

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL PANEL HEDDLU A THROSEDD



North Wales Police and Crime Panel

Monday, 15 September 2014 at 2.00 pm
Bodlondeb, Conwy

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for absence**
2. **Declarations of Interest: Code of Local Government Conduct**
Members are reminded that they must declare the **existence** and **nature** of their declared personal interests.
3. **Urgent matters**
Notice of items which, in the opinion of the Chairman, should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.
4. **Minutes** (Pages 3 - 13)
To approve and sign as a correct record minutes of the previous meeting
5. **To consider reports by the North Wales Police and Crime Commissioner:**
 - a) Periodic update by the North Wales Police and Crime Commissioner *(to follow)*
 - b) Update on the 2014/15 Budget (as at 30 June 2014) (Pages 14 - 16)
 - c) Timetable for the Proposed Policing Precept 2015/16 (Pages 17 - 23)

6. To consider reports by the Host Authority

- a) Response to consultation on Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's (HMIC) programme for regular force inspections (Pages 24 - 66)
- b) Review of membership of Police and Crime Panel (*to follow*)
- c) The Forward Work Programme for the North Wales Police and Crime Panel (Pages 67 - 69)

7. Date of Next Meeting:

Monday, 10 November 2014 @ 2.00 pm

Membership of Panel

Cllr Amanda Bragg
Cllr Glenys Diskin (Chair)
Cllr Bob Dutton OBE
Cllr Philip C. Evans J.P.
Cllr Julie Fallon
Cllr William T. Hughes
Cllr Colin Powell
Cllr Bill Tasker
Cllr Gethin Williams (Vice-Chair)
Vacancy

Flintshire County Council
Flintshire County Council
Wrexham County Borough Council
Conwy County Borough Council
Conwy County Borough Council
Isle of Anglesey County Council
Wrexham County Borough Council
Denbighshire County Council
Gwynedd Council
Gwynedd Council

Patricia Astbury
Timothy Rhodes

Independent Co-opted Member
Independent Co-opted Member

NORTH WALES POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Monday, 2 June 2014 at 2.00 pm
Bodlondeb, Conwy

- Present: Councillor Glenys Diskin (Chair)
- Councillors: Amanda Bragg, Philip C. Evans J.P., Julie Fallon, Colin Powell and Gethin Williams
- Lay Member/
Co-opted Member Pat Astbury
- In Attendance: Councillor Bob Dutton OBE
- Officers: Ken Finch (Strategic Director - Democracy, Regulation and Support), Iwan Siôn Gareth (Translator), Dawn Hughes (Senior Committee Services Officer) and Richard Jarvis (Solicitor)
- Also in Attendance: Anna Humphreys (Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner), Kate Jackson (Chief Finance Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner), Winston Roddick CB QC (North Wales Police and Crime Commissioner) and Julian Sandham (Deputy North Wales Police and Crime Commissioner)

107. **APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR**

It was proposed and seconded that Councillor Glenys Diskin be appointed as the Chair of the North Wales Police and Crime Panel for 2014/15.

RESOLVED-

That Councillor Glenys Diskin be appointed as the Chair of the North Wales Police and Crime Panel for 2014/15.

108. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR**

It was proposed and seconded that Councillor Gethin Williams be appointed as the Vice-Chair of the North Wales Police and Crime Panel for 2014/15.

RESOLVED-

That Councillor Gethin Williams be appointed as the Vice-Chair of the North Wales Police and Crime Panel for 2014/15.

109. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Wil Hughes, Charles Jones, Bill Tasker and Tim Rhodes (Independent Member).

The Chair welcomed Councillor Bob Dutton to the meeting; Councillor Dutton would replace Councillor Ian Roberts who had recently resigned from the North Wales Police and Crime Panel, subject to Home Office approval.

110. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST: CODE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONDUCT**

Councillor Julie Fallon declared a personal, but non-prejudicial interest, as her husband is a serving Police Officer in the North Wales Police.

111. **URGENT MATTERS**

None.

112. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the North Wales Police and Crime Panel held on 17 March 2014 were submitted for approval.

In relation to Minute 104 – Police and Crime Plan for North Wales, it was requested that the 4th bullet point in the third paragraph be amended to read 'Building effective partnerships'.

RESOLVED-

That the minutes of the North Wales Police and Crime Panel held on 17 March 2014 be approved as a correct record, subject to the above amendment to Minute 104 – Police and Crime Plan for North Wales.

113. **UPDATE REPORT FOR THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) provided the Police and Crime Panel with an update report, which concentrated primarily on the Panel's broader functions under Section 28 (6) of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 (the Act) to review or scrutinise decisions made or other actions taken by the PCC. In addition, the report also provided the Panel with the information it required to carry out its functions under Section 13 (1) of the Act.

The PCC highlighted the following areas of the report:

Section One - Scrutiny of North Wales Police

- The PCC scrutinised the Force's performance via the Strategic Executive Board, which he chaired, membership of which included the Chief Constable and Senior Officers.
- Police and Crime Objective 1: Prevent Crime:
 - four measures by which the performance of this objective was measured, included 'the level of total crime', 'the level of victim based crime', 'the level of resolved crime by type' and 'the level of anti-social behaviour'.
 - The Force was now working to the new national crime recording requirements; previously the outcome of the crime was recorded as either 'detected' or 'undetected'; from 1 April 2014 there would be 18 categories of outcomes, which would provide a more precise description of the outcome of the crime.
 - Detection rates at 28.4%, which was in line with the national average; in light of the changes to the recording standards, further scrutiny work would be undertaken once the outcome data became more comprehensive.
 - The national crime statistics for North Wales year ending December 2013, showed that out of 21 crime categories, 16 showed a reduction, with 5 showing an increase.
- Police and Crime Objective 2: Deliver an effective response:
 - Overall response times were currently stable (average emergency response time for 2013/14 was 14.8 minutes).
 - There had been a reduction in the % of abandoned calls (calls which do not reach a designated call handler), due to a result of changes introduced at the Communication Centre; the current abandonment rate stood at around 2% of non-emergency calls.
 - Results of victim satisfaction surveys showed some deterioration towards the end of the survey period. The PCC anticipated that with the introduction of the Victims Code and new practices, the satisfaction rate would increase.
- Police and Crime Objective 3: Reduce harm and the risk of harm:
 - The number of persons killed or seriously injured to February 2014 was higher than in the previous year (311 compared to 295). The PCC had asked the Chief Constable to explain the increase and would report back to the Panel in due course.
- Police and Crime Objective 4: Build effective partnerships – the PCC would provide further information in relation to this objective in future periodic reports to the Panel.

Section 2 – General Updates:

- Details of meetings and events the PCC had attended since the last meeting is appended to these minutes for information.
- Work of the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner
- HMIC Inspection Reports
 - ‘Everyone’s business: Improving the police response to domestic abuse’ – a national and local report had been published by the HMIC, which identified a number of shortcomings and concluded that the overall police response to victims of domestic abuse was not good enough.
 - ‘Crime recording: A matter of fact - interim report’ – The HMIC was currently carrying out an inspection into the way 43 police forces in England and Wales recorded crime data. The HMIC published an interim report on the findings from 13 forces inspected to date, which included North Wales. North Wales Police (NWP) achieved a 93% score in the reporting of crime – out of the 78 cases, where a crime should have been recorded, the HMIC found that 73 were correctly recorded. This was the best compliance rate by any force included in this part of the inspection report.
- Joint Audit Committee – meetings were held in public and Panel Members were welcome to attend.
- Correspondence figures 1 January 2014 – 31 March 2014.

Section three provided the Panel with an update on actions that had previously been agreed with the Panel, which included statistical information on burglaries (domestic and non-domestic).

The PCC informed the Panel that at a recent meeting of the Strategic Executive Board, it was reported that the current operational challenges included burglary dwellings and shoplifting offences.

The Panel was informed that shoplifting was one of the Force’s main priorities and the NWP was monitoring trends. In addition, a seminar had been arranged for 13 July 2014, when supermarkets would be invited to attend to discuss how to develop appropriate responses to tackle this type of crime.

The DPCC also informed the Panel that further reports on this matter would be presented to the Strategic Executive Board in July 2014.

The Panel made reference to the significant increase in shoplifting offences in Wrexham town. It was suggested that perhaps stores needed to take some responsibility in tackling this type of crime. In response, the PCC stated that the NWP could only act after the crime had taken place and that the issue of deterring crime would be discussed further with the supermarkets at the seminar.

The Panel also questioned whether there was an appropriate level of resources deployed to such areas; it was suggested that perhaps the time taken to process such offences was the cause for the increase in crime, particularly in relation to domestic burglary.

In response, the DPCC informed the Panel that the Chief Constable did have the flexibility to move resources around the force area and this was usually reviewed on a daily basis. However, the Panel's concerns would be reported back to the Chief Constable.

Reference was also made to mental health issues and the time taken to process these types of cases. The PCC agreed to look at this issue further and report back to a future meeting.

RESOLVED-

- (a) That the Police and Crime Panel notes the decisions and actions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner, and the information provided within his update report.**

- (b) That the Police and Crime Panel's concerns in relation to the appropriate levels of resources deployed, particularly to the Wrexham area be reported back to the Chief Constable.**

- (c) That the time taken to process cases relating to mental health issues be investigated further by the Police and Crime Commissioner.**

114. **PROVISION OF CCTV IN NORTH WALES**

Whilst the item was not referred to on the agenda, the Police and Crime Panel felt it was important to discuss the issue of CCTV provision in North Wales.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC) informed the Panel that Local Authorities applied to the North Wales Police for funding to help with the provision of CCTV (*there were currently 6 different schemes in place in North Wales*). Due to the need for public authorities to make savings, discussions had taken place regarding the future and funding of the service, however no solution had been found to date.

The Panel was informed that the North Wales Police had contributed over £1m over the last 11 years to Local Authorities, towards the running costs of CCTV cameras.

In relation to the recent decision taken by Isle of Anglesey County Council to withdraw its CCTV provision, the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) stated that he had made his views clear in the press and media that he felt it was a retrograde step and that the service played an important part in securing public safety and the prevention of crime. Whilst staff had been withdrawn, the facilities had not been dismantled, in order to allow for a period of reflection.

Whilst this was a matter for the Chief Constable, the PCC would also engage with the debate, as part of the solution could be collaboration/partnership working.

The DPCC agreed with the PCC that collaboration was the way forward in order for Local Authorities to continue with this service and assist with the deliverability of the North Wales Police and Crime Plan.

Reference was made to the establishment of a North Wales Regional CCTV Service, which had been previously considered by Local Authorities in North Wales. However, not all Authorities favoured the scheme and therefore the project was disbanded.

The Panel concurred that collaboration/partnership working was probably the most effective and efficient way forward, and Members were concerned that the withdrawal of CCTV would impact significantly on the deliverability of the Police and Crime Plan.

Councillor Philip C. Evans J.P., who had previously been involved in the regional CCTV project, stated that it was unfortunate that the discussions in relation to a regional service had taken place prior to the election of the PCC. Whilst some Authorities would be happy to collaborate with neighbouring Authorities, this may not be the case throughout North Wales.

The Strategic Director (Democracy, Regulation and Support) suggested that as a way forward, the concerns of the Panel could be referred to the Safer Communities Board, which he and the PCC would be attending on Friday, 6 June 2014.

The Panel agreed with the proposed course of action and that further consideration should be given to the matter of partnership working, in order to secure CCTV provision in North Wales.

RESOLVED-

That the Safer Communities Board be informed of the Police and Crime Panel's concerns in relation to the future of CCTV in North Wales and that further consideration should be given to partnership working, in order to secure CCTV provision.

115. **ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER**

The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) presented the Police and Crime Panel (PCP) with his Annual Report for 2013/14.

Section One of the report provided details of progress on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan, which was originally published in March 2013, with a revised Plan finalised in March 2014, following consultation with the public and the PCP.

The report provided details of the Strategic Outcomes and the results of an independent survey to assess progress against delivering the outcomes. In addition, the PCC also provided details of events, projects and meetings he had attended during the year.

Section Two of the report, provided the PCP with details of delivering the role of the PCC, whose core functions were:

- To secure the maintenance of an efficient and effective police force for North Wales;
- To hold the Chief Constable to account for the exercise of his functions;
- To bring together community safety and criminal justice partners; and
- To co-operate with the other Police and Crime Commissioners and to formulate and implement strategies across Police Force areas.

From April 2014, the PCC became responsible for the Community Safety Fund and Annex A also provided details of the distribution of the PCC's Fund for 2013/14.

In accordance with Section 28, Paragraph 4 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, the Panel reviewed the annual report and made the following observations.

In relation to 'Police Visibility and Accessibility', which was one of the strategic outcomes highlighted within the report, the Panel queried the reduction in Community Beat Managers (CBMs) and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). The Panel requested more information in relation to the provision of CBMs and PCSOs in the force area and an update on the pilot scheme in Rhyl.

The Panel also made reference to a significant historic increase in the precept for the provision of a PCSO in each ward, however as funding had reduced this had decimated the number of PCSOs.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner stated that the current structure for neighbourhood policing was on the PCC's website and that a review was pending in relation to PCSOs.

The PCC agreed to pass the Panel's concerns in relation to the reduction of CBMs/PCSOs to the Chief Constable and would provide more information in relation to the role of CBMs at the next meeting.

The Panel accepted the PCC's Annual Report for 2013/14.

RESOLVED-

- (a) That the Police and Crime Panel accepts the Police and Crime Commissioner's Annual Report for 2013/14 and that a report be submitted to the Commissioner in accordance with Section 28, Paragraph 4 (d) of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.**

(b) That the Police and Crime Commissioner informs the Chief Constable of the Panel's concerns in relation to the reduction of Community Beat Managers and Police Community Support Officers in the force area, and that further information in relation to the role of CMBs be provided at the next meeting.

116. **INCREASE IN POLICE OFFICER ESTABLISHMENT**

The Police and Crime Commissioner presented a response to the Police and Crime Panel's letter in relation to the increase in the Police Officer Establishment.

RESOLVED-

That the Police and Crime Commissioner's response be noted.

117. **ALLOWANCE SCHEME**

The Strategic Director (Democracy, Regulation and Support) presented a report, requesting the Police and Crime Panel (PCP) to consider whether the Allowance Scheme for the PCP should make provision for:

- Reasonable time for pre meeting preparation; and
- Travelling time to and from the place of the meeting.

The report also provided details of expenses made to Members of the PCP for 2013/14, which would need publishing in accordance with the Terms of Reference of the PCP.

Whilst the Independent Remuneration Panel for Wales (IRPW) did not have any jurisdiction over the PCP, the Allowance Scheme was based on its payments to co-opted Members.

The IRPW had now published its final report following a consultation exercise and had revised determinations in relation to payment to co-opted Members, in that reasonable time for pre-meeting preparation was eligible to be included in claims, together with travelling time to and from the place of meeting.

The Panel agreed that the status quo should remain and the revised determinations from the IRPW should not be included within the PCP's Allowance Scheme.

RESOLVED-

(a) That the status quo remains in respect of the Police and Crime Panel' Allowance Scheme and that the revised determinations from the IRPW in relation to payments to co-opted Members are not included within the Allowance Scheme.

(b) That expenses paid to Members of the Police and Crime Panel for 2013/14 be published in accordance with the Terms of Reference of the PCP.

118. **WEBCASTING OF MEETINGS**

The Strategic Director (Democracy, Regulation and Support) presented a report, requesting the Police and Crime Panel (PCP) to consider whether meetings of the PCP should be webcast.

Conwy County Borough Council (CCBC) had recently procured a webcasting system using grant funding provided by Welsh Government, which had been installed in the Council Chamber at Bodlondeb, Conwy.

Webcasting of PCP meetings would increase its profile and visibility, and enhance transparency and public access to meetings.

The Strategic Director felt that the costs associated with webcasting of PCP meetings could be accommodated within the Home Office grant at present.

However, the Panel was informed that as the webcasting system was currently funded by the WG, if funding was not available after the pilot, CCBC could not guarantee the future of its webcasting facilities.

Whilst some Members of the Panel supported the webcasting of meetings in order to enhance transparency and visibility, others felt that as not all Panel Members were in attendance, the matter should be deferred until the next meeting.

The PCC also stated that whilst he was not against webcasting, the PCP needed to be made aware of the constraints he was under when questions were asked on prohibited matters.

The Panel acknowledged the PCC's concerns and agreed they would take guidance on such matters and that the PCC could state that matters were operational and would need to be discussed with the Chief Constable.

The Panel agreed that the matter should be deferred until the Panel had a full complement of Members. In addition, the Chief Executive to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner agreed to undertake a risk assessment of the implications of webcasting on the PCC's role and also identify areas of good practice from other PCPs, who were currently webcasting their meetings.

RESOLVED-

- (a) That the matter of webcasting be deferred until the Police and Crime Panel has a full complement of Members present.**
- (b) That the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner undertakes a risk assessment of webcasting on the Commissioner's role, taking into account good practice from other Police and Crime Panels, who are currently webcasting.**

119. **SUMMARY OF COMPLAINTS RECEIVED**

The Strategic Director (Democracy, Regulation and Support) provided an update, in relation to the action taken to resolve the complaints the Police and Crime Panel (PCP) had received to date.

The PCP had received 5 complaints to date, of which 3 complaints had been previously reported to the Panel and were now closed.

In relation to the 2 remaining complaints, the Panel was informed that in line with the Complaints Procedure, the Strategic Director had consulted with 3 Members of the Panel to agree a course of action for local resolution.

The action taken to resolve the 2 remaining complaints was listed in Paragraph 4 of the Committee Report and these complaints were now closed.

RESOLVED-

That the action taken to resolve the complaints be noted.

120. **DEVELOPING A SCRUTINY FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME**

The Police and Crime Panel (PCP) was presented with a report requesting that consideration be given to developing a Scrutiny Forward Work Programme (FWP) for the PCP taking into account the document published by the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) – Police and Crime Panel: The First Year.

The Panel was informed that the Head of Democratic Services for Conwy County Borough Council had agreed to provide the support necessary to develop a proactive work programme for the PCP.

Possible areas for scrutiny were listed in Paragraph 2.6 of the report, which could be linked to the PCC's activities.

The Police and Crime Commissioner welcomed the development of a FWP, however requested that the second bullet point in Paragraph 2.6 be amended to read: 'How is the PCC scrutinising the Force's performance against the Police and Crime Objectives of the Plan'.

The Panel agreed that a FWP should be developed incorporating the areas for scrutiny listed in Paragraph 2.6, subject to the PCC's suggested amendment.

RESOLVED-

(a) That the Police and Crime Panel notes the contents of the published report by the Centre for Public Scrutiny – Police and Crime Panels: The First Year, as 'good practice' principles.

(b) That a Scrutiny Forward Work Programme be developed incorporating the areas for scrutiny listed in Paragraph 2.6 of the report, subject to the amendment to the second bullet point as highlighted above.

121. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

The next meeting of the North Wales Police and Crime Panel would be held on Monday, 15 September 2014 at 2.00 pm, venue to be confirmed.

(The meeting ended at 3.35 pm)

AGENDA ITEM 5b

Report from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Title:	Update on the 2014/15 Budget (as at 30 June 2014)
Meeting:	North Wales Police and Crime Panel, 15 September 2014
Author:	Kate Jackson, Chief Finance Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The aim of this paper is provide members of the panel an update of the policing budget for North Wales as at 30 June 2014 (month 3).

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To note the report.

3. Update on the 2014/15 budget

- 3.1 The net budget for the Police and Crime Commissioner for North Wales was approved by the Police and Crime Panel on 20 January 2014 at £141.204m. As at 30 June 2014, the total projection to the end of the year is a net £0.385m underspend.

- 3.2 Expenditure is projected to be broadly in line with the budget. However, this consists of a number of projected over and underspends. The most significant of these are:

- Employees – projected overspend £0.564m.
This is the net effect of a number of factors, the most significant of these being:
 - Police Officer Pay £0.254m overspend – the policy of recruiting early will ensure that all police officer posts can be filled. This overspend may be funded from the Probationer Reserve in line with the recruitment strategy.
 - Police Staff Pay £0.462m overspend – the number of agency staff is being reduced, and it is expected this projected overspend will reduce during the course of the year.
 - Allowances £0.220m underspend – the original budget incorporates elements for rent, housing and compensatory grants payable to existing officers. As those officers retire, these allowances will no longer be payable; the underspend has been calculated based on an estimate of the officers retiring this financial year.
- Supplies and Services – projected underspend £0.394m
 - Forensics £0.450m underspend. This estimate is based on 2013/14 expenditure and activity so far this financial year. Should the level of activity vary, then the projected costs will also change. Forensics has been identified as an area where savings could be achieved; if this level of expenditure is maintained then the budget will be reduced in 2015/16.
- Income – projected additional income £0.404m

- Around half of the additional income is attributable to sales of vehicles. The vehicle replacement programme is now fully underway, following a capital freeze in 2011/12. This has resulted in a higher than usual volume of vehicle sales in 2013/14 and 2014/15.
- The balance is due to a number of partnership grants.

3.3 At the current time, capital charges, contingencies and the community safety fund are projected at budget.

3.4 A summary of the budgets and projections is given below.

Revenue Budget	YTD Budget	YTD Actual	YTD Est/Comm	YTD Var	Annual Budget	Full Year Projection	EOY Variance
Budget 2014-15 as at 30 June 2014	30.6.14	30.6.14	30.6.14	30.6.14	30.6.14	30.6.14	30.6.14
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Expenditure							
Employee Costs	30,080	30,154	379	453	120,716	121,280	564
Premises Costs	1,930	2,015	-	85	8,187	8,002	- 185
Transport Costs	1,118	1,375	-	257	5,193	5,227	34
Supplies and Services	4,103	4,722	-	619	16,911	16,517	- 394
Debt Charges and Contribution to Capital	476	-	-	476	1,904	1,904	-
Contingencies and Savings	247	-	-	247	989	989	-
Community Safety Fund	292	4	-	288	1,166	1,166	-
Gross Expenditure	38,246	38,270	379	403	155,066	155,085	19
Income	- 3,562	- 2,640	-	922	- 14,131	- 14,535	- 404
PFI Reserve	373	-	-	373	373	373	-
Speed Awareness Reserve	- 26	-	-	26	- 104	- 104	-
Net Expenditure	35,031	35,630	379	978	141,204	140,819	- 385
Total Grants	- 19,275	-	-	19,275	- 77,102	- 77,102	-
Council Tax	- 16,026	-	-	16,026	- 64,102	- 64,102	-
Funding	- 35,301	-	-	35,301	- 141,204	- 141,204	-
Contribution (to)/from reserves						- 385	- 385

4. Capital

4.1 The original capital programme for 2014/15 is £13.9m as per the Medium Term Financial Plan. When amounts brought forward from 2013/14 are taken into account, this increases to £15.3m. Around 50% of the capital budget for 2014/15 has been allocated to three major projects:

- Wrexham Project - £4.4m
- Llandudno Development - £2.75m
- Pwllheli Relocation - £0.85m

Although the business cases have been agreed and public consultation is now being undertaken, it is likely that much of the expenditure on these three schemes will fall into future financial years. The budget for the capital programme will be re-profiled when more information is known.

- 4.2 Of the remaining £7.3m, only £0.5m has been spent during the first quarter. Although it is normal for expenditure to be low at the start of the financial year, the budgets for many of these projects will also need to be re-profiled, particularly where they are dependent on other ongoing reviews.

5 Implications

Diversity	No separate diversity implications
Financial	The purpose of this report is inform the Police and Crime Panel of the revenue and capital monitoring position as at the end of June 2014. Adequate funding is vital to the delivery of the police and crime plan and to fulfil our legal requirements
Legal	No separate legal implications
Risk	No separate risk implications
Police and Crime Plan	No separate police and crime implications.

Report from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Title:	Timetable for the Proposed Policing Precept 2015/16
Meeting:	North Wales Police and Crime Panel, 15 September 2014
Author:	Kate Jackson, Chief Finance Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the proposed timetable for setting the precept for the 2015/16 financial year.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 For the Police and Crime Panel to approve the proposed timetable for setting the precept for the 2015/16 financial year.

3. Timetable

- 3.1 The Police and Crime Panel have a key role in determining the level of policing precept for 2015/16. Schedule 5 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 sets out the role of the Panel in reviewing the precept level proposed by the Commissioner; [Appendix 1](#) of this report contains the Home Office guidance and statutory timetable for the Police and Crime Panel.
- 3.2 If details of the policing grant are published in good time, it may be possible to submit budget plans to the panel in December; however, it is more usual to receive this information in mid or late December, therefore the Commissioner will not be in a position to submit firm proposals to the Panel until January 2015.
- 3.3 It is proposed that the Commissioner will notify the Panel of the proposed precept level for 2015/16 on 12 January 2015, one week in advance of the **meeting of the Panel on 19 January 2015**.
- 3.4 The table below summarises the statutory deadlines and the proposed arrangements for North Wales. In the event that the Panel determines to veto the proposed precept, in order to meet local timelines for the issuing of council tax bill, the process must be **completed by 13 February 2015**, and a special meeting of the Panel would need to convene prior to 2 February:

Activity	Statutory deadline	Timetable for North Wales
The Commissioner to notify the Panel of the proposed precept	1 February	12 January
The Panel to review and make a report to the Commissioner on the proposed precept (whether it accepts or vetoes the precept).	8 February	19 January
It the Panel decides to veto the proposed precept, the Commissioner is required to have regard to and respond to the Panel's report, and to publish his response including the revised precept.	15 February	
The Panel, on receipt of a response from the Commissioner notifying them of the revised precept, to review the revised precept and make a second report to the Commissioner	22 February	<i>Special meeting of the Police and Crime Panel to be arranged prior to 2 February (if required)</i>
The Commissioner to have regard to and respond to the Panel's second report and publish his response.	1 March	

4. IMPLICATIONS

Equality	No separate equality implications.
Financial	If the precept is not decided within the statutory timetable, North Wales Police will not have the necessary resources to fulfil its statutory responsibilities in 2015/16.
Legal	The suggested timetable takes into account the statutory timetable for the proposal and scrutiny of the Police and Crime Commissioner's precept.
Community	The precept is required to provide police and crime services to the communities in North Wales.
Risk	The risk is financial, as detailed above.
Police and Crime Plan	The precept must be decided in order to deliver the objectives of the Police and Crime Plan.

Home Office Guidance

Police and Crime Panels – Scrutiny of Precepts

This guidance note explains the process for the police and crime panel's (PCP) scrutiny of the police and crime commissioner's (PCC) proposed precept and should be read alongside:

- Schedule 5 of the [Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011](#) ("the Act")
- Part 2 of the [Police and Crime Panels \(Precepts and Chief Constable Appointments\) Regulations 2012](#) ("the Regulations")

A separate [guidance note setting out the scrutiny of chief constable appointments](#) has been published alongside this guidance note.

Background

Schedule 5 of the Act sets out the process for issuing a precept, including the panel's role in reviewing the proposed precept, their power to veto the precept and the steps to be taken if they do veto the proposed precept.

The Regulations provide greater detail to the Act, including time limits applicable to the stages of the process and the process for reviewing and issuing a revised precept.

Schedule 5 requires:

- the PCC to notify the panel of his/her proposed precept;
- the panel to review the proposed precept;
- the panel to make a report to the PCC on the proposed precept (this may include recommendations);
- the panel's report (if they veto the proposed precept) to include a statement that they have vetoed it;
- a decision of veto to be agreed by two-thirds of the panel members;
- the PCC to have regard to the report made by the panel (including any recommendations in the report);
- the PCC to give the panel a response to their report (and any such recommendations);
- the PCC to publish the response.

It is for the panel to determine how a response to a report or recommendations is to be published.

If there is no veto and the PCC has published his/her response to the panel's report, the PCC may then issue the proposed precept - or a different precept (but only if in accordance with a recommendation in the panel's report to do so).

The Regulations require:

- the PCC to notify the panel of his/her proposed precept **by 1 February**;
- the panel to review and make a report to the PCC on the proposed precept (whether it vetoes the precept or not) **by 8 February**;
- where the panel vetoes the precept, the PCC to have regard to and respond to the Panel's report, and publish his/her response, including the revised precept, **by 15 February**;
- the panel, on receipt of a response from the PCC notifying them of his/her revised precept, to review the revised precept and make a second report to the PCC **by 22 February**;
- the PCC to have regard to and respond to the Panel's second report and publish his/her response, **by 1 March**.

Panel's report on the proposed precept

If the panel fails to report to the PCC by 8 February the scrutiny process comes to an end, even if the panel have voted to veto the proposed precept, and the PCC may issue the proposed precept.

PCC's response to a veto

Where the panel vetoes the proposed precept, the PCC must have regard to the report made by the panel, give the panel a response to the report and publish the response, by 15 February. In his/her response, the PCC must notify the panel of the revised precept that he intends to issue.

Where the panel's report indicates that they vetoed the precept because it was:

- too **high**, the revised precept must be lower than the previously proposed precept.
- too **low**, the revised precept must be higher than the previously proposed precept.

The PCP may only veto the first proposed precept. Such a veto must be agreed by two-thirds of PCP members (the full membership rather than those present at a meeting). Where a veto occurs, the report to the PCC must include a statement to that effect.

Panel's review of the revised precept

On receipt of a response from the PCC notifying them of the revised precept proposal, the panel must review the revised precept proposal and make a second report to the PCC on the revised precept by 22 February. This report may:

- indicate whether the panel accepts or rejects the revised precept (although rejection does not prevent the PCC from issuing the revised precept); and
- make recommendations, including recommendations on the precept that should be issued.

If the panel fails to make a second report to the PCC by 22 February, the PCC may issue the revised precept.


Issuing the precept

Excluding where the panel fails to report on the proposed precept by 8 February or make a second report on the revised precept by 22 February, the scrutiny process ends when the PCC gives the panel his/her response to their second report.

The PCC may then:

- issue the revised precept; or
- issue a different precept, although:
 - they must not issue a precept that is higher than the revised precept if the revised precept was lowered following the panel's initial report on the first proposed precept indicating it was vetoed because it was too high;
 - they must not issue a precept which is lower than the revised precept if the revised precept was raised following the panel's initial report on the first proposed precept indicating it was vetoed because it was too low.

Process for PCP scrutiny of PCC's proposed precept





REPORT TO:	North Wales Police and Crime Panel
DATE:	15 September 2014
CONTACT OFFICER:	Ken Finch, Strategic Director (Democracy, Regulation and Support) – Conwy County Borough Council
SUBJECT:	Response to consultation on Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary’s (HMIC) programme for regular force inspections

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 For the North Wales Police and Crime Panel (PCP) to consider a response to the HMIC’s public consultation on its new programme for regular force inspections

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The HMIC is developing a new programme for inspections of aspects of day-to-day policing in all police forces. This will allow the HMIC to examine what is happening on the ground in force areas, identify and disseminate best practice amongst forces, and increase the chances of any problems or service failures being discovered early, so that things are put right before they become more serious in terms of harm and cost.
- 2.2 The HMIC Board has agreed a proposed approach to the annual all-force inspections, which will focus on three themes:
- How well each force cuts crime (effectiveness)
 - How well each force provides value for money (efficiency) and:
 - How well each force provides a service that has legitimacy in the eyes of the public (legitimacy).
- 2.3 A letter from the HMIC explaining the reasons for the consultation is attached at Appendix 1; a summary of the consultation is attached at Appendix 2; and the proposed response to the consultation, which is based on 10 questions is attached at Appendix 3.

2.4 The deadline to the consultation has been extended to Friday, 12 September 2014; therefore as this report is a public document, a draft copy of the response has been submitted to the HMIC, and any changes made by the PCP, will be forwarded to the HMIC subsequently. The Strategic Director has advised the HMIC of this proposed course of action.

3. RECOMMENDATION(S)/OPTIONS

3.1 That the North Wales Police and Crime Panel endorses the response to the consultation on Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's programme for regular force inspections.

4. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4.1 In recent years, policing in England and Wales has undergone significant change. The institutions of the police have been through major reform. These changes include:

- the creation of directly elected police and crime commissioners (PCCs) to improve accountability;
- setting up the College of Policing to set standards, improve professionalism and develop a better understanding of what works;
- setting up the National Crime Agency to tackle serious and organised crime; and
- giving the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) more powers and resources.

4.2 The way in which the HMIC supports police improvement has also changed and will continue to adapt to this new era of policing. The HMIC have become more independent of both government and the police service, and are changing their approach to inspecting the 43 police forces in England and Wales, so that those holding the police to account – the public and PCCs – have a reliable, impartial and expert assessment of policing.

4.2 The HMIC will be carrying out a new annual programme of all-force inspections. The inspections will provide accessible, annual independent assessments of the performance of police forces. They will make it possible to see from a small number of easy-to-understand categories of police activity and assessment, how well police forces are performing.

The principal aims for the programme are to:

- improve effective democratic accountability;
- inspect in a way that leads to the greatest practicable appreciable
- improvement in policing services; and
- assist in identifying problems at an early stage and so reduce the risk of failure.

The focus of the programme will be on three principal themes:

- efficiency: how well police forces provide value for money;
- effectiveness: how well each force cuts crime; and
- legitimacy: how well each force provides a service that is fair and treats people properly.

4.3 The name for the new programme will reflect these themes. The inspections will be called Police Efficiency, Effectiveness and Legitimacy assessments, or PEEL assessments.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 Consultation has been carried out with all Members of the PCP.

6. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

6.1 None.

7. RISKS

7.1 By responding to the consultation, the HMIC will be aware of the PCP's views on its proposed PEEL inspection programme.

8. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

8.1 To give the PCP an opportunity to comment on the HMIC's proposed approach to the PEEL inspection programme, as set out in the consultation document.

Thomas P Winsor
Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary

Chair
Police and Crime Panel

18 July 2014



HMIC's new programme of regular force inspections

In a Written Ministerial Statement laid on Wednesday 18 December 2013, the Home Office announced its decision *to fund a new annual programme of HMIC all-force inspections.*

At the Home Secretary's request, we are developing this new programme of inspections of aspects of day-to-day policing in all police forces. This will allow us to examine what is happening on the ground in force areas, identify and disseminate best practice amongst forces, and increase the chances of any problems or service failures being discovered early so that things are put right before they become more serious in terms of public harm and cost.

I am writing to update you on our plans in relation to this work, known as the PEEL (police effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy) programme.

Until now, HMIC has principally fulfilled its core function of inspection and reporting on the efficiency and effectiveness of forces in England and Wales (as required by section 54(2) of the Police Act 1996) by monitoring data provided by police forces and inspecting areas of policing that present a particular risk.

However, such an approach carries the risk that potential problems may be missed. The recent mid-Staffordshire NHS case – in which the absence of regular, on-the-ground inspection resulted in the Care Quality Commission failing to identify severe shortcomings in the provision of services because, on the surface, the health trust was performing reasonably well – has been very much in our minds during these deliberations.

The HMIC Board therefore considers that routine and regular inspections are the most reliable basis for sound, thorough and comparative assessments of police efficiency and effectiveness.

Work to implement the programme is continuing apace, and HMIC is increasing the amount and extent of its consultation with the public and other policing institutions and interested parties, including police and crime commissioners, local policing bodies (PCCs and LPBs) and the police service.

The HMIC Board has now agreed a proposed approach to the annual all-force inspections. The new programme will focus on three themes:

- how well each force cuts crime (effectiveness);

- how well each force provides value for money (efficiency); and
- how well each force provides a service that has legitimacy in the eyes of the public (legitimacy).

Each force will be inspected and reported on twice each year as part of the PEEL programme.

- One inspection will cover **effectiveness**. It will focus in detail on how effectively forces prevent and reduce crime, and how effectively they investigate crime in the context of the demand they face and local priorities.
- The other inspection will cover **efficiency**. It will consider how forces provide value for money, how they make best use of their resources to achieve the right results for local communities, and whether their plans are sustainable in years to come.
- Both inspections will cover elements of **legitimacy**, along with organisational factors and local context.

The findings from the two inspections will then be combined to produce one fully integrated assessment for each force. We will use PEEL assessments and all relevant thematic reports to provide a national assessment of policing.

HMIC's proposed judgments and recommendations

The report after each inspection will include judgments in relation to individual elements of the assessment.

HMIC proposes to use four judgments: two positive and two negative. Judgments will be made in connection with the three themes of efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy, as well as individual elements of the inspection framework. The judgments reflect the terminology used by Ofsted. The Care Quality Commission has recently consulted on a proposal based on a similar model. The judgments will be:

- outstanding;
- good;
- requires improvement; and
- inadequate.

We will publish criteria so that the way in which we arrive at judgments is clear. We will base judgment criteria on existing professional standards where they exist. Judgments will be accompanied by further information that will include comments on local context, and whether the force is improving or getting worse.

HMIC is committed to making recommendations when an assessment has identified there is a clear problem that needs to be addressed. We are also proposing to make recommendations in relation to areas that could be improved. As well as making recommendations to police forces, we propose to make recommendations to other bodies, such as the Home Office and the College of Policing, where issues that arise from inspections need to be addressed by those bodies.


We will also change the way we approach our inspections to reflect the way the police collaborate. It is right that, in a tight financial climate, the police should exploit opportunities to join up with other organisations in the public, voluntary and private sectors, cutting out duplication and providing better, more efficient services to the public. HMIC will be mindful of collaboration arrangements in order to minimise inspection demands. HMIC will work with other inspectorates so that we are accurately identifying material issues before and after inspection.

The consultation

On Monday 30 June 2014, we launched a period of public consultation, in which I would encourage you to take part. The consultation is open to all, and will enable us to obtain the views of the public, policing institutions and other interested parties.

The consultation period ends on Friday 29 August 2014, after which time we will collate and consider all responses.

I hope that you will find this update useful, and will consider responding to the attached consultation formally.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Thomas P Winsor', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Thomas P Winsor

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary



Inspecting policing
in the **public interest**

HMIC's programme for regular force inspections

For consultation

© HMIC 2014

www.hmic.gov.uk

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) independently assesses the efficiency and effectiveness of police forces and policing activity – ranging from neighbourhood teams through serious crime to the fight against terrorism – in the public interest.

In preparing our reports, we ask the questions which citizens would ask, and publish the answers in accessible form, using our expertise to interpret the evidence. We provide authoritative information to allow the public to compare the performance of their force over time and against others, and our evidence is used to drive improvements in the service to the public.

HMIC consults and works with other organisations on the inspection and assessment of police forces in England and Wales. HMIC also has a long history of conducting joint inspections with other inspectorates. HMIC does not have a statutory duty to inspect police and crime commissioners and their offices, but can be commissioned to inspect services on their behalf.

Our mission

Through inspecting, monitoring and advising, to promote and advance improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of policing. We will do this independently, professionally and fairly, always championing the public interest, and we will explain what we do and why.

Contents

Foreword from HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary	4
Policing in England and Wales	5
The need for change	7
The new approach: all-force inspections	9
The proposed approach	11
Overview	11
Assessment framework	11
Frequency and structure of inspections	13
Reporting.....	15
Judgments and recommendations	17
Making judgments	17
Making recommendations	18
Collaboration and partnership principles	20
PEEL assessment practicalities	22
Gathering evidence	22
Reflecting the victim experience.....	23
Quality assurance and moderation.....	24
Report development and publication.....	24
Skills, expertise and knowledge	25
Interim assessment	27
The consultation	29
Consultation questions	29
How to respond to this consultation	30
How consultation responses will be reviewed	30
Annex A: Responses – confidentiality and disclaimer	31
Annex B: Design principles	32

Foreword from HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary

In November 2013, the Home Secretary asked HMIC to develop and implement a new programme of annual all-force inspections with a view to assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of policing in England and Wales. It will see forces judged and placed in one of four categories: outstanding, good, requires improvement or inadequate.

This will be a major undertaking for the inspectorate and will have significant implications for policing. It is therefore right that we hear as many views as possible as we develop the programme for these assessments. The assessments will judge whether your police force is providing an efficient and effective service.

Over recent years, HMIC has moved from reviewing and reporting on the efficiency and effectiveness of each force to focusing on specific issues across the police service. A thematic and risk-based approach has served to address areas of significant public interest and will need to continue.

Policing is changing and this necessitates a more consistent and accessible means for the public to assess the quality of policing as a whole in their area. This will complement the greater focus on forces' accountability to the public through directly elected police and crime commissioners.

In addition to inspections on specific issues, HMIC will set out a clear, objective and comprehensive assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of policing in each force area. The new programme of inspections will give the public an easy-to-understand assessment of how their force is performing.

This document sets out our proposed approach for these new assessments. We are keen to hear your views. Throughout the document, we have asked a number of questions and your responses will inform the next stage of the programme's development.

I should like to thank you on behalf of Her Majesty's Inspectors for taking the time to read this document and I look forward to your responses.

Thomas P Winsor
HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary

Policing in England and Wales

- 1 In recent years, policing in England and Wales has undergone significant institutional, structural and operational reform. Since 2010, the substantial reforms to the institutions of the police have included:
 - the creation of police and crime commissioners¹ (PCCs) to improve accountability;
 - the establishment of the College of Policing to set standards, improve professionalism and develop a better understanding of what works;
 - the establishment of the National Crime Agency to tackle serious and organised crime;
 - more powers and resources for the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC); and
 - an inspectorate that is more independent of government and more independent of the police service.
- 2 In addition, there have been wide-ranging changes to police terms and conditions of service, and there has been huge advancement in the use of technology, by both offenders and officers. These changes collectively amount to the greatest reform of the police for almost 100 years.
- 3 By far the most significant single change has been the introduction of democratically elected PCCs, one for each police force area. PCCs have replaced police authorities and set policing priorities through their local police and crime plans, set the budgets for their forces, and hold their chief constables to account.
- 4 The introduction of PCCs has been coupled with the abolition of government targets and a reaffirmation that operational responsibility belongs with the police. This reflects a move from bureaucratic accountability – where the police are held to account by central monitoring of targets and performance indicators – to local democratic accountability. Through the PCCs, the public now has a greater voice in determining the priorities of its local force.

¹ The term police and crime commissioners is used as shorthand to make reference to police and crime commissioners, the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime in the Metropolitan Police Service and the Common Council of the City of London.

- 5 There are a number of independent regulatory and inspection bodies that scrutinise the police in the public interest and provide information on performance. The role of these bodies, which include HMIC and the IPCC, has been strengthened as part of the move to democratic accountability.
- 6 Some of these changes have been underpinned by legislation. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 made a number of significant changes to HMIC. It gave Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMIs) explicit powers of entry and access to information as well as a direct route of accountability to Parliament and the public.
- 7 The changes Parliament enshrined in law were a reflection of a changing policing world – one where democratic accountability could only successfully generate improvements if the public and the PCC had a clear, objective and robust sense of what was happening in their force.

The need for change

- 8 The significant changes to police accountability have required organisations supporting the process, such as HMIC, to review the ways they work to make sure they are fit for the future.
- 9 HMIC's role in publishing information about the quality of the service police forces provide facilitates greater public scrutiny. This information serves as the basis for a dialogue between the public and their local PCC – but only if the information is accessible, easy to understand and covers the issues in which the public are interested.
- 10 In recent years, the expectations of the general public in relation to the information they receive about public services has changed radically. The public are accessing more information, through more channels, more quickly and easily than ever before. In March 2014, YouGov² polled over 2,000 members of the public on behalf of HMIC to get their views of performance information on the police. We know from this polling that the majority of the public want information but few feel that they are well informed about the police.
- 11 The information that HMIC provides needs to cover all aspects of policing and must take account of the complexities of policing in the modern age. The demand for the services of the police is changing, as is the nature of crime. The internet and associated technology have created conditions in which criminals have greater opportunities to operate in an environment that they believe to be safer, and where opportunities to offend are more readily or easily available. The internet has made new kinds of offending possible, and has increased the number of potential victims.
- 12 Inspections also need to be able to identify early signs of systemic problems across forces that could lead to issues like those seen in Mid Staffordshire hospital³. The last few years have seen a number of controversies and revelations of a serious and negative nature in relation to the conduct of some police officers – for example, conduct exposed by the Leveson Inquiry and the

² *PEEL Assessments – General Public survey*, YouGov, March 2014 and *PEEL Assessments – Survey of Local Councillors*, YouGov, March 2014 available from www.hmic.gov.uk/programmes/regular-force-inspections-peel-assessments/

³ *Report of the Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust Public Inquiry*, Sir Robert Francis QC, London, 2013

conclusions of the Hillsborough independent panel. Inspections need to put performance in to context, looking not just at the effectiveness of the force, but also the fairness and propriety of its processes.

- 13 In recent years, HMIC has monitored the efficiency and effectiveness of police forces through detailed analysis of performance and financial data and through thematic inspections, concentrating on areas of highest risk, greatest importance to the public and where things have gone wrong. It is our view that the balance of inspections has become too weighted towards thematic inspections. Having access to comparable assessments of force performance over a period of years allows forces and the public to identify, assess and monitor improvements or deterioration in service. Thematics, unless revisited routinely, do not provide the systematic analysis over time that provides the rich picture needed for democratic accountability, or the incentive for forces to improve year on year.
- 14 As the example of Mid Staffordshire hospital demonstrated, public institutions have their own sense of identity and characteristics born from their leaders, their work and their history. With these come inherent strengths and weaknesses. These strengths and weaknesses are often part of the institution and can be given insufficient emphasis in any thematic inspection focused on a single issue.
- 15 It is essential that those holding the police to account – the public and PCCs – have a reliable, impartial and expert assessment of the efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy of core policing functions. The challenge is to provide this without unnecessarily increasing the demands on forces and continuing to provide detailed assessments of principal issues of concern when required. This will necessitate a change not only in what we do but also, crucially, how we do it.

The new approach: all-force inspections

- 16 In order to meet these challenges, as we set out in the consultation on our 2014/15 inspection programme⁴, HMIC will be carrying out a new annual programme of all-force inspections. The inspections will provide accessible, annual independent assessments of the performance of police forces. They will make it possible to see from a small number of easy-to-understand categories of police activity and assessment, how well police forces are performing.
- 17 The principal aims for the programme are to:
- improve effective democratic accountability;
 - inspect in a way that leads to the greatest practicable appreciable improvement in policing services; and
 - assist in identifying problems at an early stage and so reduce the risk of failure.
- 18 The inspection programme will provide information about what is happening in reality across a range of policing functions. This will help forces drive improvement in their own performance through comparison with the best performers. It will support PCCs in holding their chief constables to account and reduce the need for PCCs to conduct regular assessments. It will assist the public in holding PCCs to account.
- 19 The focus of the programme will be on three principal themes:
- efficiency: how well police forces provide value for money;
 - effectiveness: how well each force cuts crime, from anti-social behaviour to protecting vulnerable people and organised crime; and
 - legitimacy: how well each force provides a service that is fair and treats people properly.
- 20 The first two themes reflect HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary's statutory responsibility to provide an annual assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of policing in England and Wales (section 54(4A), Police Act

⁴ HMIC's Proposed 2014/15 Inspection Programme for consultation, HMIC, London 2014

1996). The legitimacy of the police service is central to its effectiveness, and of sufficient significance to merit a third theme.

- 21 The name for the new programme will reflect these themes. The inspections will be called Police Efficiency, Effectiveness and Legitimacy assessments, or PEEL assessments.
- 22 In designing the PEEL assessment programme, HMIC has obtained the co-operation and constructive assistance of PCCs, police forces, the College of Policing and the Home Office, together with other inspectorates and senior academics and we have also carried out public polling. This collaborative work has helped to make the design of the new inspection programme as sound and efficient as possible to meet the needs of the public. The team used this engagement to establish a number of design principles that were used in developing the proposed approach. These principles can be found at Annex B at the end of this document.
- 23 The PEEL assessment programme will give HMIC a solid baseline to comment on the breadth of policing. It will reduce the need for additional thematic inspections and should, over time, lead to a reduction in the inspection demands that we place on forces.
- 24 The purpose of this consultation is to gather views on the approach HMIC uses to make PEEL assessments and the way the PEEL assessments will be presented.

The proposed approach

Overview

- 25 HMIC proposes the following principles to underpin the approach for PEEL assessments.
- Assessments will cover the range of activities that forces undertake.
 - There will be consistency in the way that assessments of different forces are carried out and reported upon. There will be a robust moderation process so that sound comparisons can be made between forces.
 - Inspections will be primarily based on qualitative evidence (i.e. descriptive information). Quantitative data will be used to support inspections.
 - The public's – and especially victims' – experiences of the police will be central to making an assessment.

Assessment framework

- 26 HMIC will build on the existing monitoring framework in place for forces, basing PEEL assessments on a set of core questions. The questions will be grouped around the PEEL themes of efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy, as set out below.
- (a) Efficiency
1. Is the force maximising the efficiency of its operational resources?
 2. Does the force have a secure financial position for the short and long terms?
 3. Does the force have a sustainable workforce model for the comprehensive spending review period and beyond?
 4. Does the force have the leadership capacity that it needs?
- (b) Effectiveness
5. How effective is the force at reducing crime and preventing offending?
 6. How effective is the force at investigating offending?

7. How effective is the force at protecting those at greatest risk of harm?
8. How effective is the force at tackling anti-social behaviour?
9. How effective is the force at tackling serious, organised and complex crime?
10. How effective is the force at meeting its commitments under the Strategic Policing Requirement⁵?
11. How effective is the force at proactively ensuring public safety?

(c) Legitimacy

12. What are the overall public perceptions of the force?
13. How effective is the force at responding when a member of the public calls for service?
14. How well is the force meeting its responsibility to treat people equally and without discrimination?
15. Does the force's workforce act with integrity?
16. Are the data and information that forces provide about their work of a high quality?

27 The framework will be extended to provide more rounded assessments. In addition to the 16 questions, assessments will consider:

- local context to reflect the different demands faced by forces, different priorities set by police and crime commissioners, and the collaboration and partnership arrangements that forces have in place; and
- organisational factors that drive operational performance, such as: leadership; supervision and management; organisational culture; training; allocation of resources; use of technology; and how forces learn, improve and innovate.

⁵ *Strategic Policing Requirement*, HM Government, London, 2012

Frequency and structure of inspections

- 28 Each force will be inspected and reported on twice each year as part of the PEEL programme.
- Inspection 1 will cover effectiveness. It will focus in detail on how effectively forces prevent and reduce crime, and how effectively they investigate crime in the context of the demand they face and local priorities.
 - Inspection 2 will cover efficiency. It will consider how forces provide value for money, how they make best use of their resources to achieve the right outcomes for local communities, and whether their plans are sustainable in years to come.
 - Both inspections will cover elements of legitimacy, along with organisational factors and local context.
- 29 The findings from the two inspections will then be combined to give one fully integrated assessment.




Figure 1: Structure of PEEL inspections

- 30 This approach of inspecting twice a year will provide an opportunity to revisit issues where it becomes apparent after the first inspection that additional information is required. It will also mean that forces are not penalised as a result of their position in the inspection timetable. For example, inspections will not be limited to one snapshot of a force at a certain point in the financial year and business planning cycle.
- 31 Our proposed approach, alongside the retention of some capacity to carry out thematic reviews, will also put HMIC in a position to identify and investigate national trends in policing at an early stage.

Reporting

- 32 We propose to produce a report after each inspection that includes judgments against individual elements of the assessment framework. These reports will then be brought together to provide annual assessments against the three themes, along with a view of the organisational health of the force in terms of leadership and management. We will use PEEL assessments and any additional inspection reports on specific subject areas of policing to provide a national overview of policing.

Consultation questions

- Q1. What do you think of the proposed approach? How could it be improved?**
- Q2. Are there any other aspects of police work you would like to see covered by PEEL inspections? If so, what are these?**




Figure 2: PEEL inspection programme timeline

Judgments and recommendations

Making judgments

- 33 HMIC has consulted the public and stakeholders about whether PEEL assessments should make judgments in relation to the services being inspected. The feedback is clear that we should. A review across the inspectorates shows that there are numerous ways of arriving at judgments. However, there are two common threads to the approaches used:
- transparency in relation to judgment criteria; and
 - judgments are based clearly on the available evidence.
- 34 HMIC proposes to use four judgments: two positive and two negative. Judgments will be made in connection with the three themes of efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy, as well as individual elements of the inspection framework. The judgments reflect the terminology used by Ofsted. The Care Quality Commission has recently consulted on a proposal based on a similar model. The judgments will be:
- outstanding;
 - good;
 - requires improvement; and
 - inadequate.
- 35 In making these judgments inspectors will consider whether:
- the standard of policing is good, or exceeds this standard sufficiently to be judged as outstanding;
 - the force requires improvement in a given area because it is not yet performing at a good level, and/or there are some weaknesses in the organisation; or
 - the performance of the force in a given area is inadequate because it is significantly lower than might reasonably be expected.
- 36 We will publish criteria so that the way in which we arrive at judgments is clear. We will base judgment criteria on professional standards where they exist. Judgments will be accompanied by further information that will include comments on local context, and whether the force is improving or getting worse.

- 37 If a force is judged as inadequate against one of more of the themes, we propose the following steps.
- The force is automatically placed under formal review by HMIC's Crime and Policing Monitoring Group⁶.
 - Progress with resolving the problems identified should be monitored closely by the relevant HMI.
 - Follow-up inspection work (and publication of the findings) might follow, even before the force is visited again as part of the next round of routine inspections. This will be at the discretion of the HMI, dependent on the nature of the problems found.
 - Failure to make the necessary improvements would lead to escalation through the stages of the monitoring process (i.e. a letter to the PCC and, ultimately, referral to the Home Secretary).
- 38 This approach could be implemented if the force is judged as inadequate in any of the three PEEL themes. There may also be circumstances where a judgment of 'requires improvement' could trigger this approach. The decision will be subject to clear criteria, will be transparent, and ultimately will be the responsibility of the relevant HMI.

Making recommendations

- 39 Making recommendations will help HMIC to achieve two of the three aims of the PEEL programme: to inspect in a way that leads to improvement, and to assist in the identification of problems at an early stage. HMIC will be able to identify common themes emerging from the force recommendations and highlight where a national response might be appropriate.
- 40 HMIC is committed to making recommendations when an assessment has brought to light a clear problem that needs to be addressed. We are also proposing to make recommendations in relation to areas that could be improved. As well as making recommendations to police forces, we propose to make recommendations to other bodies, such as the Home Office and the College of Policing, where issues that arise from inspections need to be addressed by those bodies.

⁶ This is a group led by HMIC that keeps Home Office officials, representatives of chief constables and the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners informed about those areas that, in its professional judgment, might present significant risk to the public.

- Q3. Do you agree with the proposal to use four categories for making judgments? If not, how could it be improved?**
- Q4. Do you agree with the proposed approach to those forces that receive a judgment of inadequate? How could it be improved?**
- Q5. Is there anything else that we should include in our recommendations to ensure that they lead to improvement?**

Collaboration and partnership principles

- 41 Police forces do not provide local policing services in isolation. All forces are involved in local strategic partnerships, and most now collaborate with other forces, other public bodies and the private sector. They collaborate on significant aspects of service, ranging from shared back office functions to front-line activities, such as the use of the National Police Air Support Unit and tackling serious and organised crime.
- 42 Many of the arrangements are complex and, although there is a statutory framework to be followed (sections 22A to 23I, Police Act 1996 and sections 5 to 7, Crime and Disorder Act 1998), there is no standard collaboration or partnership approach or arrangement. It is important that PEEL assessments are flexible enough to accommodate the breadth of these arrangements. We therefore propose the following principles.
- We will be mindful of collaboration arrangements in order to minimise inspection demands.
 - In the longer term, force management statements will identify local collaboration and partnership arrangements of which HMIC will need to be aware. (See page 22 below for more detail about force management statements.)
 - Collaboration arrangements may provide greater benefits to some forces than others, so it will be possible to come to different judgments in different forces about the same collaboration agreement.
 - PEEL assessments will not judge the efficiency and effectiveness of local partnerships – this is beyond HMIC’s remit – but will comment on the force’s contribution to and benefits derived from those partnerships.
 - In the same way that HMIC will comment on decisions a PCC makes if they have an effect (adverse or beneficial) on the efficiency and effectiveness of forces, HMIC will state if another organisation’s decisions hinder or improve a force’s efficiency and effectiveness.
- 43 HMIC will work closely with relevant partner inspectorates so that we are able accurately to identify material issues before and after inspection. HMIC will work with other inspectorates so that it is best placed for the purposes of PEEL assessments to take account of anything that has a bearing on the service being provided. More specifically we will:
- identify relevant information before inspection so that we understand the context and can direct our work accordingly;

- ensure our work assists other inspectorates, in particular informing any assessments or recommendations that partner inspectorates may make to other local organisations; and
- if appropriate, consider using the powers available under Schedule 4A of the Police Act 1996 to explore opportunities and the need to work jointly, take on or delegate powers to other inspectorates.

Q6. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to inspecting partnership and collaboration arrangements?

PEEL assessment practicalities

- 44 Like police forces, we need to do our work efficiently, effectively and with legitimacy. This will not only apply to what we do but to how we do it. The introduction of PEEL assessments provides an opportunity to build on those elements of our inspection activity that work well and stop those that do not.

Gathering evidence

- 45 HMIC has listened to forces' concerns, fed back through various channels including the consultation on HMIC's inspection programme⁷, about the amount of data and information they provide during an inspection. As PEEL assessments commence, our objective will be to change the way in which we inspect so as to minimise any unnecessary demands on forces. We will do this by:
- using publicly available information where possible;
 - working with forces to make more data publicly available via force management statements (see below);
 - introducing clear, easy-to-understand templates to specify the information we require;
 - being consistent wherever possible;
 - preparing thoroughly to focus our fieldwork and make the best use of force time;
 - using unannounced inspections where appropriate to minimise unnecessary or inappropriate preparatory work by forces; and
 - using technology to ensure the management of data is efficient and minimises duplication.
- 46 In his Independent Review of Police Officer and Staff Remuneration and Conditions (2012)⁸, Tom Winsor recommended that HMIC should establish a national template for a force management statement, to be published by each

⁷ *HMIC's 2014/15 inspection programme*, HMIC London 2014.

⁸ *Independent Review of Police Officer and Staff Remuneration and Conditions*, Cmnd 8024, 2012.

force with its annual report. The recommendation stated that the statement should contain data on:

- projected demands on the force in the short, medium and long terms;
- plans for meeting these demands, including financial plans; and
- steps the force intends to take to improve efficiency and economy with which it will maintain and develop its workforce and other assets, and discharge its functions to the public.

47 The statement should also report on performance in the last year against projections made for that year in the previous force management statement.

48 We will be working over the next few months to develop a template for these statements. The aim is for the statements to provide a significant amount of the factual information that will underpin PEEL inspections, thereby reducing the demands on forces as the force management statement matures. We will complement force management statements by developing a system that minimises the number of requests for data.

Reflecting the victim experience

49 We are committed to ensuring that the views of victims are fully reflected in each PEEL assessment in terms of how well forces meet the needs of their victims, and how forces develop their services in response to feedback from victims. Assessments will also consider how well forces adhere to the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime, which was published in October 2013 by the Ministry of Justice.⁹

50 We have already undertaken some consultation on how, through inspection, we can better understand the victim experience. Having considered the responses to this consultation, we are proposing the following approach:

- quantitative and qualitative data will be used in combination;
- assessments will consider how forces make distinctions between different types of victims; and
- assessments will cover processes, outcomes and how services are being improved.

⁹ *Code of Practice for Victims of Crime*, Ministry of Justice, London, 2013.

- 51 We will minimise the demands placed on forces by building on victim satisfaction data they and PCCs already gather. We recognise that PCCs currently are assessing the local need for victim support services in advance of assuming responsibility for victims' services commissioning in October 2014, and where practicable we will draw on information that becomes available through that process.
- 52 HMIC recognises there are limitations to the data that is currently collected by forces. National guidelines for victim surveys only require that the victims of violent crime, burglary, vehicle crime and racist crime are asked for their views. In addition, victim surveys exclude victims of sexual offences, domestic violence, and those aged under 16. As a result of this, HMIC will use a range of techniques to gather qualitative and contextual information, such as consulting focus groups and online forums. HMIC will engage with the voluntary sector to improve the quality of data collected and to help reach those victims who are less likely to engage with the police.

Quality assurance and moderation

- 53 HMIC is committed to ensuring good quality assurance processes are built into the PEEL assessment process at critical points. This includes the development and publication of our judgment criteria and moderation processes. These will help forces to understand clearly what to expect from us and what we in turn will expect from them. All inspections will be subject to robust moderation so that forces are assessed and judged consistently.
- 54 We will be asking the public each year whether PEEL assessments provide them with the information they need to tell them how well their force is performing. We will be developing the detail of the evaluation over the next few months, and it will include obtaining full and frank feedback from each force after each inspection to identify what worked well and what could be done better.

Report development and publication

- 55 The public is at the heart of our work, and the way in which we communicate our findings, judgments and recommendations to the public will be central to our ability to meet our objective of improving effective democratic accountability. Our reports must also be designed so that it is clear to police forces what needs to improve.

- 56 Our reports will be presented in various formats in order to meet the range of needs of these different audiences. These will include:
- a report summarising the principal deficiencies across all forces;
 - content on our website that provides ready access to further detail; and
 - short narratives for local media and interested parties such as local councillors.
- 57 Our decisions on the detail of how we report has been and will continue to be influenced by polling undertaken by YouGov for HMIC in relation to what information on policing the public is interested in. The polling found that:
- local media is considered an essential source of information about the work of the police. People said that if they wanted to look for performance information they would look on their force’s website or in the local media;
 - crime rates and statistics dominated responses concerning the types of information people would find most interesting. The aspects of policing that were of the greatest interest in terms of performance information were how the police respond when asked for help, how the police deal with anti-social behaviour, and crime investigation; and
 - 71% of those polled felt that it was important to have information about whether a force’s performance is improving or getting worse. Descriptive text on the strengths and weaknesses of the police was of interest to 63% of people.
- 58 As we develop them, we will test our reports with a variety of interested parties – including the public and police forces – so that they meet the needs of those who will use them.

Skills, expertise and knowledge

- 59 Such a considerable expansion of our work means we need more people. Our need is primarily for an increase in inspection staff, as well as specialist support such as communication and analytical teams. We have recruited from police forces and the civil service.
- 60 We will provide a comprehensive training programme for all new staff. This will include an inspection course which staff will complete before participating in inspections. The new inspection training will focus on specialist skills: interviewing, facilitating focus groups and report drafting, and will have an appreciable practical element. Our longer-term aim is for HMIC to have an

externally accredited inspection training course, and work is underway to achieve this.

- 61 HMIC will continue to use several types of peer inspector: force subject matter experts and experts from the voluntary community sector and local partners providing public services. Peer inspectors have been used successfully to date and we have received positive feedback about the value they have added. Feedback includes: having a fresh and different perspective, bringing additional expertise and challenging both the force and HMIC on their approaches. We will develop a policy to make best use of peer inspectors.

Q7. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to gathering evidence?

Q8. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to gathering information from victims?

Q9. What else should we consider doing to make the PEEL assessments as fair as they can be?

Q10. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to reporting to the public?

Interim assessment

- 62 Not all the staff we require for the PEEL programme are yet in place, and so we will not have the time or capacity to carry out a full PEEL assessment this year. We will, therefore, be carrying out an interim PEEL assessment, using the three themes of efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy, and the assessment will be published by the end of November 2014.
- 63 There are a number of ways in which the interim assessment will facilitate the achievement and application of the aims and principles of the PEEL assessment programme. We will present the public with information about the performance of each force, providing a level of assurance about the efficiency and effectiveness of policing in England and Wales to support democratic accountability. We will draw out the main findings and recommendations from force inspections undertaken in the last 12 months, thereby inspecting in a way that leads to worthwhile improvement in policing. We will take individual force findings, overall conclusions for each of the themes and the outcome of thematic reports in the last 12 months to provide a national picture of emerging issues to assist in identifying problems at an early stage and reducing the risk of failure.
- 64 The interim assessment will inform development of the full assessment and provide the opportunity to test new methodologies. We will also to learn from the reaction of police forces, the public, the media, politicians and other interested parties so that we can improve future PEEL assessments, in particular the full assessment scheduled for November 2015.
- 65 As our methodology for the PEEL assessments programme is not yet fully developed, interim assessments cannot be as comprehensive about each force as our 2015 assessment will be. The PEEL assessments programme is being developed because there is currently no single comprehensive and rounded picture of individual police forces or national policing. The process of designing the interim assessment has made us intensify our focus on what more we need to do to ensure we have a sound knowledge of the state of the police.
- 66 We will incorporate into the interim assessment the main findings and recommendations of other inspections we have carried out in the previous 12 months, including those concerning crime data integrity, making best use of police time and domestic abuse. Judgments will be made where force inspections were designed with that intention, specifically the force inspections for valuing the police 4, crime, and police integrity and corruption. We will also include those inspections that have not covered all 43 forces but that are

nevertheless material to achieving a more accurate picture for the forces concerned.

67 The interim assessment will provide an individual assessment for each of the 43 police forces as well as an overview of policing in England and Wales. The assessment will include the following.

- Assessments of all 43 forces. These will draw out information from recent and new reports into one report for the force. The principal audience for these reports will be the public and will give information on how well their force is performing in respect of a small number of categories of police activity and assessment. Where appropriate, the reports will link to recent and new force inspections.
- National theme summaries. There will be three national summary reports on each theme: efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy. They will provide a summary of how well we judge forces are performing and provide some of the detail underpinning the national overview.
- A national overview. This will draw information from the national theme summaries and other inspections undertaken in the last year.

68 We will reflect the feedback from this consultation in our interim assessment where this is possible in the time available.

The consultation

69 Alongside this consultation document, HMIC will be engaging with the public and other interested parties in a variety of ways. We will use a range of targeted methods including electronic communication and face-to-face engagements to reach as many people and organisations as possible.

70 The aims of the consultation are to:

- ensure target audiences understand – and have the opportunity to comment on – the proposed approach;
- engage in a variety of ways with different people and organisations;
- use meetings that HMIC already holds with interested parties to provide a forum for engagement on the preferred option; and
- ensure the public and other interested parties have the information they need to respond fully to the public consultation.

Consultation questions

- Q1. What do you think of the proposed approach? How could it be improved?
- Q2. Are there any other aspects of police work you would like to see covered by PEEL inspections? If so, what are these?
- Q3. Do you agree with the proposal to use four categories for making judgments? If not, how could it be improved?
- Q4. Do you agree with the proposed approach to those forces that receive a judgment of inadequate? How could it be improved?
- Q5. Is there anything else that we should include in our recommendations to ensure that they lead to improvement?
- Q6. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to inspecting partnership and collaboration arrangements?
- Q7. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to gathering evidence?
- Q8. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to gathering information from victims?
- Q9. What else should we consider doing to make the PEEL assessments as fair as they can be?
- Q10. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to reporting to the public?

How to respond to this consultation

Please submit your answers to these questions, together with any other comments you may have, by email to haveyoursay@hmic.gsi.gov.uk no later than **Friday 12 September 2014**. If you prefer, you can post your responses to Chief Operating Officer, HMIC, 6th Floor, Globe House, 89 Eccleston Square, London, SW1V 1PN.

If you have a complaint or comment about HMIC's approach to consultation, please email haveyoursay@hmic.gsi.gov.uk.

How consultation responses will be reviewed

HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary will consider respondents' views and, where appropriate, reflect the comments in the methodology as it develops.

The results of the consultation will be made available on HMIC's website at www.hmic.gov.uk/consultations.

Our approach to disclosing responses is set out in Annex A.

Annex A: Responses – confidentiality and disclaimer

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA)).

If you want information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory regime and Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, among other things, with obligations of confidence.

In view of this, it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system, if you email your response, will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on HMIC.

HMIC will process your personal data in accordance with the DPA. In the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Annex B: Design principles

Ref.	Criterion	Description
<i>Aims-related</i>		
1	Supports accountability	Proposals should be designed to facilitate accountability in policing. For a proposal to meet this criterion, there should be evidence that demonstrates that it is likely to facilitate accountability (as opposed to an assertion that it will).
2	Facilitates improvement	Proposals should be designed to facilitate improvement in policing. For a proposal to meet this criterion, there should be evidence that demonstrates that it is likely to help police forces or PCCs make improvements to the services they provide or oversee.
3	Helps identify failure before it happens	Proposals should be designed to identify failure in police activity before it happens. For a proposal to meet this criterion, there should be evidence that demonstrates that it will allow us to spot likely failure before it happens.
4	Supports other benefits	Proposals should be designed to achieve one or more of the other objectives of the assessments.
<i>Assessment-characteristics-related</i>		
5	In the public interest	Proposals should be aimed at ensuring that the public interest should be at the heart of the assessments. For a proposal to meet this criterion, it must be clearly grounded in what is in the public interest, even if that is at the expense of the interest of the force, PCC, government or any other policing institution.
6	Supports a broad assessment of policing activity	Proposals should be aimed at ensuring that the assessments cover the breadth of policing activity.
7	Shows what is happening in the force	Proposals should be aimed at ensuring that the assessments reveal what is happening in reality. For a proposal to meet this criterion, it must show how it will support exposition of the service that is actually being provided, not just that which appears to be being provided.

8	Are consistent	Proposals should be aimed at ensuring that the assessments are consistent, between forces, between different parts of the assessment, and over time.
9	Are evidence – based and explainable	Proposals should be aimed at ensuring that the assessments are evidence-based.
10	Take into account local priorities and the contextual differences between forces	Proposals should be aimed at ensuring that the assessments take into account local priorities, and the differences between forces (i.e. those over which they have little or no control).
11	Benefits outweigh the costs	Proposals should be aimed at ensuring that the benefits of gathering evidence and making assessments (to the public and the police service, and others) outweigh the costs (to HMIC and to the service).
12	Identify the good as well as the bad	Proposals should be aimed at ensuring that the assessments identify good practice as well as failure.
13	Avoids unintended consequences	For a proposal to meet this criterion, the possible unintended consequences of implementing the proposal must have been identified. These could be unintended consequences in relation to the likely actions of the police, or the effects on the public.
<i>Development-characteristics-related</i>		
14	Informed by the views of the public	For a proposal to meet this criterion, the views of the public (including the general public, victims of crime, and/or representatives such as local councillors) on the proposal should have been taken into account.
15	Informed by the views of PCCs	For a proposal to meet this criterion, the views of PCCs on the proposal should have been taken into account.
16	Informed by the views of the service	For a proposal to meet this criterion, the views of the service (including chief officers, technical experts, the College of Policing, and front line staff) on the proposal should have been taken into account.
17	Informed by learning from the past, and from elsewhere	For a proposal to meet this criterion, any relevant learning from history (e.g. previous approaches used to assess the police) and from other sectors (e.g. the approaches of other inspectorates and equivalent bodies) will have been taken into account.

18	Evaluated	For a proposal to meet this criterion, it must be possible for HMIC to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposal once it has been implemented.
19	Timely	For a proposal to meet this criterion, it must be possible to implement it within the timescales required of the programme.
20	Future proof	For a proposal to meet this criterion, there should be good reason to believe that future developments (e.g. issues in the public interest, in policing, in government policy and in HMIC) would not prevent the proposal from being implemented successfully in the longer term.



Inspecting policing
in the **public interest**

Consultation on Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's programme for regular force inspections

Questionnaire template

Consultation response

Our detailed proposed approach to the PEEL inspection programme is set out in our full consultation document, which can be found at

<http://www.hmic.gov.uk/publication/consultation-on-hmics-programme-for-regular-force-inspections/>.

The questions in the consultation are listed below.

Please include your answers in the boxes below each question.

Q1. What do you think of the proposed approach? How could it be improved?

The approach needs to be undertaken in a timely manner and a report produced likewise. No organisation can learn from an inspection if it takes too long to carry out and the outcomes are reported some months later; any problems would have continued in the meantime.

Q2. Are there any other aspects of police work you would like to see covered by PEEL inspections? If so, what are these?

There is no reference here to working in partnership with other organisations, public or otherwise, in terms of aspects of the forces' responsibilities e.g Community Safety Partnership; Local Health Board; Local Resilience Forum Social Care or Education, to name but a few. It is referred to in Question 6, but our view is that it should be referred to at the outset.

Q3. Do you agree with the proposal to use four categories for making judgments? If not, how could it be improved?

The categories appear to be suitable for the purpose described.

Q4. Do you agree with the proposed approach to those forces that receive a judgment of inadequate? How could it be improved?

The approach appears to be reasonable. It is hoped that the Police and Crime Panel would be kept informed as to the progress in its role of holding the Police and Crime Commissioner to account.

Q5. Is there anything else that we should include in our recommendations to ensure they lead to improvement?

No comment.

Q6. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to inspecting partnership and collaboration arrangements?

Fully support the proposals.

Q7. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to gathering evidence?

It is useful to see comments such as in the third bullet point of paragraph 45. The information gathered as a whole, would need to have been prepared on a consistent basis, so there will need to be a mechanism to ensure that this happens.

Q8. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to gathering information from victims?

Supported – sometimes the victim is not always fully considered in the criminal justice system.

Q9. What else should we consider doing to make the PEEL assessments as fair as they can be?

As per question 7 - the information gathered, as a whole would need to have been prepared on a consistent basis, so there will need to be a mechanism to ensure that this happens

Q10. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to reporting to the public?

The approach seems reasonable. It needs to be timely.

How to respond to this consultation

Please submit your answers to these questions, together with any other comments, by email to haveyoursay@hmic.gsi.gov.uk no later than **Friday 12 September 2014**. If you prefer you can post your responses to Chief Operating Officer, HMIC, 6th Floor, Globe House, 89 Eccleston Square, London, SW1V 1PN.

If you have a complaint or comment about HMIC's approach to consultation, please email haveyoursay@hmic.gsi.gov.uk.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
PANEL HEDDLU A THROSEDD



NORTH WALES POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

Contact Officer:	Dawn Hughes
	Senior Committee Services Officer Conwy County Borough Council Bodlondeb Conwy LL28 5NF
E-Mail:	dawn.hughes@conwy.gov.uk
Telephone:	01492 576061

Date	Subject	Responsible Officer (including e-mail address)
Between 10 Nov 2014 and 15 Dec 2014	Confirmation Hearing for Deputy Chief Executive	Winston Roddick, Police and Crime Commissioner
Between 15 Dec 2014 and 19 Jan 2015	How is the PCC scrutinising the Force's performance against the Police and Crime Objectives of the Plan To receive a scrutiny report on how the PCC is scrutinising the Force's performance against the Police and Crime Objectives of the Plan.	Simon Hensey, Scrutiny Support Officer simon.hensey@conwy.gov.uk
19 Jan 2015	Complaints Received To receive a summary of the number of complaints received and the action taken.	Ken Finch, Strategic Director - Democracy, Regulation and Support ken.finch@conwy.gov.uk
19 Jan 2015	Proposed Precept 2015/16 To consider the proposed precept for 2015/16 <i>(The date of this meeting will be finalised pending confirmation of the timetable for establishing a precept for 2015/16)</i>	Winston Roddick, Police and Crime Commissioner
19 Jan 2015	Draft Budget for the Police Service for 2015/16 To consider the budget for the Police Service for 2015/16	Winston Roddick, Police and Crime Commissioner
19 Jan 2015	Draft Budget for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for 2014/15 To consider the draft budget for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for 2015/16.	Winston Roddick, Police and Crime Commissioner

Date	Subject	Responsible Officer (including e-mail address)
Future Items		
June 2015	Annual Report from the Police and Crime Commissioner To receive the Commissioner's annual report..	Winston Roddick, Police and Crime Commissioner
June 2015	Member Allowances and Expenses To receive a report on the allowances paid to members of the Police and Crime Panel.	Ken Finch, Strategic Director - Democracy, Regulation and Support ken.finch@conwy.gov.uk
June 2015	How is the PCC improving confidence in the Police across Wales To consider a scrutiny report on how the PCC is improving confidence in the Police across Wales	Simon Hensey, Scrutiny Support Officer simon.hensey@conwy.gov.uk
Between 12 Jun 2015 and 27 May 2016	How is the PCC making commissioning decisions and what are his future intentions To consider a scrutiny report on how the PCC is making commissioning decisions and what are his future intentions	Simon Hensey, Scrutiny Support Officer simon.hensey@conwy.gov.uk
Between 12 Jun 2015 and 27 May 2016	How is the PCC building effective partnerships To consider a scrutiny report on how the PCC is building effective partnerships	Simon Hensey, Scrutiny Support Officer simon.hensey@conwy.gov.uk
TBC	Update on changes to Funding Formula To receive an update on the review of the police formula funding.	Winston Roddick, Police and Crime Commissioner