

JIAC Survey Results

Overall, the survey received 4 responses.

Please indicate on the scale below how well you think the JIAC is performing (1- Very Poorly, 10- Excellent)

Of those who responded, two scored the JIAC 8/10, one scored 7/10 and another scored 6/10.

The free text responses highlight that respondents saw significant improvement in JIAC meetings with mention of better scrutiny and more intrusive questions. However, there were three areas for improvement identified:

- Respondents highlighted that the meetings were quite lengthy and could be more succinct.
- There was a comment that suggested the structure of the meeting could improve to ensure greater debate.
- Improvements could be made considering actions and holding managers to account for actions in SWAP audits.

Please indicate how satisfied you are with the service provided by the JIAC (1- Very Poorly, 10- Excellent).

Similarly to the previous question, of those who responded, two scored the JIAC 8/10, one scored 7/10 and another scored 6/10.

Respondents recognised the facilitation of independent audit as very helpful and recognised the work that JIAC members put into the role, also suggesting that their genuine interest in subject matters and the organisation helps with their scrutiny role.

A notable improvement was that the meetings are quite lengthy and the additional challenge of the pre-work around receiving and responding to questions.

Do you think there is sufficient time provided for all agenda items in JIAC meetings?

All respondents said Yes (n=4).

Does the committee bring sufficient knowledge to challenge officers?

Three of the respondents selected Yes.

One respondent selected No and explained they felt it would be helpful for members to undertake a ride along to see 'policing in action'.

Do you have enough opportunity to discuss your business area in the meeting?

Three of the respondents selected Yes.

One respondent selected No and explained that they were always at the end of the agenda (OPCC) and often have to cut things short. This respondent does express that they are okay with this as long as the JIAC are.

How can the JIAC improve its activities?

The following suggestions were made:

- There is a concern that the roles and responsibilities are not fully understood by the constabulary. Recommendations are now taken to the Recommendations, Improvement and Learning (RIL) board to ensure sufficient accountability.

- An understanding of the administrative demands of the JIAC would be beneficial, however this respondent highlighted that they would not want this to take away from the level of scrutiny provided.
- Would prefer the meetings to focus on what the JIAC want the OPCC and Constabulary to do differently.

How can we improve our procedures?

The following suggestions were made:

- Making the meetings more concise, whilst doing deep dives into specific issues of concern- especially audit recommendations
- If there are written responses to questions a respondent suggested that this does not need to be gone through during the meeting.

Overall, what could the JIAC do to improve?

Most referred to their previous responses. However, one respondent made reference to improved changes in Risk management scrutiny.

The committee has Terms of Reference- is there anything additional we should be including in the meeting?

Most said no, but one respondent highlighted that they could do more to communicate the outputs of the JIAC back to the organisation.

We provide many questions in advance of the meeting. Do you have any concerns here with the number and details of the questions? If so, please explain.

One respondent responded 'No'.

Three highlighted that they thought there were too many questions in advance of the meetings and that they should be answered in the meeting to ensure all conversation, challenge and debate is minuted.