Wiltshire Police and Crime Panel

5 March 2015

Interim report of the Police Performance Review Working Group

Purpose

1. To present the initial findings and recommendations of the Police Performance Review Working Group for discussion by the Panel.

2. To invite the Panel to discuss which performance information and indicators should be included in every quarterly performance report provided by the Commissioner from June 2015 onwards.

Background

Wiltshire Police's Performance Culture Review

3. In March-April 2014 Wiltshire Police undertook a review of the way the Force monitors and uses performance data to drive improvements. Around this time, there were a number of national news stories about inaccurate recording and reporting of crime figures, targets creating 'perverse incentives' operationally meaning that victims were not always put first, and consequent potential damage to public confidence in the Police. These followed a report from the Public Administration Select Committee (PASC), *Caught red-handed: Why we can't count on Police Recorded Crime statistics published in April 2014.* http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmpubadm/760/76 0.pdf

   Two key paragraphs from that report were:

   "The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) role, and the political and electoral pressures that PCCs are subject to, has the potential to foster target cultures within forces, with consequent perverse incentives and detrimental impact on data quality. There is considerable variance across the country in the use of targets by PCCs."

   "Some PCCs consider the perverse incentives created by targets to be so serious that they have dropped all targets. Others believe the risk is manageable. As part of its annual audit programme, HMIC should examine the effect of PCC target-setting on crime recording practices and culture, and should in due course look back at the first PCC period in office to assess the impact on data integrity of locally-set targets."

4. The objective of the Force's review was to answer to following questions:

- What impact does the Force's performance culture have on frontline staff?
- Does the Force's performance culture assist those staff who are responsible for delivering Policing services?
- Is the Force's performance culture target driven? If so, what is the impact?
- Where targets/thresholds/ or measures exist, are they meaningful? Are they customer driven?

5. The following condenses the purpose of the Police's review:

"Hitting the Target, Missing the Point

We have spent too long concentrating on internal performance measures instead of the quality of service delivery. This programme of work is about transforming the organisation to provide the best possible service, do the right thing, and put the public at the forefront of everything that we do."

Performance and the Police and Crime Panel

6. Recent performance reports to the Panel have briefed members on the direction of the Force's performance culture review. They have also begun to reflect a more narrative style and offer an holistic appraisal of performance, in keeping with the principles established by the review. The Commissioner has reported an aspiration that a new style of performance reporting to the Panel will take effect from the beginning of the 2015/16 financial year.

7. It is important that the Panel has the opportunity to influence how the Commissioner demonstrates the delivery of his Police and Crime Plan through performance information. The Panel was therefore invited to form a working group to engage with the review and help shape the performance reports it will receive from the Commissioner in future.

Terms of reference

8. These were endorsed by the Panel on 15 January 2015:

   a) To monitor implementation of the Police's performance culture review on the Police and Crime Panel's behalf, reporting back to the Panel as appropriate.

   b) To provide constructive input on the Police performance culture review to the Police and Crime Commissioner as appropriate.

   c) To work with the Police and Crime Commissioner to agree a performance reporting mechanism that enables the Panel to effectively monitor delivery of the Police and Crime Plan. This mechanism should emphasise contributing to a culture of achieving positive outcomes, rather than a culture of perverse incentives.

Methodology

9. The working group's membership is as follows:

Cllr Andrew Bennett
Ms Cindy Creasy
Mr Chris Henwood
Cllr Julian Johnson

10. The task group have met with the following and is grateful for their input:

   Ryan Hartley, Business Intelligence Team Leader, Wiltshire Police
   Kieran Kilgallen, Chief Executive, Wiltshire OPCC
   Sarah Kyte, Business Manager, Wiltshire OPCC
   Chris McMullin, Head of Business Improvement, Wiltshire Police

11. The working group has met three times since October. It intends to meet once more as discussed under paragraph 25.

Findings

<u>The use of performance targets</u>

12. The working group is satisfied that nationally Police forces are moving away from using targets to drive performance. Targets have been shown to inadvertently create perverse incentives and have a detrimental impact on data quality. Essentially targets do not necessarily encourage the behaviour that is desired. They can instead lead to behaviours that help to achieve a target on paper, but do not lead to a better service or outcome for the public.

13. There is evidence suggesting that a culture of performance targets higher up does permeate to the lower levels of a hierarchy. The working group therefore does not have concerns about the Commissioner not using targets in his role of holding the Chief Constable to account. However, it suggests that the Panel monitors the impact of the Commissioner's changed approach to performance management and establishes if the anticipated benefits are achieved.

14. In terms of the Panel monitoring delivery of his Police and Crime Plan, the working group concludes that the 'thresholds' currently included in its quarterly performance reports do not aid the Panel in fulfilling this role. The thresholds do serve as a prompt for discussion, with more context being provided on request by the Commissioner and other witnesses. However, the discussions tend to centre around the achievement, or not, of the numerical threshold. The working group is concerned that these thresholds provide only a limited picture of actual behaviours and outcomes and therefore may not support the Panel to accurately assess delivery of the Plan.

<u>Performance report content</u>

15. The working group is clear that a removal of performance targets should not mean an end to measuring or monitoring performance. It is important that the quarterly performance reports received by the Panel continue to include a range of evidence, including numerical data. Rather than measuring performance

against pre-determined targets, however, it should be compared with historic data (to highlight trends) and data from other forces and force areas, particularly Wiltshire's Most Similar Forces (MSFs).

16. Relevant information should also be drawn, where appropriate, from the regular force inspection reports produced by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies (HMIC). These are a potentially useful resource that the Panel has not fully exploited so far. They should be accompanied by the Commissioner's views on the inspection outcomes and any action he plans to take.

17. The thresholds currently included in the Panel's performance reports could be seen as providing an at-a-glance indication of progress in delivering the Plan – though potentially a misleading one. The removal of the thresholds means it will be important that future performance reports…

    a) Consistently and reliably cover areas of performance that are likely to be of interest to the Panel (see paragraph 22);
    b) Use context and commentary to expand on any statistical data;
    c) Are as concise as possible.

18. The working group is supportive of the increasingly narrative style of performance report that has been provided to recent Panel meetings. It supports a move to a more rounded overview of the Commissioners' progress in delivering his Plan and in managing challenges as they arise. This approach will require Panel members to actively engage by sending questions about any issues that they, or the public, might want the Commissioner's response to.

Focusing on particular Police and Crime Plan objectives

19. At present every quarterly performance report received by the Panel provides an update on all seven objectives of the Police and Crime Plan. The working group is aware that Panels in some areas (for example, Derbyshire) take a different approach and receive performance updates on **certain sections** of their area's Plan at different points throughout the year. This approach would seem to enable a more in-depth consideration of each Plan objective. However, it could lead to the Panel missing urgent performance issues as they arise and waiting 12 months for an update on areas of concern. The working group therefore recommends a hybrid of these two approaches:

20. The seven objectives in the Police and Crime Plan should be grouped into logical groups and each quarterly performance report put particular focus on one of these groups (example below). This should include updates on relevant projects and initiatives. Discussions with the Commissioner will be needed to agree when each group of objectives is most appropriate for focus.

    Quarter 1 performance report: Focus on objectives A and B
    Quarter 2 performance report: Focus on objectives C and D
    Quarter 3 performance report: Focus on objectives E, F and G

Quarter 4 performance report: All objectives
(annual report)

21. However, **all** quarterly performance reports should continue to include a suite of key performance indicators that cut across **all seven objectives** in the Police and Crime Plan. The question of which indicators should be included is discussed further under paragraph 25.

22. Regardless of which group of Plan objectives are being focused on, **every** performance report should address **any** performance issues which, for that period,
    a) Have shown a significant change;
    b) Are of particular concern to the Commissioner;
    c) Are an area of excellent work or progress; or
    d) Are prominent in the local or national media.

    Sticking to these criteria should create a 'no surprises' agreement between Commissioner and Panel when it comes to performance monitoring.

23. The Panel may also wish to emphasise monitoring progress with initiatives or issues already identified as work priorities (for example, prosecutions that fail due to quality of police evidence, restorative justice and the responsible management of licensed premises), rather than wait for the relevant objectives to come around every 12 months.

Holding the Commissioner to account

24. The Panel's role is to monitor and support delivery of the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan; not to monitor performance of the Police force directly. This is a difficult balance to strike because delivery of the Plan inevitably relies on effective policing. However, the working group recommends that the Panel places greater emphasis on understanding what the Commissioner is doing to drive performance and deliver his Plan. The following structure for future performance reports is proposed in order to encourage this:

    Police and Crime Plan Objective X

    a) Relevant performance information
    b) Commentary and context
    c) What the Commissioner is doing, or will do, in relation to this area, including any relevant key decisions taken.

Choosing the key performance indicators

25. Under paragraph 21 it is proposed that **all** quarterly performance reports include a suite of high-level performance indicators that cut across **all seven objectives** in the Plan. The working group has not yet considered which indicators should be included, and will require a further meeting to discuss this.

26. The indicators currently included in every quarterly performance are listed under Appendix 1 with some commentary. **The Panel is asked to consider this list and make comments for the working group to discuss at its final meeting.** This will enable it to agree a final list of performance indicators to be included in quarterly performance reports from June onwards.

27. The working group asks the Panel to consider the following factors:

- Which indicators give a meaningful indication of actual behaviours and outcomes that relate to the objectives in the Police and Crime Plan?
- Do the current indicators over-emphasise the role of the Police and neglect other aspects of the Police and Crime Plan and the Commissioner's responsibilities?
- Which indicators would the public expect the Panel to have a close eye on?

Recommendations

The working group recommends that the Police and Crime Panel asks the Commissioner to make the following amendments to the quarterly performance reports he provides to the Panel:

1. **To remove the performance thresholds and RAG-ratings, with the aim of:**
   - **reflecting the shift away from performance targets locally and nationally, with performance targets having been shown to create perverse incentives and reduce data quality; and**
   - **helping the Panel to focus on supporting delivery of the Police and Crime Plan rather than the achievement of numerical targets.**

2. **To continue to include a range of performance data, with the emphasis on enabling comparisons with historic data and data from other forces and force areas, particularly Wiltshire's Most Similar Forces (MSFs).**

3. **To include information where appropriate from the force inspection reports produced by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies (HMIC).**

4. **To address any areas of performance that, for that period,**
   a) **Have shown a significant change;**
   b) **Are of particular concern to the Commissioner;**
   c) **Are an area of excellent work or progress; or**
   d) **Are prominent in the local or national media.**

5. **Each performance report to focus on a group of objectives in the Police and Crime Plan including updates on relevant projects and initiatives, with the grouping of objectives to be agreed by the working group in its final meeting and referred to the Commissioner.**

6. **To adopt the following structure for reporting progress with each Police and Crime Plan objective:**

   Police and Crime Plan Objective X

   a) **Latest performance information**
   b) **Commentary and context**
   c) **What the Commissioner is doing, or will do, in relation to this area, including any relevant recent decisions taken.**

7. **The working group also proposes that the Panel**
   a) **considers the list of performance indicators currently included in its quarterly performance reports (Appendix 1) and refers any comments on these to back to the working group;**
   b) **asks the working group to meet once more to agree what performance information and which performance indicators should be included in quarterly performance reports from June 2015 onwards.**

Police Performance Review Working Group,
Wiltshire Police and Crime Panel

Report author: Henry Powell – Senior Scrutiny Officer, Wiltshire Council
01225 718052 henry.powell@wiltshire.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix 1   Performance indicators currently included in the quarterly reports received by the Panel

Appendix 1

Performance indicators currently included in the quarterly reports received by the Panel
(under the relevant outcomes from the Wiltshire Police and Crime Plan)

1. **Reducing crime and anti-social behaviour**
   a) 10% reduction in absolute crimes and ASB incidence
   b) People feeling safe during day
   c) People feeling safe during night
   d) To make watch schemes fundamental to intelligence gathering and crime prevention in communities – so far figures have not been provided for this indicator
   e) Volunteers taking part in Watch schemes
   f) Number of Special Constables
   g) Hours contributed by Specials (each)
   h) % of people who think that YP hanging around is a key issue
   i) Reduce harm caused by drug groups operating:
      1. Dangerous drug network harm assessment
      2. Organised crime impact assessment
   j) % of people saying ASB is a concern in their area

2. **Reducing offending and re-offending**
   a) Tackle irresponsible licensed premises – figures are provide for this indicator but what they are measuring is not defined.
   b) Reduce re-offending - figures are provide for this indicator but what they are measuring is not defined.
   c) Reoffending rate of SWITCH cohort

3. **Protecting the most vulnerable in society**
   a) Reduce serious harm crime

4. **Driving up standards of customer service**
   a) Number of allegations of incivility, impoliteness and intolerance
   b) Victim satisfaction
   c) Number of days to finalise a locally resolved complaint
   d) Prosecutions that fail due to the quality of police input – Crown Court
   e) Prosecutions that fail due to the quality of police input – Magistrates Court
   f) Data quality

5. **Putting victims and witnesses first**
   a) Number of days from report to disposal
   b) Satisfaction with follow up
   c) Satisfaction with investigation
   d) Resolved rate
   e) Victims referred to victim support

f) Victims satisfied with victim support
   g) Proportion of cases dealt with out of court

6. **Ensuring unfailing and timely response to calls for help**
   a) Immediate response rate
   b) 999 calls answered within 10 seconds
   c) 101 to report crime – call answered within 30 seconds

7. **Unlocking the resources to deliver (the priorities)**
   a) Public satisfaction and police visibility
   b) Number of Police Officers
   c) Number of PCSOs