'

**5. Where are the main problem areas in the county when it comes to drug trafficking?**

Drug related issues occur throughout the County and activity is based on the current intelligence picture. Drug networks can be quite sophisticated and there is strong evidence linking London based crime groups. The current level of enforcement is in line with the 3yr average indicating the markets continue to be frustrated in their attempts to grow by regular pro-activity. The reduction in robberies is also a good indicator of a moderated drugs market.

**6. The reduction in ASB is welcomed but is there a view it might be under-reported? There was evidence from the public forums to suggest levels of ASB linked to the night-time economy were still a big issue. Highlighting some examples of good work could help in terms of re-assurance.**

Although there is a 20% reduction in ASB based on the 3yr average the figures have remained fairly static for the last 12months. There has certainly been focussed police activity around the Night Time Economy (NTE) issues with formal adoption of 'Grade C nights' (dates where through predictive analysis we anticipate higher demand and adjust resources accordingly). Additionally, schemes such as 'reducing the Strength' and Best Bar None' have had a positive effect in this area. Our dedicated NTE team actively follow up all reported disorder that is in anyway linked to a licensed premises to ensure appropriate licensing conditions are in place and are enforced. Working in partnership with Trading Standards, test purchase operations now occur regularly throughout the County and have allowed formal reviews to take place. Over the last couple of years Operation Facilitate has drawn upon all Departments to ensure appropriate policing is in place for known peak demands around Bank Holidays etc. This has been further supplemented by co-ordinated support from the Special Constabulary on specific nights (Op Disruption).

ASB is under-reported and the existing performance measure needs to be viewed with real caution. A focus on quality of service is preferable.

**7. Car parking was another issue raised at all the forums and on the recent radio interview of the PCC and Chief. What could be done to ensure enforcement was a greater priority?**

Parking enforcement is undertaken by most of our SNT's that have responsibility for Town Centres. Priorities are agreed with the public at the SNT Priority Setting Meetings and are then published on the SNT website pages. If parking is considered to be a top priority then in general this will be undertaken. There are some town centres that make it very difficult to enforce parking. Where these locations are identified effort should be directed at long term problem solving with the Local Authority rather than a pure enforcement approach.

The priorities are set out within the Police and Crime Plan, but the Chief Constable is leading on a focus of dealing with what matters to communities.

**8. On domestic abuse repeat victimisation - when will the data be available for the crime rate and average? It refers to 65% of victims – what does this mean in terms of numbers?**

The data has now been collected. The final step is translating it into the past 36 months' data points, which has to be done a month at a time and the Performance Management Unit (PMU) are currently undertaking this. The trend over the last 12 months shows no significant change, varying between 64% and 67%, with 65.7% the latest figure.

To explain the numbers behind this, the description of the indicator given in the paper requires slight extension. The percentage quoted is the number of crimes reported by all victims of domestic abuse in the past twelve months which were their fourth repeat offence/victimisation in the past two years. The 65.7% figure is derived from:

- 321 total domestic abuse crimes reported by the at-risk victim cohort during the past 12 months, the cohort being all domestic abuse victims who have reported three offences within the preceding 12 months;
- 211 of the above crimes were fourth offences;
- $211/321=65.7\%$

The indicator is only able to drive an ongoing assessment of repeat victimisation at given points in time. The number of cases is not the critical figure as the cohort changes each time the percentage is calculated, being based on a rolling 24 month period. i.e. the 321 offences in this month's cohort, and their victims, were not the same offences as in August's figure, as the oldest offences "drop off" the far end and individual victims leave or join the cohort as applicable.

The PMU supplies lists of the victims and offences comprising the cohort and failures (fourth offences) to Local Policing Commanders.

**9. How does the 'red' grading on 'think the police do a good/excellent job' square with the other confidence measures and the report as a whole? Do you think nationally reported incidents have an impact? When will the ONS detailed survey data the force has requested be available? [The PCC would like an assurance this grading need not be the subject of an exception report to the next meeting.]**

The red grading, while subjective in this instance, is based upon objective analysis of the measure's trend over time, and the latest data's significance against historic data. Of the four Quality of Service indicators, this was the only one not exhibiting some degree of improvement over the past 12 months. In fact it shows a strong downward trend, the strongest trend of all the measures reported in the paper. The latest data is not statistically significantly worse than historic performance, so the red grading was based on the weight of the trend, and the drop in national ranking.

The PMU has requested the underlying survey results from ONS.

The Constabulary may face a long (3-4 months) wait for the June data given the March data is only now due for release on UKDS. The Constabulary was unable to obtain the dates when surveys were conducted in Suffolk to see if they coincide with media issues etc.

The Constabulary has not requested the single quarters' data as all it is likely to prove is that we had much stronger survey results 5 quarters ago than in the last quarter, which will have held the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quarters higher and caused the sharpness of the drop once outside the twelve month rolling period.

**10. Under the Establishment section what is the impact of managing with 53 student officers and does this figure vary greatly? How many fully qualified officers were there at the end of September? It would be helpful to have a clearer breakdown of actual numbers of officers, PCSOs, specials and staff.**

In terms of managing with 53 Student Officers - we look at the overall effective strength levels and each SPC is running between 81-89% effective at constable rank for Patrol/SNT, this will also include those also not deployable due to either maternity, sickness or restrictions etc. We assess the levels monthly and it is also discussed in Staffing Levels.

At the end of September there were 53 Student Officer who are not currently deployable, so from an overall strength of 1198.34 FTE – there would be 1145.34 FTE officer qualified, but they may not have all been deployable as mentioned above, due to reasons such as maternity etc.

**Breakdown of actual numbers at 30.09.2013: -**

Employee Type	Establishment FTE	Strength FTE	Comments
Officers	1201	1198.34	Establishment will increase to 1209 FTE in November. Projected strength by 31.03.2014 is 1221.34 FTE
PCSOs	169	166.57	Projected strength by 31.03.2014 is 173.57 FTE
Staff	909.13	835.54	
Specials	N/A	250 (Headcount)	Working towards a headcount of 350

**11. 124 officers on either recuperative or restricted duties seems high – what is the breakdown in each category and how is the situation managed to ensure that they are best utilised?**

In terms of management, the officers within the categories are now reviewed fortnightly through the Sickness TCG process (previously reviewed quarterly). The Constabulary is currently concentrating on getting those in the categories 1(Temporary Constraint, Non-permanent/Short Term Constraint and Temporary Limited Constraint) and 2A (Individual with a medium to long term restriction) fit as quickly as possible and back out onto full front line duties. The aim is to have as few people as possible in category 2B (Individual assessed as either medium to long term or permanently restricted), with those who are, placed in substantive and full meaningful roles. The Constabulary is well placed in MSF terms for our effective management of restricted and recuperative duties.

**12. Maintaining and if possible improving overall levels of fitness is something the PCC would like to promote – what is the current criteria?**

Working with Learning and Development and Occupational Health officers are to be offered additional fitness/wellbeing advice. Occupational Health are running drop-in

health check sessions for officers and staff. Learning & Development qualified fitness instructors are offering appointments and advice regarding fitness plans.

Current data identifies that the overall fitness level of Suffolk officers is to a high standard.

The Joint Force Policy entitled 'Fitness Testing of Serving Officers' is currently out for consultation.

**13. When is the working group formed by the Diversity Programme Board expected to report? The PCC is keen to see some improvement in terms of the workforce profile.**

The Workforce Profile Working Group is due to meet for the first time on 19<sup>th</sup> November. An update report will be provided to the Diversity Programme Board on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2013 although it is too early to determine whether any firm recommendations can be made in such a short period of time.

**AP13/49 – FINANCIAL MONITORING**

**1. Para 1.6 refers to an over-spend of £30k on removal expenses – how many officers does this relate to?**

It relates to one officer as no budget provision had been made.

**2. What impact has Landmark House had on the maintenance budget and are there other examples (apart from Ipswich) of dual running costs?**

The building maintenance budget has not been affected, there is cost avoidance in relation to Ipswich police station but other backlog maintenance has been prioritised.

Other examples of dual running costs are:

Woodbridge Police Station

Stowmarket OHU

Stowmarket Federation

**3. On capital financing what can be done to get more accurate forecasting? Linked to this what does the £917k slippage linked to joint schemes relate to (Appendix B)?**

We have monthly joint capital monitoring meetings to monitor the year-end forecast position closely.

As part of the Scrutiny process we have asked budget managers to zero base the capital requirements and more accurately profile these requirements to inform the four year Medium Term Financial Plan.

[Detail in relation to the slippage was tabled at the meeting.]

**AP13/50 – JOINT ICT**

**1. What are the cultural differences referred to in para 1.3 and how big an impact are they having?**

Prior to the decision by the Police Authorities and PCCs to create a single joint ICT department, the two separate departments operated in some quite significantly different ways. The Suffolk ICT department was considered to be historically under-

resourced whereas in Norfolk considerable resources had been added to the department over a period of years. Suffolk operated Novell technology which was inconsistent with the majority of Constabularies and it has been a major change to introduce Microsoft. Similarly, the Suffolk network was largely contracted to BT to provide by landline, which is expensive, and changes have been made to change the network to microwave, which is more cost-effective. The department in Norfolk has had a strong service-delivery, productivity and performance culture under a consistent management structure, whereas this may not have been equally possible in the Suffolk department as the management structure has changed several times in the recent past (Suffolk Head of Knowledge Architecture followed by Director of ICT from Cambridgeshire followed by a Director of ICT from Kent/Essex under the proposed "Eastern Counties Information Service" followed by Joint Norfolk/Suffolk Director of ICT). All of these changes will have had an unsettling effect on staff who will have been used to and loyal to the structures and systems that they had previously been familiar with.

An ICT People Strategy is being introduced along with various other measures which it is intended should promote confidence and cohesion across the joint department for the future.

**2 Could greater clarity be provided in terms of the difficulties outlined in para 1.4 – what are the likely additional costs in terms of contract staff and, in the longer term, job evaluation & gradings?**

The impact of the Job Evaluation Review on ICT posts is not yet known but it seems likely that any pay scale decided will be out of kilter with the external market for some posts at some times and policy for market supplements is being drafted for agreement.

**3 Why were the additional savings in para 2.1 not predicted? There has been frustration expressed by staff at all levels over ICT failures and with the resources available - could they have been better predicted and managed? Given those frustrations and the impact of Microsoft implementation being highlighted on the risk register, was it appropriate under para 1.2 to put "No significant issues" ?**

The Joint Business Support Review (JBSR) report was conducted and base-lined by Strategic Change Department against the 2009/10 financial year budget. Once ICT came together as a joint department it was recognised that with the collaboration agenda increasing, larger savings could be made in ICT by the rationalisation of systems and consolidation of licence/maintenance agreements. This would not have been apparent to Strategic Change at the time of writing their report as collaboration was in its early stages. ICT produced a savings profile which was shared with Strategic Change, Finance, Joint Chief Officer Team (JCOT) and the Police Authorities predicting further savings to those required to meet the JBSR. This has been monitored at the ICT Programme Board and through the scrutiny process with the Joint Finance Department and JCOT. Some of these savings have been used to draw in essential skills as described above.

ICT failures were an expected "known unknown" at the time of the Novell migration to Microsoft in Suffolk, given the level of investment in the ICT infrastructure and the previous lack of a consistent approach to desktop delivery, with devolved ICT purchased in silos across the Constabulary. It was inevitable that with ICT some issues would be experienced during the migration process. The ICT department engaged the support of NEC who have experience of major Novell migrations and the department was as best prepared as possible. A standard approach to desktop

delivery has now been achieved meaning the department can respond to and fix issues with equipment in a more efficient and effective way.

The Microsoft migration is complete and there are a small number of work-arounds in place for units that have very old software that is not compliant with the Windows 7 environment.

#### **AP13/51 – CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE**

**1. Is the Constabulary satisfied in terms of the commitment of partners to the MASH and is the go-live date of January 2014 now firmed-up?**

There is a Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) strategic group in place and the Chair of this sits with Suffolk County Council (SCC) Children and Young Peoples Services (CYPS). All potential partners contribute to this forum. The main concern is the involvement of Health and the Constabulary has asked for a meeting with the Strategic Group chair to discuss this. Health are a complex organisation and it is less clear that all parts of health are where they need to be at this point.

The go-live date for January 2014 is still the intended date.

**2. What is the timescale for the delivery of the Child SARC?**

There is no fixed time-scale for this. Once the business case has been formally submitted this will assist in determining time-scales.

#### **AP13/52 – LSCB ANNUAL REPORT**

**1. Similar question on MASH as above;**

See above.

**2. There is recent evidence to suggest attendance at MARAC is not as reported on p18. What is your understanding and what more could be done to support young people that might witness or experience domestic abuse issues?**

There are some gaps in attendance at MARACs and these are local issues as opposed to county wide. There is a meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> November where this is due for further discussion. It is envisaged that a 'register' will be kept of attendance on each case that can then be used to feedback to senior managers.

There are a number of initiatives being looked at in relation to children witnessing/experiencing DA. Operation Compass is a national initiative that seeks to address this and this will be discussed with the County Domestic Abuse Forum Chair and Suffolk County Council Domestic Abuse Lead. The MASH will again present opportunities to ensure the flow of information to schools etc. where other agencies are aware of DA issues within a child home environment.

#### **AP13/54 – PROTECTIVE SERVICES COMMAND**

**1. Regarding para 6.2, when are the expected improvements likely to occur – is there an action plan?**

A formal response is still awaited from HMIC. However a meeting is scheduled for 6 November involving senior managers from Protective Services and the County Policing Command to fully assess whether, in light of new and emerging demands,

increased complexities in investigations and the HMIC findings, some re-organising and re-structuring in Protecting Vulnerable People (PVP) is required. Norfolk Constabulary will be involved in this initial scoping as the Vulnerable People Directorate is structured and aligned differently and this will enable the full range of options to be considered. Full consideration is being given to an action plan and of course this will be presented to Chief Officers for full and appropriate consideration and sign-off before any work begins. It should be noted that some of the initial thoughts following the HMIC inspection related to additional posts and again the meeting will identify some opportunities and solutions. In terms of timescales it is feasible to include some initial proposals for inclusion in an action plan in the paper prepared for the next Accountability and Performance Panel on 5 December.

**2. In relation to the SARC (Protecting Vulnerable People), are the staff now on the same Ts & Cs?**

Two posts in the SARC have recently been placed on permanent contracts however they and their counterparts in Norfolk are not on the same terms and conditions and therefore pay scales. It is expected that this will be resolved through the pay evaluation and harmonisation currently underway.

**3. On the wider issue of events planning, does the Constabulary response to Remembrance services/fetes etc need greater publicity. Should SNT officers be encouraged to attend local events even where there was not an operational need to do so, with a view to raising public confidence?**

Over recent years the Constabulary has taken steps to ensure there is an appropriate balance between the need to ensure that the attendance of Police at local community events does not lead to organisers over-relying on this presence to manage the event, with a clear need for police presence to be part of the community attending such an event. On occasions such as Remembrance days and other similar events of national importance, the police will be involved in the management of the event as well as attending as a mark of respect. In answer to this part of the question the Constabulary's response has been published and sent directly to key people and organisations so event planners and community leaders are aware. Other community events such as fetes do go into SNT engagement diaries and staff are encouraged to attend when they can to maintain a good level of engagement. Whilst this is at the officer's discretion it does enable local officers who know the communities to ensure there is engagement with a wide number of groups. At the time of writing there is nothing to suggest that attendance at such events where there is not an operational necessity for them to attend is decreasing.