



OPCC

Office of the Police &
Crime Commissioner
for Gloucestershire

AUTHOR: Gary Thompson

SPONSOR: DCC Stratford

DECISION NUMBER: D24-2019

(to be completed on approval)

SUBMITTED TO: Martin Surl, Police & Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire

SUBJECT: Review of the Police and Crime Plan

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report seek to outline the process undertaken by the Constabulary to fulfil the terms of reference issued by the OPCC in relation to the Police and Crime Plan.

The report lists a number of lessons learned and makes a number of recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION:

PCC Governance Board is asked to note the report and associated recommendations.

OUTCOME/APPROVAL BY:

Signature:

Date: 24 Sept 2019

<p>Public Access to Information</p> <p><i>Information in this form and associated reports is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Specified Information) Order 2011. Where it has been indicated that this is a decision of significant public interest, all of this form except Part Two will be made available on the website of the OPCC.</i></p> <p><i>Any information that should not be automatically available on request should not be included in Part One but instead on a separate Part Two form.</i></p>	
<p>Is this a decision of significant public interest?</p> <p><i>This includes a decision with any impact on the community expenditure in excess of £50,000, or any decision that would be obvious interest to the media or the general public</i></p>	No
<p>Is there a Part Two form?</p> <p><i>This section should only include information that, if published:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>would, in the view of the chief officer of the police, be against the interests of national security;</i> b) <i>might, in the view of the chief officer of police, jeopardise the safety of any person;</i> c) <i>might, in the view of the chief officer of police, prejudice the prevention or detection of crime, the apprehension or prosecution of offenders, or the administration of justice; or</i> d) <i>is prohibited by any enactment.</i> e) <i>breaches commercial sensitivity</i> 	No

ORIGINATOR CHECKLIST (MUST BE COMPLETED)	Comments including who has approved the report if applicable
Has legal advice been sought on this submission required?	No
Has the Chief Finance Officer been consulted, if required?	No
Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered, as appropriate?	Yes
How is the recommendation consistent with the objective of the Police and Crime Plan?	The report is a review of the PCP
Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?	Not applicable
Has communications advice been sought on areas of local media, community, staff or partner interest and how this might be managed?	Not applicable
Have all relevant implications and risks been considered?	Yes

PART ONE – For publication**1. Purpose of the report**

This report provides the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) for Gloucestershire with an update on the process which was undertaken in order to deliver on the requirement to review the Constabulary's delivery of the Police and Crime Plan (PCP), 2017-21.

The reports highlights a number of areas of both organisational and personal learning and makes a number of recommendations.

2. Background

In May 2016, Martin Surl was re-elected as the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Gloucestershire.

One of the statutory requirements for that role is to deliver a Police and Crime Plan.

The PCC produced an updated PCP for the period 2017 to 2021, building on the principles and successes of the previous 2012 to 2016 PCP.

In August 2018, the Constabulary was asked to carry out a review which provided evidence of how it had contributed to the effective delivery and success of the PCP.

Terms of reference (ToR`s) were produced by the OPCC (see appendix 1 for details) with a guidance on the areas to be considered in the review, which included:-

- Define progress against the delivery of each of the priorities and other key elements of the plan
- Provide evidence of how this has been achieved
- Identify potential areas for future development of plan related activities

A timetable for delivery for the review was set as follows:-

Activity	Owner	Date
Approval of evaluation	OPCC	June 2018
Commissioning of evaluation	OPCC	13 June 2018
Evaluation Commences	OPCC	August 2018
Stage 1 - Interim Report	OPCC	18 February 2019
Stage 2 - Final report and presentation	OPCC	20 May 2019

Submission process

The review of the PCP has now been through three separate submission processes, (February, May and September 2019) with each version being refined and amended in light of feedback from key stakeholders from both the Constabulary and OPCC.

Unfortunately, whilst a great deal of effort and work was invested in the first and second submissions, the content and quality of these reports was judged to be inadequate – as a result, a third submission has been necessary with a target date of 17 September 2019.

Methodology and timelines

The responsibility for oversight and delivery of the PCP review was given to the Chief of Staff (CoS) ,Gary Thompson on behalf of the Chief Officer Group (COG).

As a result, a number of meetings were convened with OPCC Deputy Chief Executive (DCE) Richard Bradley and others, to ensure that there was absolute clarity on what was required in terms of the review.

Consequently, the following methodology was used to produce the first review document:-

- The Performance and Evaluation Team was commissioned to gather evidence across all the major strands of the PCP for consideration
- Each part of the organisation was canvassed to determine their contribution to the plan along with views about how their work could be improved
- One to one interviews with the police leads for each of the major strands of the Police and Crime Plan
- A snap-survey of staff within the organisation to capture their understanding of the Police and Crime Plan and how it drives their business
- Material gathering from across the Constabulary to assist in building an evidence base.

First submission – target date – 18 February 2019

The first draft review was submitted by the required deadline and consisted of a comprehensive 126 page document.

The document considered each of the main strands of the PCP and provided an evidenced based assessment which addressed each of the ToR`s.

In compiling the document a number of people were engaged to provide material including the Research and Evaluation team, Executive Support research officer and the CoS as well as those listed in the bullets above.

Whilst the document contained a wealth of information, it lacked a consistent style and consequently, failed to address to ToR`s adequately.

Feedback from OPCC included the following comments – the document:-

- is far too long in content i.e. 115 pages of information in section 1 alone,
- is a download of information with no context ,
- is not easy to follow
- does not provide any self-analysis leaving the reader thinking 'so what ?,
- lacks analysis of what it actually means.
- One can undertake lots of activity and still achieve nothing...there needs to be examples used as evidence, not just a litany of data.

It was agreed that a second submission was necessary and that this document would be more focussed on providing details of selected initiatives which the Constabulary had undertaken to deliver on the requirements and expectation of the PCP.

Intervention by the Deputy Chief Constable and Deputy Chief Executive

Following this initial submission in February 2019, the whole approach that the Constabulary was taking to delivering the PCP came under close scrutiny by the both the DCC and OPCC DCE.

Whilst it was apparent that a great deal of good work was being undertaken by the police leads to deliver the PCP, there appeared to be a lack of central co-ordination and consistency in completing the PCP Delivery matrix which were being submitted to the OPCC on a quarterly basis.

As a result, the DCC took personal responsibility for engaging with the police leads to ensure that they were approaching the requirement to deliver the PCP in a consistent and corporate manner.

The DCC formed a new Constabulary meeting of police leads which considered their approach to the PCP and examined some of the issues which had not previously been addressed. The first of these meetings was held on 20 March 2019.

Examples of outputs from this meeting included:-

1. an agreement that identification of police leads for the PCP would be the sole responsibility of the DCC and that no police lead would change unless the DCC gave approval. This would ensure that the right person within the Constabulary retained responsibility for fulfilling the action plans designed to deliver on the PCP priorities.

During the review process, it was apparent that the effort being invested by some police leads was inadequate and not sufficient to support the action plans that were in place. The intervention, at this meeting, by the DCC ensured that only those Constabulary staff with the appropriate skill set and motivation were given the responsibility of leading the priorities.

2. a consistent approach to the completion of the quarterly PCP Delivery matrix – this followed feedback from the OPCC that completion by police leads could be of variable quality and failed to provide measureable outcomes. This had the knock-on effect of making it very difficult to judge whether the PCP priority had been delivered successfully. As a result, the DCC instructed that police leads would follow a standard format for the submission of quarterly updates to the PCP Delivery matrix and that all activity had to be capable of meaningful measurement.

3. it was acknowledged that there had been a missed opportunity in 2017 to ensure that the Corporate Strategy, Force Management Statement (FMS) and PCP were all synchronised effectively. There was direction from the DCC that activity to deliver the PCP should also be geared towards seamlessly delivering all three plans so that unnecessary bureaucracy and duplication could be removed.

4. internal media messaging around the PCP could be improved. Whilst a great deal of fantastic work had taken place to deliver the PCP and whilst the OPCC press officers had shared this information with the public, it was acknowledged more work could be done to share the successes within the Constabulary so that officers and staff were not only more aware of the PCP, but also the success in delivering it. Engagement by police leads with Communications and Engagement staff could be improved and work was required to ensure that internal corporate messaging was improved.

It was widely acknowledged by all those attending the DCC's meeting that it was a very useful and productive forum to ensure consistency and an opportunity to share best practise along with risk and blockers. Having the DCC in the meeting meant that an Executive Board member could remove these blockers to delivery and harness organisational support for the mitigation of risks.

Second submission – target date – 20 May 2019

The second iteration of the PCP review document was due to be submitted by the 15th May, but an extension was granted by the OPCC Deputy Chief Executive (DCE) following a request from the CoS, until the end of May – unfortunately, this deadline was missed and the document was delivered on 3 June 2019.

This delay was due to problems with accessing resources which were needed to format the final document. Whilst the contents were complete – the formatting of the document was not. Unfortunately, at the time of the PCP review submission, work was being carried out on the FMS. This meant that the formatting of the PCP review was slightly delayed. This was regrettable and is subject to one of the learning points / recommendations.

The approach to completion of the second document was that the PCP review would be delivered in two parts – a fact-based assessment of the delivery by the Constabulary accompanied by a glossy A5 document which showcased a number of initiatives under each section of the PCP.

In compiling the A5 document, police leads were fully engaged in helping to determine what initiatives should be included in the final document. The challenge for the Constabulary was

deciding what information to put into the review document and what to omit. Analysis demonstrated that so much good work had taken place over each PCP priority that only a small fraction of that activity could be included in the final document. (a full list of activity is contained at appendix 2).

The CoS met with OPCC DCE to ask if there were specific initiatives or areas which he felt should be included within the review document. This was motivated by the fact that OPCC had supported and financed a number of initiatives through the Commissioner's Fund.

The second PCP review document was submitted on 3rd June 2019 and feedback was again provided by the OPCC.

Unfortunately, the submission failed to meet the expectations of the OPCC and as a result, a meeting was held on 15 July 2019 with attendees consisting of the Deputy PCC, OPCC Chief and Deputy Chief Executive, DCC and CoS to discuss feedback.

The meeting agreed the following for the third iteration of the document:-

1. The glossy document A5 would be subject to additional work – which will include:-

- A forward from the Chief Constable
- Each section will have some analysis from the police lead which summarises the successes and plans going forward
- Editing from the Comms & Engagement team to ensure a consistent, high quality style with no repetition.

2. A PCC Governance Paper will be prepared which will reflect upon the review process and capture the lessons learned and highlight some of the areas where the Constabulary's performance could have been different.

Third submission – target date – 24 September 2019

The agreed deadline for submission of the third iteration of the review was set at 24 September 2019. The report was required at the PCC Governance Board.

It was also agreed that this final document would be shared with the public to demonstrate the effectiveness of the PCP in driving police activity designed to deliver on the expectations and priorities of the public of Gloucestershire.

The CoS, learning from the previous two submission processes, compiled the following timetable for completion of the third report:

- 15 July – feedback received from OPCC on the contents of the PCP review
- 5-19 July – review of the individual sections of the PCP
- 19 July – request sent to police leads for input on their sections
- 12 August – returns due from police leads

- 13 August – DCC make sure he is happy with content
- 14 August – Friday 23 August rewriting and editing of returns
- 22 August – work to commence on the PCC Governance Board paper and presentation
- 27 August - document supplied to HA for JW to edit and put into corporate style
- 3 September – edited document back to DCC for approval/first sign off
- 4 September – signed off content to Julie Locke for design input
- 11 September – designed document back to JSt for approval/final amends
- 12 September – document sent for a small number of printed copies
- 17 September – document to be submitted to PCC Governance Board for 24 September.

This agreed timeline was designed to ensure that all key stakeholders were fully engaged in the process and that the finished PCP review document would be fit for purpose and in line with stated expectations from both the Constabulary and OPCC.

3. Lessons learned and recommendation(s)

The process of compiling three iterations of the PCP review has meant that a number of organisational and personal learning has been achieved.

These include:-

Compilation of the first submission document

Whilst the CoS retained oversight and responsibility for the compilation of this first submission, it is acknowledged that a number of key internal stakeholders were not consulted sufficiently in that process. The CoS explained that this was an attempt to avoid burdening police leads with additional work and that their engagement was minimal. This meant that they had little chance to influence the contents of their part of the PCP review.

Recommendation – the process undertaken for compilation of the first submission failed to engage the police leads. This was apparent from the feedback from OPCC. There is both personal learning for the CoS and the organisation. As a result, an action was raised to ensure that in subsequent submissions, the police leads were fully engaged in the process and had ample opportunity to influence the contents. This recommendation has been implemented for the third iteration of the document which will be submitted in September 2019.

- Action – agreed and implemented – no further action required

Learning from the “police leads” meeting chaired by the DCC

Whilst listed above, the following decisions were taken by the DCC:-

1. an agreement that identification of police leads for the PCP would be the responsibility of the DCC and that no police lead would change unless the DCC gave approval.

- Action – agreed and implemented – no further action required.

2. a consistent approach to the completion of the PCP Delivery matrix – following feedback from the OPCC that completion could be of variable quality and failed to provide measureable outcomes. As a result, the DCC instructed that police leads would follow a standard format for the submission of quarterly updates to the PCP Delivery matrix and that all activity had to be capable of meaningful measurement.

- Action – agreed and implemented – no further action required.

3. it was acknowledged that there had been a missed opportunity in 2017 to ensure that the Corporate Strategy, Force Management Statement and PCP were all synchronised effectively. There was direction from the DCC that activity to deliver the PCP should also be geared towards seamlessly delivering all three plans.

- Action – agreed and implemented – no further action required.

4. internal media messaging around the PCP could be improved. Whilst a great deal of fantastic work had taken place to deliver the PCP and whilst the OPCC press officers had shared this information with the public, it was acknowledged more work could be done to share the successes within the Constabulary so that officers and staff were more aware of the PCP but also the success in delivering it.

- Action – this requires more work and assistance from C&E team – work ongoing

Formatting of the second submission and the effect on timeliness

Resources within the Communications and Engagement (C&E) department are limited and were already engaged on formatting FMS 2 – meaning that the work to complete the PCP review had to take place once the FMS had been completed.

Whilst no criticism can be levelled at C&E staff, there is learning for the CoS to ensure that in future, C&E should be engaged at an earlier stage to ensure that clashes and competition for resources is better planned.

- Action – CoS to ensure that, in future, more consultation takes place with C&E to ensure that any required document is delivered within resource capability taking into account of current demands – agreed and implemented.

Constabulary efforts to deliver the PCP

From the wealth of work that has been completed in submitting the PCP reviews, it is obvious that there is a great deal of work being undertaken, across the whole Constabulary at all levels, to deliver the PCP.

As detailed previously, more work needs to be done to ensure that the profile of the PCP is raised within the organisation and whilst the work undertaken by the DCC partly addresses this requirement, more still needs to be done.

Recommendation – work needs to be carried out with the Communications and Engagement team to produce a communication plan designed to raise the awareness of the PCP within the Constabulary and to ensure that the great work being done to deliver on the plan is shared through various communication mediums.

Presentations by police leads are delivered to each PCC Governance Board and communications staff from OPCC are present to capture the essential details. However, no Constabulary C&E staff are present which means an opportunity to capture and share good news with the organisation is missed.

Action – DCC to liaise with head of Communications and Engagement department to develop this requirement.

Internal staff surveys

In order to provide an evidence base for the PCP review, an internal survey was placed on the Constabulary intranet site, inviting responses from staff. Unfortunately, very few staff took the opportunity to respond. This was extremely disappointing as many staff have been involved in delivering the PCP – but then failed to give their views on how delivery could be improved.

Recommendation – there is no doubt that the activity planned above in improving information about the PCP will help to address this issue.

Action – as per the previous recommendation.

Constabulary Governance Board template

CGB is the decision making forum for the Constabulary and papers have to be submitted on a standard template to ensure consistency of information.

It was apparent that authors were not required to detail how proposals contributed to the delivery of the PCP.

Recommendation – the CGB template is to be amended to ensure that all submissions to CGB are required to detail how the proposal will help to deliver the aims of the PCP.

Action – this action has been completed and the CGB template has been amended.

4. Financial and resource implications

No specific financial implications.

Constabulary resources are used to deliver the PCP – but no specific resource implications.

5. Risk assessment

No specific risks for this paper.

Risks affecting the delivery of each PCP priority are discussed at the DCC`s meeting and resolved or elevated if necessary.

6. Equality & Diversity impact assessment

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 states that a public authority should carry out an assessment prior to implementing a policy or initiative, with a view to ascertaining its potential impact on equality. Whilst assessments are not required by law, they are a way of facilitating and evidencing compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty. In this case, there is nothing that is relevant.

7. Environmental impact assessment

The Green and Pleasant County is one of the additional commitments in the PCP and work is ongoing to deliver on this priority.

8. Consultation

This paper has been shared with key stakeholders within the Constabulary.

9. Discussed with Communications & Engagement

This paper has been shared with key stakeholders within the Constabulary.

10. Conclusion

The process of delivering a review of the Police and Crime Plan for OPCC has taken longer than was originally anticipated. This was due to a number of factors and this report contains both organisational and personal learning points.

The final PCP review document accompanies this report and captures the good work that the Constabulary has carried out to deliver the PCP.

The PCP review process has enabled the Constabulary to reflect on the governance arrangements in place to monitor and deliver the PCP and as a result, a number of improvements have already been implemented.

More work is required to raise the profile of the PCP within the Constabulary and this is subject to a recommendation which will be implemented.

SPONSORING BOARD MEMBER APPROVAL

Name: Jon Stratford

Job title: Deputy Chief Constable



Signature:

Date: 17/9/19

CHIEF EXECUTIVE APPROVAL

I am satisfied that relevant advice has been taken into account in the preparation of the report and that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the PCC.



Signature:

Date: 18/9/19

Appendix 1 – Terms of reference issued by OPCC for the review of the Police and Crime Plan

Appendix 2 – full list of activity undertaken by the Constabulary to deliver the PCP 2017 – 2019.