



HM Inspectorate
of Constabulary
for Scotland

key principles continuous improvement long-term planning and budgeting ownership essential
elements compare performance measurement and monitoring consult transparency accountability
competence sound governance challenge service review key principles continuous improvement
long-term planning and budgeting ownership essential elements compare performance measurement
and monitoring consult transparency accountability competence sound governance challenge
service review key principles continuous improvement long-term planning and budgeting ownership
essential elements compare performance measurement and monitoring consult transparency account
ability competence sound governance challenge service review key principles continuous improve
ment long-term planning and budgeting ownership essential elements compare performance measur
e and monitoring consult transparency accountability competence sound governance challenge
service review key principles continuous improvement long-term planning and budgeting ownership
essential elements compare performance measurement and monitoring consult transparency
accountability competence sound governance challenge service review key principles continuous
improvement long-term planning and budgeting ownership essential elements compare perfor
mance measurement and monitoring consult transparency accountability competence sound gover
nance challenge service review key principles continuous improvement long-term planning and budge
t ownership essential elements compare performance measurement and monitoring consult tra
nsparency accountability competence sound governance challenge service review key principles
continuous improvement long-term planning and budgeting ownership essential elements compar
e performance measurement and monitoring consult transparency accountability competence sou
nd governance challenge service review key principles continuous improvement long-term plann
ing and budgeting ownership essential elements compare performance measurement and monitori
ng consult transparency accountability competence sound governance challenge service review k
e principles continuous improvement long-term planning and budgeting ownership essential ele
ments compare performance measurement and monitoring consult transparency accountability com
petence sound governance challenge service review key principles continuous improvement long-term
planning and budgeting ownership essential elements compare performance measurement and moni
toring consult transparency accountability competence sound governance challenge service review
key principles continuous improvement long-term planning and budgeting ownership essential
elements compare performance measurement and monitoring consult transparency accountability

A Value Judgement?

A Thematic Report on Best Value within the Police Service in Scotland 2000

HM Inspectorate of Constabulary for Scotland

A Value Judgement?

A Thematic Report on Best Value within
The Police Service in Scotland 2000

Contents

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VI
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	1
SUMMARY OF GOOD PRACTICE	3
INTRODUCTION	5
Thematic Inspection	5
Terms of Reference	5
Methodology	6
CHAPTER 1 LEADERSHIP	8
What is Best Value?	8
When did it start?	9
Who needs to do what?	9
Responsibility within Forces	10
Programme and Project Management	12
What guidance was available?	12
CHAPTER 2 POLICY AND STRATEGY	14
The Key Principles of Best Value	14
Police Authority Involvement	14
Public Consultation	17
Public Performance Reporting	17
CHAPTER 3 PARTNERSHIP AND RESOURCES	19
Service Review Schedules	19
Benchmarking	19
Costing in Service Reviews	20
Benchmarking of Costs	21
Common Police Services	21
Cross-cutting Best Value Reviews	22
CHAPTER 4 PEOPLE	23
Composition of Service Review Teams	23
Staffing of Reviews	23
Difficulties Encountered by Service Review Teams	24
Support Staff Involvement	24
Skills and Competencies	24
Training	25
Commitment to Service Reviews	26
Staff Awareness	26

CHAPTER 5	PROCESSES	27
	Approach to Best Value	27
	Culture	27
	The Service Review Process	28
	Slippage	30
	Action Planning	30
	Case Studies	31
	Outwith the Regime	32
	Spreading the word	32
CHAPTER 6	RESULTS	34
	Performance Measurement	34
	Budgeting	35
	A Best Value Organisation?	36
	The Way Forward	37
	A Joint Approach to 'Best Value' Inspection	38
Appendix A	Service Review Schedules: Force Status Report January 2001	41
Appendix B	Benchmarking Code of Conduct	47
Appendix C	HMIC Inspection Programme	49
Appendix D	Consultative Group Members	50
Appendix E	Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations	51

Acknowledgements

HM Inspectorate is grateful to all those who contributed to this thematic inspection including police officers and support staff at all levels and elected members and officials of police authorities.

To establish the terms of reference for the inspection a representative 'Consultative Group' was formed and reconvened to assist in the completion of the final report. The views and contributions received from Group, collectively and individually, are particularly acknowledged.

While all views were considered, HM Inspectorate accepts full responsibility for the report and its recommendations.

A list of Consultative Group members is contained in Appendix D.

Executive Summary

The Scottish Executive's Best Value regime was introduced to the police service in Scotland during the latter part of 1998. In April 2000 HMIC began a thematic inspection of Best Value to:

- assess implementation and progress within the police service,
- highlight good practice and where appropriate, make recommendations, and
- identify issues which HMIC should follow up during its cyclical inspection of police forces.

In conducting the inspection HMIC was mindful of the fact that the government circular, which sets out expectations for Best Value, is addressed primarily to police authorities and not chief constables. HMIC does not inspect police authorities and has therefore focused the inspection on the extent to which forces are supporting their authorities in responding to the Best Value regime. In addition, HMIC considered the extent to which Best Value has been applied to those police services which do not fall within the responsibility of police authorities. These included the Scottish Criminal Record Office (SCRO), the (now) Scottish Drug Enforcement Agency (SDEA) and the Scottish Police College (SPC).

This report highlights the progress which has been made in forces by adopting and implementing the principles of Best Value in their processes.

The main findings are:

Leadership

- Police authorities and chief constables have made a demonstrable commitment to the Best Value regime, to implementing sound strategic planning and financial management, to effective consultation and to performance measurement.
- HMIC found that the development of Best Value in the Scottish police service has been led, principally, by the Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland (ACPOS), Finance Standing Committee, Best Value Sub-Committee. Evidence suggested that it is a good vehicle for the sharing of information across forces, but it does not appear to be a body designed or able to deliver strategic direction and co-ordination of Best Value for the Scottish police service as a whole.
- Within forces, HMIC found different approaches to the internal management of Best Value. However all recognised the importance attached to Best Value, with an Executive member of staff taking the chair of the relevant committee.

Policy and Strategy

- HMIC found that despite the clear and important role of police authorities in developing Best Value within the police service, generally their degree of involvement has been limited.

Partnership and Resources

- The inspection revealed that some elements of Best Value have not been progressed as far as anticipated throughout the Scottish forces and this includes service reviews. At the time of inspection few service reviews had been completed and some of the completed reviews did not fully match the Best Value criteria.
- There is evidence of forces coming together with the development of a Scottish Police Benchmarking Club.
- Evidence varied in the costing of service delivery during reviews, with some forces having completed no service reviews and therefore unable to produce conclusive evidence of appropriate costing having taken place.
- The Common Police Services were not required by the Scottish Executive to address the Best Value regime, however each were found to be attempting to embrace the essential elements of Best Value.

People

- The composition of Best Value teams varied across forces, as did the size of team membership. In many forces team numbers are reducing with, in some cases, only one or two persons working full time on a review.
- HMIC acknowledged that support staff involvement within teams transcends all forces recognising that support staff have specific skills and expertise developed within their areas of work that make them invaluable contributors to Best Value projects.
- For most service reviews staff with the appropriate levels/mix of skills and competencies are used by forces to conduct the projects.
- No force produced evidence of any skills analysis being undertaken in respect of service review team membership and there is no real consistency in respect of the training of staff who took part in service reviews.

Processes

- It is clear that forces have some way to go in terms of absorbing Best Value into the mainstream of their organisations. HMIC noted the positive efforts made so far in the comparatively short time that the Best Value regime has applied to the Scottish police service.
- HMIC found that forces have adopted various approaches to determining their service review schedule. HMIC also noted the variety of Service Review topics chosen by forces for inclusion in their schedules although, in general, there was a lack of operationally focused topics which might impact more on service delivery at the sharp end and have greater scope for savings.
- One of the key issues that emerged during the inspection was that slippage has occurred in some forces in their service review schedules.
- Completed and actioned service reviews were few in number. Consequently, HMIC was unable to form a clear view on how forces and police authorities would take forward the product of service reviews.
- Of the completed service reviews examined by HMIC there was a need to produce a greater degree of evidence of comparison and competition being tested to the full. Some reviews were very good, while others fell short of meeting the criteria of Best Value.

- There is evidence that a substantial amount of 'reviewing' of policing and support activities is taking place outside the Best Value regime.

Results

- HMIC found that there is no tangible link between savings made through service reviews and efficiency savings as introduced by the Scottish Executive. Without detracting from considerations of improved effectiveness, HMIC is of the view that an opportunity exists to create these links and produce tangible indicators of the Best Value regime's contribution to 'benefits' secured by forces in terms of savings, efficiency gains or improved effectiveness.
- As a result of the inspection process it was clear to HMIC that, in their first year, forces are making real efforts to address the requirements of the Best Value regime but are at different stages in the process. No one force can yet be identified as a 'Best Value organisation' but all are some way down the path in their attempts to achieve this. The progress is comparable with experience of other public service sectors at a similar point in their development.
- Best Value is still developing as are the inspection arrangements which complement it. To avoid the burden of duplication and to manage the examination of the Best Value process within forces, HMIC is working with Audit Scotland on a joint approach to the audit/inspection of Best Value within the police service in Scotland.

This thematic report provides a snapshot of performance in applying Best Value principles and should help to inform the debate on the future of Best Value in the police service. From this baseline, future inspections will review what progress forces have made in developing, improving and implementing arrangements to secure a Best Value approach to policing for the citizens and communities they serve.

Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation 1

HMIC recommends that forces (ACPOS) examine their strategic response to Best Value and the mechanisms in place to drive the regime forward.

(Chapter 1, paragraph 1.3.4)

Recommendation 2

HMIC recommends that Chief Constables in conjunction with their Police Authorities review the methodology for the handling, maintaining and reporting of Best Value policy, practice and service reviews.

(Chapter 2, paragraph 2.2.8)

Recommendation 3

HMIC recommends that a mechanism be established to allow over-arching Best Value service reviews to be undertaken across all relevant activity in Scottish policing. (This will require dialogue between the Scottish Executive, Police Authorities and Forces.)

(Chapter 3, paragraph 3.6.1)

Recommendation 4

HMIC recommends that Chief Constables review training provision with a view to ensuring service review team members have sufficient knowledge and skills to carry out the function with which they are tasked.

(Chapter 4, paragraph 4.6.5)

Recommendation 5

HMIC recommends that forces ensure all 'reviews' being conducted are carefully considered for inclusion within the Service Review Schedule and subject to Best Value criteria. It should be a deliberate decision, with reasons, to adopt another methodology.

(Chapter 5, paragraph 5.7.2)

Recommendation 6

HMIC recommends that good communication of force Best Value review activity is a priority for forces with an active sharing of good practices.

(Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.2)

Recommendation 7

HMIC recommend that the Scottish Executive and ACPOS identify procedures and an appropriate technological application that allow for the collection of 'real time' management information.

(Chapter 6, paragraph 6.1.7)

Recommendation 8

HMIC recommend that forces adopt a rigorous approach to properly costing Best Value service reviews to provide tangible information linking these reviews to 'benefits' secured in terms of savings, efficiency gains or improved effectiveness.

(Chapter 6, paragraph 6.2.2)

Recommendation 9

HMIC recommends that ACPOS debate with the Scottish Executive the issue of timescale for a review of all services and agree an appropriate management of the five-year timeframe.

(Chapter 6, paragraph 6.4.9)

Summary of Good Practice

- HMIC views as **good practice** employment of members of support staff as co-ordinators, in that support staff often bring a level of continuity to the role.
(Chapter 1, paragraph 1.5.2)
- Lothian and Borders Police as an example of good practice have developed a corporate communication strategy which co-ordinates the many existing and new ways in which the force communicates inside and outside the organisation. More specifically they have used a partners survey, community focus groups and customer surveys to inform their planning processes.
(Chapter 2, paragraph 2.3.2)
- Strathclyde Police, as one example of **good practice**, has made a commitment to providing information which will include details of goals, objectives and targets, with specific reference to statutory and Best Value key performance indicators.
(Chapter 2, paragraph 2.4.3)
- As an example of **good practice**, a Guidance Manual based on one developed by Strathclyde Police has been produced and includes a Benchmarking Code of Conduct for the Scottish Police Service which closely follows the European Benchmarking Code of Conduct developed in 1996. The Code is based around a number of guiding principles and Scottish forces have agreed that adherence to these principles should form the basis of all benchmarking exercises whether with another force or an external organisation.
(Chapter 3, paragraph 3.2.2)
- The Scottish Police Benchmarking Club is also developing a system of storing details of service reviews in the first instance on PINS (the Police Information Net for Scotland) which is maintained at the Scottish Police College. HMIC views this as **good practice** in that forces striving for continuous improvement can limit duplication of effort by access to this information database.
(Chapter 3, paragraph 3.2.4)
- Northern Constabulary is an example of 'looking elsewhere' for expert support where their close working relationship with Highland Council has seen the use of one of the council's statisticians in supporting the team reviewing financial services. Tapping into specialist skills in this manner whether internally or externally is clearly best use of scarce resources and is seen by HMIC as **good practice**.
(Chapter 4, paragraph 4.1.3)
- One particularly interesting concept was evidenced in Tayside Police. When conducting a review of a division within their force they requested the secondment of an officer from another force to manage the process. Such arrangements not only develop the skills of the individual but also help provide an objective analysis and in appropriate circumstances is an example of **good practice**.

(Chapter 4, paragraph 4.1.4)

- As an example of good practice, Central Scotland Police use, on a consultancy basis, the services of the Best Value co-ordinator within Clackmannanshire Council. This appears to have been well received by members of service review teams who are able to turn to advice from an experienced individual.

(Chapter 4, paragraph 4.5.4)

- HMIC particularly noted the Best Value tool kit put together by Tayside Police, which in a very clear and concise fashion provides service review team members with an overview on how to tackle service reviews. HMIC commends this document as an example of good practice.

(Chapter 4, paragraph 4.6.3)

- Tayside Police as one example appear to have been fairly positive in their campaign. The force have made full use of their own newspaper, the local press, their intranet and web site to highlight Best Value. Printed colour literature describing the Best Value regime has been distributed throughout the force and inputs are given by lecturers to probationer courses and supervisory officers, particularly at sergeant rank, on their respective courses. As an example of good practice, a briefing video has also been prepared which is being distributed to the force.

(Chapter 4, paragraph 4.8.1)

- As an illustration and one which perhaps typifies many of the constituents of a review process, in Strathclyde Police development of the service review schedule. HMIC takes the view that this process is an example of good practice in the context of the tailored development of a force responding to Best Value requirements

(Chapter 5, paragraph 5.3.4)

- As an example of good practice, Fife Constabulary prepared their review schedule based on a process framework called the ACPO Police Process Classification Framework. The service review process model and schedule lists 10 main process headings, 6 under operating processes and 4 under management and support processes. A number of sub-processes under each main heading were identified as areas for review. Weighting factors were applied and a numerical value obtained by the application of points awarded for each process. Through this process it is anticipated that a timetable of service reviews can be agreed based upon available resources. HMIC views such tools as a useful way of applying a more objective approach in determining service review programmes over the coming years.

(Chapter 5, paragraph 5.4.5)

- When carrying out service reviews, forces adopted a number of practices in relation to staff awareness. Good practice was found in Grampian Police where before a review of one area the Deputy Chief Constable individually wrote to every member of staff addressing fears of any threat to their posts.

(Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.2)

- A good practice initiative was discovered in Central Scotland Police where a regular bulletin entitled 'quality news' updated staff in a brief but informative way.

(Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.2)

Introduction

Thematic Inspection

1. A Thematic Inspection of the Scottish Executive's Best Value regime within the police service in Scotland was carried out by HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) on diverse dates between April and December 2000.
2. HM Inspectors of Constabulary are appointed under the terms of the Police (Scotland) Act 1967 (as amended) to visit and inquire into any matter concerning or relating to the operation of police forces, including their state and efficiency. HMIC advises the Scottish Executive on policing matters and has the role of highlighting and spreading good practice to the wider policing community. HMIC now records good practice which is defined as follows: Good practice can be a process or practice which HMIC records as having made a contribution to continuous improvement. As such it is noted in order that other forces or police organisations can consider whether it is appropriate to adopt the practice. It is recognised that not all good practice is transferable. The good practice is a judgement made by HMIC and may not have included a full-scale evaluation. A list of good practice has been included in the report.
3. The aims of HM Inspectorate are to promote quality of service and value for money objectives which take account of public expectations and aspirations and inspire public confidence in the police service in Scotland. The conclusions reached by HM Inspectors are based on analysis of the evidence gathered during the inspection process, including interviews, document and data, and by the application of professional judgement.
4. HM Inspectors are independent of the police service, local and central government but advise and inform the tripartite structure responsible for policing in Scotland which comprises Ministers, Police Authorities and Chief Constables.
5. The 8 police forces in Scotland and the common police services (CPS) are subject to a primary inspection by HMIC every 3 years with reports being sent to Scottish Ministers and major stakeholders as well as being published. They are also posted on the HMIC website at www.scotland.gov.uk/hmic. This process allows for a focused examination of operations, organisation and outcomes to ensure that they are effective and efficient.
6. In addition to these regular inspections, thematic inspections are conducted to concentrate on specific issues or themes common to all 8 forces and where appropriate CPS organisations. Recent published thematic inspections have focused on policing activity related to Special Branch, Asset Confiscation, Complaints against the Police and Race Relations.

Terms of Reference

7. To inform the inspection process, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary sought the early involvement of major stakeholders involved in the progress of the Best Value regime within the Police Service in Scotland. A consultative group was established and each of the following organisations were represented:

- COSLA,
 - UNISON,
 - ACPOS,
 - ASPS,
 - Scottish Police Federation,
 - Accounts Commission, and
 - Scottish Executive (Police Division and Local Government Division).
8. Terms of reference were established and the thematic inspection was conducted within the following parameters:
- To assess the implementation and progress of the Scottish Executive's Best Value regime within the police service in Scotland,
 - To highlight good practice and where appropriate, make recommendations, and
 - To identify issues which HMIC should follow up during its cyclical inspection of police forces.
9. In conducting the inspection HMIC was mindful of the fact that the government circular which sets out expectation of Best Value is addressed primarily to police authorities and not chief constables. HMIC does not inspect police authorities and has therefore focused the inspection on the extent to which forces are supporting their authorities in responding to the Best Value regime. Nevertheless, all police authorities in Scotland accepted an invitation to meet with HMIC and there has been a useful exchange of views. Because of the overlapping responsibilities of police authorities, police forces and other agencies in Best Value the subject matter of this report inevitably touches upon matters which are, in a strict legal sense, beyond the remit of a police inspectorate. HMIC recognises its position in this regard and acknowledges that any comment which extends beyond the police service is entirely advisory in nature.
10. In addition, it was identified that, in support of the inspection process HMIC would consider the extent to which Best Value has been applied to these police services which do not fall within the direct responsibility of police authorities. These included the Scottish Criminal Record Office (SCRO), the Scottish Crime Squad (SCS) (now part of the Scottish Drug Enforcement Agency, SDEA) and the Scottish Police College (SPC). For the purposes of this report these organisations are collectively referred to as 'Common Police Services' (CPS).

Methodology

11. The inspection process was carried out under a written protocol agreed by the consultative group, circulated for comment to chief constables and structured in accordance with the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) Excellence Model. This was designed to ensure a consistent approach and to disclose valid evidence of measurement and achievement.
12. The inspection began with an extensive review of the available literature relating to Best Value followed by a formal inspection visit by Mr Graham Power, Assistant Inspector of Constabulary, assisted by a Staff Officer. All police forces and common police services were visited, records examined and interviews conducted with a range of officers and support staff either individually or in focus groups. Meetings also took place with police authority members, officials and Scottish Executive representatives.

13. HMIC is conscious of the fact that this report reflects in large part a 'snapshot' in time of how Scottish forces were approaching Best Value at points in 2000 although some updating of the information from forces has taken place to help reflect 'the latest position.' HMIC is equally aware of the keen interest in how Best Value will develop and where the focus of future inspectorial scrutiny will lie. The information gathered during the various phases of the inspection has been analysed and the findings deliberated upon both within the Inspectorate and in collaboration with the Consultative Group for this thematic inspection. This report and its recommendations is the published result of that process, but the responsibility for the report rests with HMIC.

1. Leadership

1.1 What is Best Value?

1.1.1 The Scottish Executive in its programme for government committed itself to develop a Best Value approach in local government. This new approach, initially intended to replace Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT), is said to retain positive elements of competition to achieve economy while relaxing bureaucracy and the compulsory nature of CCT. The 'least cost' option associated with CCT has now been replaced with a recognition that quality of service may be at a cost and it is for police forces and police authorities to decide on options which provide the best solutions to meet the needs of their customers. Descriptive as opposed to prescriptive, Best Value should be viewed as a process rather than a product.

1.1.2 HMIC has established repeatedly during the course of the inspection that Best Value is by no means an easy option but puts pressure on forces to acquire and develop new techniques and skills in reviewing its functions and activities.

1.1.3 In introducing Best Value to local government the then Secretary of State, along with Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA), established a Best Value Task Force to develop an approach and identify the essential elements of the regime. The Task Force comprised officials from the Scottish Executive, COSLA and the Accounts Commission. The first Task Force report, published on 4 July 1997, identified the essential elements of Best Value as:

- sound governance,
- performance measurement and monitoring,
- continuous improvement, and
- three year budgeting.

1.1.4 Scottish Office Home Department Police Circular No 12/1998 issued on the 20th November 1998 invited a voluntary commitment by forces to the Best Value regime and was accompanied by an invitation to submit a programme of review, over a 3-5 year timescale, of a force's functions and activities. At the time of submissions by forces it was difficult for them to predict precisely budget levels for the future year. However, there was a demonstrable commitment to implementing sound strategic planning and financial management, to effective consultation and to performance measurement.

1.1.5 The goal of a service review is to show that forces are delivering all their functions and activities, both operational and support, in the most efficient and effective means possible and to this end Police Circular 12/98 encompassed the need to demonstrate a clear commitment to the so called 4C's:

- Challenge,
- Compare,
- Consult, and
- Compete.

Challenge - the area under review has to be examined with a view to challenging not only why the service is being delivered but, if required, whether it could be delivered by an alternative

supplier or in an improved way by the police. Many service areas perhaps can only be delivered by the police, nevertheless alternatives should be explored.

Compare - one of the primary reasons for a service review is to assess performance and identify scope or options for improvement. Accordingly there is a need to collect information and data in order to compare a force's performance and processes with other forces or external organisations.

Consult - the review is required to fully consider a consultation process, ensuring that those involved in delivering and receiving the service are fully involved in identifying areas for improvement. There is a need to establish whether or not the service meets the needs or indeed expectations of those involved.

Compete - where applicable the service area should be open to competition. Are there alternative providers? If so, the evidence gathered during the assessment stage of the service review will play a significant part in determining the cost and quality of service provision within that area of service delivery.

1.1.6 A requirement for an Implementation Plan was also placed on police authorities and forces to ensure that actions and priorities were scheduled both in the short and longer terms of the 3-5 year timescale.

1.1.7 HMIC determined that adherence to the commitments given by forces would be the subject of particular focus during the thematic inspection.

1.2 When did it start?

1.2.1 Scottish Office Development Department (SODD) Circular 22/97 first introduced Best Value to councils in Scotland in July 1997 with police authorities requested to demonstrate a commitment to the regime approximately one year later. Based upon the guidance, documents detailing this commitment and signed up to by both police authorities and chief constables were submitted to the then Scottish Office in November 1998. Ministerial approval was given to the commitment documents in March 1999.

1.3 Who needs to do what?

1.3.1 Police Circular 12/98 indicated that Best Value would be applied to police authorities. This is significant as the then Scottish Office clearly placed the onus on police authorities to demonstrate commitment to the regime. Accordingly, it is police authorities that are responsible for Best Value with Chief Constables tasked to implement the authorities programme. The inspection revealed that this is not the way it is happening in practice, with forces largely left to get on with it and authorities taking more of a peripheral role. Of course, collaborative effort is a key component for likely success.

1.3.2 Against this backdrop, it can be said that the development of Best Value in the Scottish police service has been led, principally, by the Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland (ACPOS), Finance Standing Committee, Best Value Sub-Committee. Meetings are held on average, every 2 months. Chaired by an Assistant Chief Constable the Committee was formerly the Quality of Service Sub-Group of the General Policing Standing Committee. However with the advent of the Best Value regime, ACPOS decided the Finance Standing Committee was the more appropriate vehicle for oversight of Best Value matters.

1.3.3 All forces are represented on the Committee with membership generally pitched at practitioner level. An examination of the minutes of these meetings suggests it is a good vehicle for the sharing of information across forces. It does not however appear to be a body

which is designed or able to deliver strategic direction and co-ordination of Best Value for the Scottish police service as a whole. This observation is made recognising that ultimate responsibility rests with individual police authorities and forces.

1.3.4 HMIC considers that the existing Best Value programme, supported by the work of this Committee, does not address 'Best Value in Scottish policing' at a strategic level. As an example, 'Best Value' in training, arguably, should consist of a service review of the Scottish Police College in collaboration with reviews undertaken within the eight forces. HMIC therefore queries whether ownership of the subject is held nationally as robustly as it might.

HMIC recommends that forces (ACPOS) examine their strategic response to Best Value and the mechanisms in place to drive the regime forward.

Recommendation 1

HMIC recommends that forces (ACPOS) examine their strategic response to Best Value and the mechanisms in place to drive the regime forward.

1.4 Responsibility within forces

HMIC noted the importance attached to Best Value within forces as each had an Executive member of staff taking the chair of the relevant committee. Forces have adopted different approaches to internal management but all aim to achieve a similar result. The following summarises the position of individual forces.

Central Scotland Police

A Force Policy Group comprising of the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable, the Chief Superintendent Operations, the Chief Superintendent Corporate Management, and in an advisory capacity the Asset Manager deals with Best Value issues. The Chief Superintendent Corporate Management has functional responsibility for Best Value issues and reports direct to the Force Policy Group. HMIC notes that a Strategic Planning and Best Value Officer is to be appointed.

The Best Value Officer's role will address the Best Value concept in the widest sense and will be central to the force strategic business planning and development processes.

Dumfries and Galloway Constabulary

The Executive Policy Group, chaired by the Chief Constable, and comprising the Deputy Chief Constable, Detective Chief Superintendent and Chief Superintendent Operations deals with Best Value issues. On a day to day basis the Superintendent, Corporate Services, leads for the force assisted by a Chief Inspector, Inspector and a member of support staff from the Force Corporate Services Department.

Fife Constabulary

The lead on Best Value matters is held by the Deputy Chief Constable who chairs the force Performance Management Board. This Board reports to the Force Executive on Best Value matters. Day to day administration of the regime is carried out by an Inspector from Performance Management Department. HMIC notes the appointment of a Best Value Officer and Research Officer to undertake the research work involved with Service Reviews.

Grampian Police

Responsibility for Best Value rests with the Programme Board comprising the Deputy Chief Constable, Chief Superintendent, Headquarters and the Superintendent, Strategic Development Department. This group reports to the Force Executive, comprising the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable, Assistant Chief Constable and Director of Corporate Services. On a day to day basis the Inspector, Strategic Development Department, deals with Best Value matters.

Lothian and Borders Police

The Policy and Best Value Working Group considers Best Value issues and is chaired by the Convenor of the Joint Police Board. Six councillors from the Board also sit on the Working Group with the Chief Constable, Director of Corporate Services, Central Services Manager and the Superintendent, Corporate Development. At the time of inspection three meetings of the Working Group had been held. In seeking updates to the service review schedules of forces, HMIC was informed that within the force, four service reviews have been undertaken, with the Management of Crime review reaching the report stage. HMIC noted that revision to the Service Review Programme by the Force Executive Policy Group has resulted in a decision to support a maximum of four service reviews per year and that all such reviews will be limited to 90 days and resourced appropriately for that period.

Northern Constabulary

Meeting quarterly the Management Service Group, chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable, deals with Best Value. The group comprises Service Unit Managers (Heads of Department and Area Commanders) with day to day work carried out by the Force Best Value Co-ordinator, a member of support staff, and the Superintendent Performance Services.

Best Value matters may be reported from this Group to the Policy Forum which is chaired by the Chief Constable. The Forum comprises the Management Services Group members and representatives from the police staff associations and support staff union.

Strathclyde Police

The force Programme Board chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable considers Best Value project matters and meets on average every six weeks. A project support office monitors projects and a Best Value Co ordinator (member of support staff) deals with day to day issues. The Programme Board reports to the force Policy Group, comprising the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable, the 5 Assistant Chief Constables (responsible for Strategic Support, Operations, Personnel, Crime, and Community Safety) the Head of Financial and Physical Resources and the Head of Legal Services.

Tayside Police

The force has a Best Value Board chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable although at Executive level the Director of Corporate Services takes the lead. On a day to day basis the Superintendent, Force Development, deals with matters and reports to the Best Value Board, which in turn reports direct to the Executive. From the force update requested in December 2000, HMIC notes that a new Corporate Development Department is being created, in part to accommodate the additional workload brought about by Best Value. In a similar vein, the force Programme Support Group has been enhanced by the appointment of a dedicated Performance Manager who will assume responsibility for all aspects of Best Value delivery, including service reviews, development of Performance Management and Planning material, Performance Indicators, and Public Performance Reporting (PPR).

1.4.1 In acknowledging these management arrangements HMIC looks forward to examining progress in the co-ordination and mainstreaming of a Best Value approach within the respective forces.

1.5 Programme and Project Management

1.5.1 HMIC found that all forces are using some form of programme management to consider Best Value 'projects'. The use of a formal project management methodology was evident based either on PRINCE 2 or SPM (Successful Project Management). Projects are monitored by a Project Support Officer or Office whereby information is then fed into some form of programme board. This structured approach to Best Value is essential.

1.5.2 At programme board level or equivalent all forces demonstrated executive involvement, usually by chairing the responsible group, which may include other members of the executive or heads of department. Typically, the monitoring of the progress of Best Value Service Reviews rests with a force Best Value Co-ordinator. In some forces the Co-ordinator is a civilian member of support staff while in others the duties are carried out by a police officer. HMIC views as good practice employment of members of support staff as co-ordinators in that support staff often bring a level of continuity to the role.

1.6 What guidance was available?

1.6.1 It is important to note that the implementation of Best Value in the police service in Scotland has been different from that of England and Wales where the regime is influenced by strong central control and a legislative framework. Best Value was defined by the Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) in its White Paper, Modern Government: In Touch with the People (1998) thus:

"Best Value will be a duty to deliver services to clear standards – covering both cost and quality – by the most effective, economic and efficient means available. Local authorities will set those standards – covering both cost and quality – for all the services for which they are responsible."

1.6.2 The Local Government Act 1999 provided the legal basis, Best Value becoming a statutory duty for local authorities in England, and police and fire authorities in England and Wales from 1 April 2000. Best Value therefore applies to all 43 police authorities in England and Wales in line with their statutory responsibility under the 1996 Police Act to secure the maintenance of an efficient and effective force.

1.6.3 This has not been the case in Scotland where a **voluntary and more 'collaborative' approach** has been adopted. The then Scottish Office, by issuing 'guidance', relied on the co-operation and goodwill of those involved.

1.6.4 Some criticism had been voiced to HMIC by police management regarding the lack of detailed and effective guidance by the Scottish Office during the run up to the introduction of the Best Value regime to the police service in Scotland. Progress may have been enhanced by greater clarity of detail in what was expected of forces and police authorities, however, Best Value was never intended to be wholly prescriptive and this has been the stance of both the local government and police divisions of the Scottish Office since it was applied to the police. Despite this criticism, forces appear to have made rigorous efforts in producing the necessary commitment documentation, have embarked on comprehensive service review programmes and have established management structures to support the Best Value concept.

1.6.5 HMIC notes that forces have taken advantage of the series of Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) workshops covering Best Value. Several of these have now been held in Scotland bringing together representatives from lead agencies involved with Best Value in Scotland. In addition it has proven to be an ideal opportunity for Scottish practitioners within the service to learn of developments in Best Value within police forces south of the border. It could be argued that it might have been 'best value' for ACPOS to have developed a series of seminars for the service in Scotland. However, the updates and developments provided by CIPFA at their workshops have proved a useful primary source for practitioners.

1.6.6 Given the criticism levelled at the introductory guidance, the subject and detail of future guidance on the development and direction of Best Value is considered a key issue.

2. Policy and Strategy

2.1 The Key Principles of Best Value

2.1.1 HMIC is satisfied that all forces had taken early cognisance of and were striving to meet the key principles of Best Value, which are:

- **Accountability**, whereby services are designed to be customer focused and accessible and customers have an opportunity to input into decisions about services,
- **Transparency**, whereby there is an openness about decisions taken and reasons for them,
- **Continuous improvement**, whereby forces address five essential questions:
 - what are we seeking to achieve?
 - why are we doing it?
 - how are we doing it?
 - are we achieving our goals?
 - can we get better?
- **Ownership**, whereby everyone with an interest in services should feel some degree of involvement.

2.1.2 HMIC was particularly interested in examining the principle of transparency, having regard to consultation with the public and other stakeholders and the reporting of information. HMIC was encouraged to find that all forces have structures in place that allow the views of their local communities to be sought on a range of issues, including surveys, focus groups and public meetings. Similarly, elected members of police authorities have a vital role to play in Best Value by regular scrutiny of progress by forces in delivering their projects. In this way forces and police authorities can be seen to be transparent, open and upholding the public interest in such matters. However, a picture of rigorous scrutiny by elected members did not emerge during the inspection and in some cases there had been little dialogue, particularly in relation to early progress with implementation of the regime and the development of Service Review schedules and their outcomes.

2.2 Police Authority Involvement

2.2.1 To ensure a climate of continuous improvement and enhanced performance Best Value requires a particular culture within an organisation. In reality Best Value may never be attainable, as there is always room to improve on efficiency, economy, effectiveness and the quality of service provided to customers.

2.2.2 HMIC reported in Chapter 1 that in late 1998 the Scottish Office, as it then was, required all Police Authorities to make a submission consisting of:

- a self-assessment against the essential elements of Best Value,
- an implementation plan showing how deficiencies identified by the self-assessment would be addressed,
- a service review schedule setting out plans to review all services in a 5 year period, and
- details of the proposed service review methodology.

2.2.3 These submissions, following guidance contained in Police Circular No 12/98, were formally agreed by respective Chief Constables and Police Authorities. HMIC found that Chief Constables had been delegated the authority to prepare the Best Value submission to the Scottish Executive. In many cases, the consultation with Police Authority elected members and officials, appeared limited.

2.2.4 Early guidance issued by the Accounts Commission for Scotland and Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) indicated that Best Value can only be achieved if it is owned by local government - with a commitment to doing better year on year - and is expressed at all levels within a Council. A Council's commitment to Best Value must be explicit, shared and owned within the Council, both at elected member and staff level. Councils must take control of the agenda and not respond to Best Value because they believe they have to respond to Central Government direction.

2.2.5 Unlike England and Wales where Best Value is prescribed by law and HMIC have a new, and unprecedented, statutory role to inspect Police Authorities in respect of the Best Value regime this is not the case in Scotland. During this inspection HMIC sought the co-operation of Police Authorities to discuss progress and views. HMIC is grateful for the openness and frankness of Police Authorities.

2.2.6 The following is a summary of the known involvement of Police Authorities in Best Value:

Central Scotland Police

At the time of inspection a Best Value Group had been recently established to consider Best Value issues and in particular to take account of the progress and achievements arising from Service Reviews including the developing processes which identify and prioritise areas for review. It comprises the convenor of the Police Board, two other board members and two members of staff from the force Policy, Strategy and Quality Unit.

Dumfries and Galloway Constabulary

Dumfries and Galloway Council's Executive Committee has a Best Value Sub-Committee. The current route for all Police Best Value reports is for initial presentation to the Best Value Sub-Committee and then to the Police, Fire and Public Protection Committee.

Fife Constabulary

The Public Protection and Regulation Committee (PPRC) of Fife Council deal with all policing matters although at the time of inspection there was no formal structure allowing the force to meet with elected members specifically to discuss Best Value issues.

Grampian Police

The Grampian Joint Police Board Stewardship Sub Committee deals with Best Value matters on behalf of the Joint Board and membership comprises the Convenor, Vice Convenor and three other elected members. Representation from the force includes the Deputy Chief Constable with the Superintendent and Inspector from Strategic Development Department. At the time of inspection two meetings of the Sub Committee had been held.

Lothian and Borders Police

The Policy and Best Value Working Group (PBVWG) is consulted on Best Value issues on behalf of the Joint Police Board. The PBVWG's membership comprises the Convenor and 6 elected members. The force is represented by the Chief Constable, Director of Corporate Services, Central Services Manager, Head of Corporate Development and Head of Management Services. At the time of inspection three meetings of the PBVWG's had been held.

Northern Constabulary

A Best Value Board, involving two members of the Northern Joint Police Board, has now been established.

Strathclyde Police

The Best Value Sub Committee (BVSC) of the Joint Police Board has all Best Value matters referred to them. The BVSC comprises the Convenor, 2 Vice Convenors and 4 other elected members. Included from the force are the Assistant Chief Constable Strategic Support, Head of Finance and Physical Resources and the Best Value Co-ordinator. At the time of inspection the BVSC were seeking full delegated powers from the Joint Police Board. Meetings are held quarterly.

Tayside Police

At the time of inspection the force were in early discussion with the Joint Police Board regarding future arrangements to deal with Best Value matters. An update given by the force in January 2001, informed HMIC that a Steering Group has been formed to develop ownership of Best Value within the Joint Police Board. The Steering Group, made up of elected members and a specialist local authority representative will meet quarterly to quality assure the Best Value programme.

2.2.7 HMIC is of the view that despite the clear and important role of Police Authorities in developing Best Value within the police service, generally their degree of involvement has been limited. Police authorities acknowledged that their detailed knowledge and understanding of some areas of policing subject to Best Value service reviews was less than that in other council services. That said they have an important role and identifying the most effective means of discharging that responsibility is crucial for the Best Value regime to have maximum impact.

2.2.8 An allied issue was the minuting of meetings between Forces and Police Authority members relating specifically to Best Value. A number of Police Authorities indicated that informal talks are held between senior management of forces and elected members to address Best Value issues. To ensure accountability and clearly demonstrate the differing roles of the Chief Constable and Police Authority, minutes or a note of Best Value meetings should be part of the Police Authority public reports, save where operational or commercial confidentiality requires a more cautious approach. No single process is suggested but the key issue is public accountability.

HMIC recommends that Chief Constables in conjunction with their Police Authorities review the methodology for the handling, maintaining and reporting of Best Value policy, practice and service reviews.

Recommendation 2

HMIC recommends Chief Constables in conjunction with their Police Authorities review the methodology for the handling, maintaining and reporting of Best Value policy, practice and service reviews.

2.3 Public Consultation

2.3.1 The need to meet the requirements of the Best Value regime has driven reviews of the planning processes within forces. Guidance indicates that Best Value requires services to develop a customer/citizen focus. A Best Value service is responsive to the needs of its communities, citizens, customers and other stakeholders, and its plans and priorities are demonstrably based on such an understanding. It makes sure that it involves stakeholders in helping to identify policy and priorities including service availability, the standards of service to be delivered and improvements that are required. Examples of approaches to such consultation may involve linkage with community forums, citizens' juries, customer panels, surveys and other methods.

2.3.2 During the inspection HMIC found that all forces consulted with the public to some degree. Lothian and Borders Police as an example of good practice have developed a corporate communication strategy which co-ordinates the many existing and new ways in which the force communicates inside and outside the organisation. More specifically they have used a partner's survey, community focus groups and customer surveys to inform their planning processes.

2.3.3 The partner survey formed the basis of a comprehensive study of the opinions and experiences of the public, staff, local authority departments, elected members, business, partner organisations, educational bodies and community groups. The results were discussed by the force executive and with managers and staff at the force parliament and force conference. This led to the development of force goals for their policing plan 1999/2002. HMIC noted that it is the intention of the force to undertake a partner's survey every 3 years to inform the policing plan.

2.3.4 Lothian and Borders Police have also held a series of public consultation meetings referred to as community focus groups in each local authority area where members of the public and community groups were invited and discussed issues, including policing priorities, the fear of crime and public expectations.

2.3.5 All other forces use a variety of (similar) mechanisms for public consultation and the above is illustrative of the range of activity.

2.4 Public Performance Reporting (PPR)

2.4.1 In order to achieve significant improvements in service delivery it is important that there should be increased local accountability and a sound public performance reporting framework is a key element in this. In tandem with a focus on public consultation, the public need regular and reliable information to make informed judgements about the performance of the policing service being provided by their local force.

2.4.2 Forces use a wide range of mechanisms to help secure the dissemination of information to the public and these will vary from force to force as they often reflect the specific needs of local communities. For example:

- **Central Scotland Police** has distributed public information posters giving details of their performance for a range of policing functions. These posters are made available for display in public buildings and in shops, post offices and similar establishments where they are likely to be viewed by large numbers of the public. They are also displayed in the foyers of police offices throughout the force area. A promotional wall planner outlining performance and identifying senior managers has also been produced and distributed (via Royal Mail delivery) at no cost to the public purse, to homes throughout the force area.
- To maximise access to the information in the public performance report **Dumfries and Galloway Constabulary** for example provide quarterly reports which are circulated to the press, meetings of the Police Authority, elected representatives and also displayed in police stations.

2.4.3 It was agreed with the Scottish Executive that **Chief Constables' Annual Reports** would be the primary vehicle for police public performance reporting and it is becoming apparent that this is driving innovation in the way some forces pass performance information to their communities. For example:

- **Northern Constabulary** and **Dumfries and Galloway Constabulary** have renamed their Annual Report to call it their Public Performance Report and include relevant information on Best Value.
- **Lothian and Borders Police** have departed quite radically from the traditional Annual Report and produced for 1999/2000 a tabloid type newspaper, which for the same price as their Annual Report, comprises tens of thousands of copies, thus allowing a much wider distribution to the public.
- **Strathclyde Police**, as one example of good practice, provided information within its Annual Report which included details of goals, objectives and targets, with specific reference to statutory and Best Value key performance indicators.

2.4.4 HMIC supports these positive developments.

3. Partnership and Resources

3.1 Service Review Schedules

3.1.1 At the request of the Scottish Office, the eight Scottish police authorities in partnership with forces each submitted a Best Value commitment document and implementation plan as part of the introduction of the Best Value regime. A request was also made by the Scottish Executive to include a schedule of Service Reviews to be undertaken in the first year of the regime (1999/2000). As part of the approval process for submissions HMIC were asked by the Police Division of the Scottish Office to comment on these schedules and in doing so expressed some concern about the lack of operational focus in the initial choice of activities for review. It was clear to HMIC that, given the comparatively small expenditure devoted to support services, to make any impact on efficiency savings a greater operational focus would be required.

3.1.2 Of the submissions forwarded to the Scottish Office all but one included a Service Review schedule, one force choosing to use the results of an upcoming force-wide EFQM assessment to inform the choice of activities for review. As the inspection unfolded it became apparent that some re-prioritisation of the initial schedules by forces was taking place as issues emerged that were deemed sufficiently important for review in the first year. Many influences, both internal and external, impact on policing priorities and the Best Value regime is flexible enough to take account of such requirements.

3.1.3 The inspection revealed that elements of Best Value have not been progressed at the anticipated pace throughout the Scottish forces and this includes service reviews. At the time of inspection few service reviews had been completed and some of the completed reviews did not wholly fulfil the Best Value criteria.

3.1.4 Much of this slippage appears to have been caused by a need to have suitable structures in place that will allow for the Best Value regime to be progressed within forces and this situation is not dissimilar to that experienced by councils following their first year of operating Best Value.

3.1.5 In developing these structures experience in some forces identified the need to change the planning processes. In one force it was found that the force goals were re-adjusted to span a 3 year period instead of annually and this will facilitate the introduction of 3 year budgeting. Evidence was also forthcoming of force targets being redesigned by a 'bottom up' approach to give increased focus on issues arising from local public consultation.

3.1.6 The number and status of service reviews within forces as at January 2001 are tabulated at Appendix A.

3.2 Benchmarking

The Best Value regime has brought about the development of a Scottish Police Benchmarking Club where the key practitioners involved in Best Value within forces come together to examine the delivery of levels of performance not only within the Scottish Police Service but with outside organisations. Benchmarking is a structured and focused approach to examining an area where it has been decided that a degree of improvement is required and involves comparing the organisation against others who provide the same or similar services. However these comparisons go beyond broad measures of cost and standards and can involve examination of what it is that other organisations do to produce better results.

3.2.2 As an example of **good practice**, a Guidance Manual based on one developed by Strathclyde Police has been produced and includes a Benchmarking Code of Conduct for the Scottish Police Service which closely follows the European Benchmarking Code of Conduct developed in 1996. The Code is based around a number of guiding principles and Scottish forces have agreed that adherence to these principles should form the basis of all benchmarking exercises whether with another force or an external organisation. The Code of Conduct is reproduced at Appendix B.

3.2.3 The importance of being able to benchmark effectively is paramount within the Best Value regime and the capacity to do this relies on the availability of comparable information which in return depends largely on common definitions, similar methodologies and a willingness to share. However, some concerns and misconceptions are deep rooted.

"If you want to benchmark properly we all have to count things in the same way and possibly do things in the same way. We are not close to doing things in the same way. Many people still feel that information would be used against them in some form of league table".

Senior Police Officer

3.2.4 HMIC noted that the Scottish Police Benchmarking Club was exploring links with the National Benchmarking facility being developed by the Chief Constable of Lancashire Constabulary on behalf of the police service in England and Wales. A database is being established which will allow for the exchange of information between forces using the Police National Network 2 (PNN2). Based on the benchmarking of processes which underpin each policing function, the database is called 'PROBE' (process benchmarking exchange) and will be a valuable resource to forces in undertaking Best Value reviews. While negotiations are continuing regarding this initiative 'The Club' are also developing a system of storing details of service reviews in the first instance on PINS, the Police Information Net for Scotland which is maintained at the Scottish Police College. HMIC views this as good practice in that forces striving for continuous improvement can limit duplication of effort by access to this information database.

3.3 Costing in Service Reviews

3.3.1 During the course of the inspection HMIC examined whether all elements of provision of the services were costed during the service reviews. Evidence varied in respect of this with some forces having no completed service reviews and therefore unable to produce conclusive evidence of comprehensive costing having taken place. Some forces have not carried out any costing while others produced evidence of some costing having taken place in completed reviews. Available information on the costing of service reviews are shown at Appendix A.

3.3.2 Some forces have referred to the need for costing within their service review guidance documents and for example in the manual for **Strathclyde Police**, it indicates that it will be necessary to gather information on the cost of service provision, broken down to the appropriate level. It goes on to acknowledge that detailed accurate costing is essential if meaningful comparisons are to be carried out and that the Budget Unit in the Finance Department of the Force will provide all the necessary assistance in this area.

3.3.3 The same manual states that dependent on the nature of the service under review, service review teams may wish to consider breaking down costs as follows:

- for each main area of service provided,
- for each section within the structure,
- for each reporting level within the structure,
- for each activity undertaken, and

- with detailed examination of the costs associated with buildings, equipment, other assets and general overheads.

3.3.4 HMIC considers it essential that progress in the costing of police services and the development of mechanisms for forces to demonstrate Best Value in the use of resources is given a high priority. Best Value and the present requirement to demonstrate efficiency savings suggests that forces should collaborate to identify where and how savings can be found and how services can be more accurately compared. Activity Based Costing (ABC) is one such methodology which may prove to be of benefit to forces as it develops with the potential to support Best Value service reviews.

3.3.5 The actual costs of implementing Best Value and conducting service reviews was a subject raised with HMIC. Concerns were expressed about the cost of the bureaucracy of Best Value and of the abstraction of 'operational' officers and other staff in facilitating reviews. HMIC believes that the costs of implementing and progressing Best Value should be weighed against the potential and actual benefits gained. This requires costs to be accounted for, as well as quantification of monetary savings and benefits. Also, judgements about the timing and depth of reviews will be important.

3.4 Benchmarking of Costs

3.4.1 Benchmarking of costs between forces is in its very early stages and there is currently little useful information. However there is agreement that all forces will channel comparisons of this nature through the Scottish Police Benchmarking Club, which is considered to be an appropriate forum for this to be discussed. Effective comparing and competing in a transparent way is a method by which forces can readily identify weaknesses and areas for improvement. HMIC view this development as a positive step forward which will provide the forum for collaboration in designing a comparative structure for costing Best Value towards identifying where major savings are to be made.

3.5 Common Police Services

3.5.1 The Common Police Services were not required by the Scottish Executive to address the Best Value regime although HMIC took the opportunity to visit the Scottish Police College, the Scottish Crime Squad (now part of the Scottish Drugs Enforcement Agency, SDEA) and the Scottish Criminal Record Office. To their credit all three organisations were found to be embracing the essential elements of Best Value and were in the process of drafting internal documents giving a position statement in respect of their involvement. Although, in this early stage, it was clear they had already started to think of the implications.

"The Scottish Executive promote Best Value but sometimes their own rules get in the way. Take travel for instance. Because we are on central service we are supposed to book our tickets through a Government approved agency. By getting cheap tickets on the Internet we can often save hundreds of pounds on a journey. Over a year this helps us to make our budget go further but strictly speaking it is against the rules".

Senior Official in a common police service

3.5.2 The common police services annual budget is larger than that of a small police force yet there is no structured way of applying Best Value. Their 'exclusion' from the Best Value regime appears anomalous to HMIC. There is nothing in terms of what the Best Value regime is trying to achieve that would not be considered equally applicable to common police services.

3.5.3 In paragraph 1.3.3 HMIC highlighted that at a strategic level it might be argued that Scottish policing as a whole is not the subject of Best Value, rather it is being applied within individual forces and collectively little has been done. The omission of common police services from the regime reinforces this position. Arguably, the concept and methodology should be extended to the role of the Justice Department (and others) at the Scottish Executive, as part of the 'joined up' approach to service provision.

3.5.4 The current review and potential development of Common Police Services should be reviewed in a 'Best Value' context. HMIC would be supportive of an approach which embodied a Best Value framework, including commitment to the 4C's (challenge, compare, consult and compete).

3.6 Cross-cutting Best Value service reviews

3.6.1 Forces, individually, have embarked on a schedule of Service Reviews and discussion is evident from minutes of meetings of both the ACPOS Best Value sub committee and the Scottish Police Benchmarking Club, however, at the time of inspection, HMIC found no evidence of collaboration between two or more forces in conducting a joint Service Review. Some policing functions, for example training and recruitment, share a high degree of commonality among all forces. Given the potential savings, to be gained both in resource and financial terms, HMIC considers that joint working in reviewing a number of activities to be an imperative. HMIC recommends that a mechanism be established to allow over-arching Best Value Service Reviews to be undertaken across all relevant activity in Scottish policing. (This will require dialogue between the Scottish Executive, Police Authorities and Forces.)

Recommendation 3

HMIC recommends that a mechanism be established to allow over-arching Best Value Service Reviews to be undertaken across all relevant activity in Scottish policing. (This will require dialogue between the Scottish Executive, Police Authorities and Forces.)

3.6.2 In a general sense, HMIC would consider it valuable for this proposed 'mechanism' to act as a catalyst for the engagement of all parties to consider greater collaboration in carrying forward the Best Value agenda. HMIC would not wish to be prescriptive in determining the manner by which the Scottish Executive, Police Authorities and Forces should engage, but consideration of a 'joint' working group at an 'executive' level might prove to be fruitful. The purpose and scope of the Group would be a matter for the early discussion and agreement of participants, however, it is suggested that the recommendations contained within this report would help to form an opening agenda. The inclusion of HMIC and Audit Scotland as members of this group would be considered pertinent and mutually advantageous.

4. People

4.1 Composition of Service Review Teams

4.1.1 Service Review Teams provide a development opportunity for staff in forces by extending the opportunities for individuals to participate in problem solving and policy decisions.

4.1.2 The composition of Best Value teams varied across forces. In **Grampian Police** the Best Value Board identified team leaders and other staff involved had to be ratified by the board and policy group. In **Northern Constabulary** the Superintendent, Performance Services, will assist in the decision along with executive consultation. Forces were generally of the view that first identifying a team leader and then involving that person in the subsequent choice of team members was an effective methodology. **Dumfries and Galloway Constabulary** automatically identified a team leader from middle management in the area to be reviewed.

4.1.3 The size of team membership also varied and lessons had been learned by forces from the early service reviews. In many forces team numbers are reducing with, in some cases, only one or two persons working full time on a review. Teams may include representatives from both support and police staff with the chair at senior level. All force headquarters have a number of key staff, often support staff, who have specialist skills. It is important that service review teams tap into their expertise as and when required if they are not already full time members. Smaller forces are often not able to offer the same support to their teams and must look elsewhere for support. **Northern Constabulary** is an example of this where their close working relationship with Highland Council has seen the use of one of the council's statisticians in supporting the team reviewing financial services. Tapping into specialist skills in this manner whether internally or externally is clearly best use of scarce resources and is seen by HMIC as good practice.

4.1.4 In building their teams all forces considered not only a mix of police and support staff but also individuals working within or outwith an area being reviewed. One particularly interesting concept was evidenced in **Tayside Police**. When conducting a review of a division within their force they requested the secondment of an officer from another force to manage the process. Such arrangements not only develop the skills of the individual but also help provide an objective analysis and in appropriate circumstances is an example of good practice which HMIC would encourage.

4.2 Staffing of Reviews

4.2.1 In most forces the staffing levels for the review teams are determined with reference to the volume and nature of work involved, by looking for people with appropriate skills (and availability) and allocating staff where possible without undue disruption to other duties.

4.2.2 **Strathclyde Police** have a twin track approach to carrying out service reviews. For major process reviews the force use primarily core staff from the central team based at Headquarters supplemented where necessary by specialist staff involved in operating the process. The central team was formally a restructuring team and now comprises three officers. For functional reviews, for example finance, human resources management or supplies, the force use primarily staff from the service under review. Core staff from the central team would either be a member of the review team (who would only operate part time) or provide in-depth advice, support or direction as required.

4.3 Difficulties Encountered by Service Review Teams

4.3.1 HMIC carried out an examination of a number of service reviews and in most cases team sizes appeared appropriate to the tasks undertaken. Nevertheless, during focus group interviews, a number of concerns were raised by staff and these include:

- concern about the allocation of time to carry out service reviews particularly when having to fit in their day to day duties at the same time,
- concern about officers and support staff with different rest days getting time to come together as a team,
- concern about the complexity of the task, uncertainty over processes/procedures and perceived lack of clear guidance, and
- concern about a perceived failure to deliver desired outcomes.

4.3.2 HMIC view these concerns as principally management issues. However for service reviews to be meaningful and produce results which will ensure continuous improvement within the force, it is essential that staff involved in service reviews are given the appropriate time, training and guidance.

4.3.3 The Best Value regime has created a significant workload on forces in respect of conducting service reviews. In addition, the supervision of service review teams and provision of advice and monitoring of progress has created a significant workload for officers involved in the co-ordination of Best Value within forces. It might be argued that Best Value Service Reviews are no more than the exercise of good management practice. To an extent that is true but the comprehensive, rolling programme with a basic five year framework is probably more demanding than the 'normal' business plan.

4.4 Support Staff Involvement

Support staff involvement within teams occurs in all forces and this was evidenced by their participation in the focus groups seen during the formal inspection. HMIC supports such involvement as support staff have specific skills and expertise that make them invaluable contributors to such projects.

4.5 Skills and Competencies

For most service reviews the staff with the appropriate levels/mix of skills and competencies are used by forces to conduct the projects. There was some evidence of the use of outside consultants although, generally, this was not favoured by forces for a number of reasons, predominantly that of cost.

4.5.2 Some reviews require skills in finance and accountancy and in all forces this has been met from the Finance Departments with relevant staff being co-opted onto review teams for their specialist skills as and when required.

4.5.3 Staff skills in benchmarking are still being developed. HMIC noted that a number of staff throughout the forces had attended one and two day seminars at the Scottish Police College on benchmarking and were further developing their knowledge through the Scottish Police Benchmarking Club and other appropriate forums such as Quality Scotland.

4.5.4 Constructive challenging of the emerging findings of Service Review Teams as they progress with their projects can often lead to more creative thinking on the part of the team.

Generally HMIC found forces to have some arrangement in place where senior management kept an overview of the progress of the reviews. Some forces identified a facilitator or sponsor for a team and this appears an appropriate route to follow as it provides some form of external challenge and also allows the teams an individual to 'bounce ideas off' and/or lean on for experience. As an example of good practice, Central Scotland Police use, on a consultancy basis, the services of the Best Value co-ordinator within Clackmannanshire Council. This appears to have been well received by members of service review teams who are able to turn to advice from an experienced individual.

4.5.5 Staff selection for the teams varied between forces but there appears to HMIC to be no strong link between selection of individuals and developmental requirements that might be identified from annual staff appraisals. This is a new and arguably a growth area for policing and it appears to HMIC that there is scope within forces to have a more structured approach to ensure that individuals have the opportunity to develop skills through participation in service reviews.

4.6 Training

4.6.1 No force produced evidence of any skills analysis being undertaken in respect of service review team membership and there is no real consistency in respect of the training of staff who took part in service reviews.

4.6.2 Lothian and Borders Police indicated that they did not have 'the slack' to develop or train individuals as time did not allow and that it was expected that individuals would come to the team with the skills and knowledge of the area being reviewed. One of Scotland's smallest forces Central Scotland Police have established a very structured approach, with the help of the Best Value co-ordinator of Clackmannanshire Council, to identify staff with the appropriate knowledge and competencies to undertake service reviews. The training, in this particular case, involves a number of half-day sessions with the service review team members, followed up by telephone help where appropriate and face to face meetings as the review progresses to assist with any problems that the teams may be experiencing.

4.6.3 HMIC noted that most forces did attempt to provide some form of training, however limited, and backed this up with some documentary material giving advice on how to conduct service reviews. HMIC particularly noted the Best Value tool kit put together by Tayside Police, which in a very clear and concise fashion, provides service review team members with a very good overview on how to tackle service reviews. HMIC commends this document as an example of good practice.

4.6.4 During the course of the inspection HMIC met with a focus group of service review team members in every force and most reported they had received some level of training or had access to relevant material on how to carry out service reviews that allowed them to progress their given tasks.

4.6.5 HMIC gave consideration to a suggestion from one senior officer within a force that training on service reviews could be carried out centrally at the Scottish Police College. However given the number of service reviews on-going within forces at any one time and the levels of staff committed, the demands on both the college and forces appears excessive and HMIC would endorse continuation of local training. Where forces have no regular structured training programme in place HMIC recommends that Chief Constables review training provision with a view to ensuring service review team members have sufficient knowledge and skills to carry out the function with which they are tasked.

Recommendation 4

HMIC recommends that Chief Constables review training provision with a view to ensuring service review team members have sufficient knowledge and skills to carry out the function with which they are tasked.

4.6.6 Earlier in this report (Para 1.6.5) HMIC made reference to the usefulness of the CIPFA Best Value Workshops. HMIC suggests that forces, individually or collectively, may find further advantage in engaging with other networks involved in developing guidance and training on Best Value 'tools and techniques', as exemplified by organisations such as CIPFA, COSLA and Quality Scotland.

4.7 Commitment to Service Reviews

4.7.1 During conversations with focus groups of Service Review team members a high level of enthusiasm and commitment was evident. HMIC views it as important that executive management decisions, feedback on completed Service Reviews and implementation follow as swiftly as possible. This is important not only for the morale of those involved but also for the status of further Reviews. If staff see a Service Review as something that, once completed, sits on a shelf then it is reasonable to assume that the process will not attract the same level of commitment in future.

4.8 Staff awareness

4.8.1 Various methods were used by forces to raise the awareness of all staff about the Best Value regime. Tayside as one example appear to have been fairly positive in their campaign. The force have made full use of their own newspaper, the local press, their intranet and website to highlight Best Value. Printed colour literature describing the Best Value regime has been distributed throughout the force and inputs are given to probationer courses and supervisory officers, particularly at sergeant rank, on their respective courses. As an example of good practice, a briefing video has also been prepared which is being distributed to the force. Evidence from some forces suggests that awareness of Best Value is high at senior management level but that gaps exist at lower levels in the organisation.

5. Processes

5.1 Approach to Best Value

5.1.1 Best Value has been built on the existing planning framework within forces throughout Scotland and in some forces this framework also includes self-assessment regimes. At the time of submission of the commitment documents to the Best Value regime some forces relied on European Foundation Quality Management (EFQM) Excellence Model and/or the Accounts Commission Management Arrangement Modules. The latter have now been superseded by the Best Value regime. The planning framework in some forces has had to be enhanced and evidence of gap analysis existed to identify shortfalls between existing practice and Best Value requirements. Some forces, for example **Lothian and Borders Police**, have now turned their attention to the Accounts Commission Performance and Management Planning audit and have recently carried out a pilot assessment. The audit, which already applies to councils, is applied at a corporate and departmental level. It is based on 2 stages - an appraisal stage and an audit stage. The appraisal stage assesses corporate and service approaches to continuous improvement while the audit stage assesses the extent to which the organisation has been successful in achieving the improvement actions it identified.

5.1.2 Planning processes within forces follow a cyclical pattern normally culminating in some form of force conference or strategy day. It is here that the role and importance of the Best Value regime is most evident and this is reflected in the public performance reports (annual reports) of Chief Constables.

5.2 Culture

5.2.1 One of the essential elements of Best Value is the customer/citizen focus. Increasing consultation by forces with their communities was evidenced during the thematic inspection. However Best Value also applies to 'internal customers' and includes staff within departments or divisions of forces. It is clear that forces have some way to go in terms of absorbing Best Value into the mainstream of their organisations. HMIC noted the efforts made so far in the comparatively short time that the Best Value regime has applied to the Scottish Police service. All forces were found to have a strategic aim or vision focussing on Best Value outlined in their strategic plans.

5.2.2 Best Value features in force documents and Police Authorities are taking an increasing interest as they receive information regarding forces strategic intentions and corporate objectives. Some forces are looking to develop a 'Balanced Scorecard' approach to fully integrate their performance management and planning frameworks. The 'Balanced Scorecard' is a multidimensional framework for describing, implementing and managing strategy at all levels of an enterprise by linking objectives, initiatives, and measures to an organisation's strategy. The scorecard provides a view of an organisation's overall performance by integrating financial measures with other key performance indicators around customer perspectives, internal business processes, and organisational growth learning and innovation. This approach therefore relies on planning and managing performance across all force activities rather than simply core crime and support activities. For example:

- A customer perspective is provided by the force goals, crime and other targets and by service standards,

- A continuous improvement perspective is provided by the management of issues arising from self-assessment and by elements of the service review schedule,
- An organisational development perspective is provided by the programme of key projects managed by an apposite methodology, and
- A financial perspective is provided by the efficiency gains/savings generated by the service review schedule and by the process of designing and managing a programme of key projects.

5.2.3 Extensive community consultation, at least annually, throughout the forces helps determine local priorities and provides the opportunities for each force to report on previous performance.

5.3 The Service Review Process

5.3.1 The Best Value regime currently requires forces to critically examine every area of the services provided within a five year cycle. HMIC acknowledges the crucial importance of the service review process to the success of the Scottish police service approach to Best Value. At the end of 1998, individual force service review schedules were required to be submitted along with the other documentation that comprised a commitment to Best Value.

5.3.2 Forces have adopted various approaches to determining their service review schedule, some simply listing all the policing functions that are carried out, others linking reviews to the current force policing plan while another adopted a separate and structured decision making process. HMIC did not endeavour to establish what the optimum approach to a service review would be but noted that forces had taken a variety of approaches. Typically, forces adopted a bespoke approach based upon the introductory Police Circular No 12/1998 and a miscellany of other associated guidance.

5.3.3 As an illustration and one which perhaps typifies many of the constituents of a review process, in **Strathclyde Police** development of the service review schedule involved the following key elements:

1. A decision matrix was devised to allow assessment of the relative priorities which the service review schedule should address. This involved application of a scoring system, with appropriate weightings, across a range of factors to drive the need for review. These factors included:

- Scope for efficiency gains, for example to increase productivity, enhance service delivery, and reduce waste.
- Scope for efficiency savings, i.e. cost reduction with no adverse impact on service delivery.
- Concerns raised through self-assessment process at corporate, divisional and departmental level.
- Performance against statutory performance indicators and Best Value key performance indicators.
- Concerns raised by internal audit, inspection and scanning.
- External concerns, for example from HMIC, Accounts Commission, customers and partners.

2. A process definition exercise was undertaken to identify the main business processes which operate across the force. This led to 2 key benefits:

- The service review schedule could be designed to address the difficulties which often arise when work flows between several divisions and/or departments, as well as addressing issues specific to individual areas of the force.
- A service review schedule could inform the force's IT strategy. This would allow each

review to examine the work that is done, the way it is carried out, the people who do the work and the structure within which they operate, all as one co-ordinated exercise.

The process definition exercise was based on examination of a process classification framework developed by ACPO but adjusted to take account of the Scottish Criminal Justice System and the particular requirements of Strathclyde Police. It showed that their activities could be encompassed in 14 processes which could be broken down into 70 sub-processes. Breaking down of activities into such processes of course lends itself to process benchmarking, mentioned earlier in this report. (Chapter 3, Para 3.2.4)

3. Issues arising from the force restructuring process were also fed into the service review schedule.

The result of the above saw a comprehensive service review schedule developed to integrate all the review work within that force over the next 5 years. The schedule integrates fully with the force's IT strategy and incorporates most of the issues which were planned to be addressed under a further restructuring within the force. This review schedule adopted by the force may require to be modified during the course of the programme. The key triggers would include:

- Poor performance identified through comparative data,
- Poor performance identified through complaints by customers or staff, audit or inspection,
- Performance deteriorating,
- Cost reduction targets,
- New legislation,
- A contract coming up for renewal,
- Learning from others (for example innovation practice identified elsewhere, application of new technologies etc), and
- Changes in organisation structure while at the same time allowing flexibility to reprioritise as new issues as demands come to the fore.

5.3.4 HMIC takes the view that this structured approach is an example of good practice. Similar constructive consideration was found in each force and it is not the intention of HMIC to identify or prescribe practice but to acknowledge the complex work and detailed planning undertaken by forces in this area.

5.3.5 All force service review schedules are co-ordinated and managed on a day to day basis by 'Best Value co-ordinators' who can be police officers or support staff. At a tactical level, these individuals will manage resources, agree review plans and timescales and monitor progress. Evidence was demonstrated to HMIC that at a strategic level all forces had some form of direction exercised by a programme board normally chaired by a member of the Executive. The programme board co-ordinates the planning and management of key development projects and reviews prioritisation of the service review schedule.

5.3.6 HMIC noted the variety of Service Review topics chosen by forces for inclusion in their schedules although, in general, there was a lack of operationally focused topics which might impact more on service delivery at the sharp end and have greater scope for savings. It is a matter of record that with eight forces in Scotland half chose to review catering services while only two selected crime management for the first tranche of effort.

HMIC would, however, acknowledge the expectation for early review by forces of areas such as catering and cleaning services (especially those to which CCT would have applied) in order to report on how they were delivering value for money in support services.

5.4 Slippage

5.4.1 One of the key issues that emerged during the inspection was the slippage that has occurred in some forces in their service review schedules. This was of significant concern to HMIC.

5.4.2 Much of this has been explained by forces as the consequence of the difficulties in resourcing service reviews. In simple terms, teams of staff assembled to carry out a review project have found it difficult to assign time or meet as often as required given the responsibilities of their day to day duties. **Strathclyde Police** are the only force at present running a full time Best Value team (their former restructuring team) who generally focus on reviews that have cross-cutting and force-wide implications.

5.4.3 HMIC considers that, given the current allocation of force resources, there is little prospect of any force achieving a review of all services within the 5 year target period. HMIC has given wider consideration to the concept and practicality of a 5 year target period. This is further discussed in the concluding chapter of this report where a recommendation is made (Chapter 6, Para 6.4.9), in relation to the way forward.

5.4.4 HMIC noted that different methodologies are used by forces in conducting their service reviews but forces continue to share understanding through meetings with local authority Best Value lead officers, by discussion at the Scottish Police Benchmarking Club and by exchange with the Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland Best Value Sub-Committee.

5.4.5 Internal concerns over the slippage of service review programmes are causing some forces to reconsider the prioritisation of reviews. Some forces were developing a decision or prioritisation matrix. As an example of **good practice**, **Fife Constabulary** prepared their review schedule based on a process framework called the ACPO Police Process Classification Framework. The service review process model and schedule lists 10 main process headings, 6 under operating processes and 4 under management and support processes. A number of sub-processes under each main heading were identified as areas for review. Weighting factors are applied and a numerical value obtained by the application of points awarded for each process. Through this process it is anticipated that a timetable of service reviews can be agreed based upon available resources. HMIC views such tools as a useful way of applying a more objective approach in determining service review programmes over the coming years.

5.4.6 HMIC noted that forces were intent on reviewing their schedules on an annual basis at which time they will consider several triggers including self-assessment audits from Audit Scotland, recommendations made in HMIC reports and the results of consultation across the force management structure. In addition HMIC found that some reviews were built on work previously undertaken. In some cases reviews had given rise to more questions than they actually answered and therefore required further work or study of specific areas.

5.5 Action Planning

5.5.1 HMIC accepts that various influences and demands have had an impact on progress however success in achieving service review **outcomes** has been slow and uncoordinated. While having commenced an ambitious programme of reviews, completed and actioned reviews were few in number. HMIC were consequently unable to form a clear view on how forces and police authorities would take forward the product of service reviews and the recommendations derived therefrom. This is clearly an issue which will ultimately determine the success of Best Value policing and the **management and monitoring of actions arising from service reviews** will require to be considered as an integral part of any future inspection programme.

5.6 Case Studies

5.6.1 During the course of the inspection HMIC did examine a number of completed service reviews from various forces. Of those examined there was great diversity in the subjects reviewed. Clearly a great deal of effort had been put in to completing the finished products however from HMIC's perspective a little additional effort might have produced a greater degree of evidence that comparison and competition had been tested to the full. Some were very good while others fell short of meeting the essential and binding criteria of Best Value.

Case Study

COMPETITION FOR THE PROVISION OF POLICE DOG SERVICES.

The service review of one police dog section explored alternative means of providing a police dog service. These included the consideration of Ministry of Defence police, a neighbouring Scottish force, a commercial agency and the voluntary sector. While it was found that alternative providers could provide some specialist services for parts of the force area the need for a general service over a wide territorial area led to the conclusion that a more cost effective use of the existing in-house provision offered Best Value.

HMIC noted sound application of the element of 'competition'.

Case Study

A REVIEW ON CUSTODY MANAGEMENT

A review of custody management within a force area subjected their arrangements to comparison and competition with a private enterprise which was undermined by a conclusion that it

"would not sit well with police officers"

which on the evidence provided was a purely subjective comment and one which showed no strong evidence of testing. Unsurprisingly it was not a favoured option and HMIC noted that the option had not been explored further.

Case Study

REVIEW OF PAYROLL PROCEDURES

A service review was carried out to look at payroll procedures and to ensure the principles of Best Value were being applied to the processes involved.

In viewing the project's definition HMIC noted that no external comparators were used, the force choosing to benchmark against other departments within the Council. HMIC takes the view that this is an example of a limited review, lacking sufficient exposure to competition.

Case Study

REVIEW OF TELEVISION UNIT

A review of a long established in-house television unit within a force, producing video presentations for training, briefing and national and local policing strategies and campaigns, amongst other activities.

A critical look at the functions and services provided by the unit led to a recommendation that the unit be disbanded and the work outsourced as required.

Subjected to challenge in this way, HMIC considers this a good example of challenge in asking "Do we really need to do this at all?"

5.6.2 The 'challenge' element may be the most testing for forces and HMIC recognises that it is sometimes awkward to ask the hard questions. However, for Best Value to prove effective hard choices need to be faced if services to the public are to be improved.

5.6.3 Some of the evidence gathered during a Service Review may point to seemingly unpalatable suggestions or recommendations for change but organisational culture should not be used to prevent these being aired if the Best Value regime is to succeed. The sharing of such information, for example through the Scottish Police Benchmarking Club, can lead to improvements in effectiveness and efficiency throughout the police service in Scotland. It is through such transparency that modernisation and improvement can take place and the Best Value regime move forward.

"Some of our Service Reviews show the force in a bad light. They reveal inefficient practices. I don't think our senior management would be happy to share this information with other forces."

Service Review team member

5.7 Outwith the Regime

5.7.1 HMIC noted that significant review activity of policing functions and support activities is taking place outwith the Best Value regime. This may be a missed opportunity by forces, with resources devoted to a general 'review' whose efforts were not being acknowledged as contributing to the pursuit of the Best Value regime. Conversely, a 'review' outwith the Best Value discipline might avoid the rigour of the '4 C's' criteria, the need for transparency and real accountability.

5.7.2 HMIC recognises that issues do arise or are identified that merit a 'quick' review or appraisal to inform management decisions. How should this be done? A Best Value review can be undertaken in a simple and cost effective way although it is acknowledged that other review methodologies have been and are successfully utilised by forces.

HMIC recommends that forces ensure all 'reviews' being conducted are carefully considered for inclusion within the Service Review Schedule and subject to Best Value criteria. It should be a deliberate decision, with reasons, to adopt another methodology.

Recommendation 5

HMIC recommends that forces ensure all 'reviews' being conducted are carefully considered for inclusion within the Service Review Schedule and subject to Best Value criteria. It should be a deliberate decision, with reasons, to adopt another methodology.

5.8 Spreading the Word

5.8.1 Embarking on a schedule of service reviews whether within forces or as a central service organisation, thought has to be given at all times to the impact on staff working in the areas under review. It is important that they are kept informed of progress at all stages. In particular the impact on support staff can cause considerable anxiety as borne out by the following comment by a trade union official.

"Since Best Value started in the police service it is mostly the civilian staff who have felt under threat. You don't get the impression that the same hard questions are being asked about the things police officers do".

Trade Union Official.

5.8.2 At the point of inspection there were different practices in relation to securing staff awareness. Good practice was found in Grampian Police where during a review of one area the Deputy Chief Constable individually wrote to every member of staff concerned addressing fears of any threat to their posts. Other forces have involved staff working within the area as part of the service review team therefore ensuring regular, direct dialogue and feedback. A good practice initiative was noted in Central Scotland Police where a regular bulletin entitled 'quality news' updated staff in a brief but informative way. In addition use was also made, as was discovered in several other forces, of intranet systems as a further means of updating staff. Accordingly HMIC recommends that good communication of force Best Value review activity is a priority for forces with an active sharing of good practices.

Recommendation 6

HMIC recommends that good communication of force Best Value review activity is a priority for forces with an active sharing of good practices.

6. Results

6.1 Performance Measurement

6.1.1 The Annual Statistical Return to HMIC, and its product the 'Matrix of Performance Indicators', represented an early development of a system of performance indicators within the police service in Scotland. Subsequently other performance indicators have been and continue to develop from different sources. The Local Government Act, 1992 places an obligation on the Accounts Commission (Audit Scotland) to issue an annual direction to local authorities to publish information relating to their activities. This direction is given to all local authorities and to joint committees and joint boards, as defined by the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, and amended by the Local Government etc. (Scotland) Act 1994 and therefore includes the police service. From the perspective of the Commission, this facilitates appropriate comparisons by reference to cost, economy, efficiency and effectiveness between:

- The standards of quality achieved by different authorities in that financial year, and
- The standards of quality achieved by such bodies in different financial years.

6.1.2 The Act also lays a duty on each authority to ensure that it has in place such arrangements for collecting, recording and publishing the information.

6.1.3 For 2001–2002, the statutory performance indicators for the police service are in the areas of:

1. Crimes: Cleared Up
2. Clear up of Selected Crimes
3. Telephone Answering Times
4. Sickness Absence
5. Complaints, and
6. Racially motivated incidents

6.1.4 Audit Scotland published selected results for indicators 1, 2, 3, 4 and the tri-annual quality of service survey indicator for 1999–2000 in their Fire and Police Pamphlet.

6.1.5 These statutory performance indicators appear in the Scottish Police Performance Manual which is jointly agreed by ACPOS, Audit Scotland, HMIC and the Scottish Executive through the Performance Indicator Working Group (PIWG). Regular meetings of this Working Group are held throughout the year at which the opportunity arises to discuss and agree changes to current indicators or the introduction of new indicators. At the time of the introduction of the Best Value regime to the police service in Scotland it was agreed with the Scottish Executive that the current range of indicators used by HMIC and the Accounts Commission would provide suitable indicators as Best Value rolled out in the first year or so.

6.1.6 The working group provides an excellent opportunity for the development of further relevant performance indicators to complement those already in place and reflect a broader cross-section of the outcomes of policing activity. In particular, HMIC considers there to be an emerging need to identify suitable indicators of force performance in achieving efficiency gains and savings from Best Value activity. Performance indicators determined or considered by this group do not detract, of course, from the development of locally based indicators by

forces, outwith the statutory set, which may be more appropriate to the needs of the local communities. HMIC continues to support such initiatives.

6.1.7 Performance indicators in themselves are not the drivers for achieving Best Value but are part of a wider culture of securing continuous improvement. However, if indicators are to better meet the needs of the Best Value regime within the police service in Scotland it is essential that any inter-force benchmarking on the basis of performance information be placed on a sounder footing. Across Scottish forces information gathering on a raft of issues is insufficient and arguably may remain so until such time as a national information database system is developed.

HMIC places significant importance on the need to improve management information across Scottish policing and recommends that the Scottish Executive and ACPOS identify procedures and an appropriate technological application that allow for the collection of 'real time' management information.

Recommendation 7

HMIC recommends that the Scottish Executive and ACPOS identify procedures and an appropriate technological application that allow for the collection of 'real time' management information.

6.2 Budgeting

6.2.1 The Best Value regime as currently constructed is not linked in any structured way to the Scottish Executive's expectations with regard to efficiency savings. Efficiency savings were introduced to the police service in 1998 and require forces to make savings in their revenue budgets of 1% in 1999/00, 1.7% in 2000/01 and 2.5% in 2001/02. More specifically, during the course of the inspection it was apparent that no tangible link exists between savings made through Service Reviews and efficiency savings. Without detracting from considerations of improved effectiveness, HMIC is of the view that an opportunity exists to create these links and produce tangible indicators of the Best Value regime's contribution to forces' annual efficiency savings.

6.2.2 From the evidence of Service Reviews produced by forces thus far it is clear that much work has yet to be done in identifying the cost of carrying out each review and the resulting gains or savings in terms of efficiency, effectiveness or cost. There are presently no annual targets or any coherent link to budgets, HMIC recommends that forces adopt a rigorous approach to properly costing Best Value service reviews to provide tangible information linking these reviews to 'benefits' secured in terms of savings, efficiency gains or improved effectiveness.

Recommendation 8

HMIC recommends that forces adopt a rigorous approach to properly costing Best Value service reviews to provide tangible information linking these reviews to 'benefits' secured in terms of savings, efficiency gains or improved effectiveness.

6.2.3 In so doing HMIC suggests that ACPOS engage in a dialogue with the Scottish Executive on the future direction of the requirements for attainment of 'efficiency savings' and the monitoring thereof. HMIC is of the view that Best Value offers the Scottish police service a single vehicle by which efficiency savings may be robustly and consistently pursued without the need to develop a discrete system of efficiency planning.

6.3 A Best Value organisation?

6.3.1 In 1997, the Scottish Office Development Department (SODD) introduced Best Value to all series of local government in Scotland through Circular 22/97. In 1998 Police Circular 12/98 introduced the development of Best Value to the police service and included the development of Best Value to the police service and included within its annexes a breadth of 'guidance' material covering the ongoing development of Best Value in the public sector.

6.3.2 Encompassed within the Circular were therefore the key principles behind Best Value, namely:

- Accountability,
- Transparency,
- Continuous improvement, and
- Ownership.

6.3.3 Also outlined were the essential elements of Best Value:

- Sound governance,
 - customer/citizen focus
 - sound strategic management
 - sound operational management
 - sound financial management
- Performance measurement and monitoring,
- Continuous improvement: competition and other tools, and
- Long-term planning and budgeting

6.3.4 From this foundation, an organisation delivering Best Value, in the opinion of HMIC, will therefore be defined by a number of characteristics, which would include:

- a performance management structure designed to deliver continuous improvement in the standard of services provided to its customers;
- the unequivocal commitment to the 4C's (consult, compare, compete and challenge) in reviewing its activities and functions;
- an unyielding approach to analysing the mechanisms and processes used in the delivery of its services; and
- a consistency with the key principles of Best Value through a robust planning framework and ownership.

6.3.5 As a result of the inspection process it was clear to HMIC that, in their first year, forces are making real efforts to address the requirements of this Best Value regime but are at different stages in the process. Some have concentrated on ensuring they have sound performance management and planning arrangements in place before progressing Service Review schedules, while others are making inroads into their schedules with variable results in so far as the application of the 4C's is concerned. No one force can yet be identified as a 'Best Value organisation' but all are some way down the path in their attempts to achieve this. The progress is comparable with the experience of other public service sectors at a similar point of development.

6.4 The Way Forward

6.4.1 As part of the inspection process, HMIC have held discussions with other bodies engaged in the inspection of Best Value, either individually or through the Scottish Executive's Joint Scrutiny Forum (JSF). The purpose of the JSF is to consider the organisation and implementation of the scrutiny of Best Value in Scotland, in Councils and Police and Fire Authorities. Its membership includes the relevant Inspectorates of the Scottish Executive and Audit Scotland amongst others. Discussions in such a forum can help avoid duplication where responsibilities for inspection potentially overlap. In this vein, HMIC has also held specific discussions with Audit Scotland in respect of the future arrangements for inspecting Best Value within the police service in Scotland.

6.4.2 HMIC equally recognises the broader dimension to any discussion on Best Value, including addressing the more strategic issue of responsibility for oversight of the regime as a whole. The Scottish Executive has consulted on the next steps in the development of Best Value in Scotland. HMIC notes that the 'Best Value in Local Government – next steps consultation document' accepted in principle all the recommendations of the Best Value Task Force (BVTF), including possible legislation. HMIC awaits with interest the results of this consultation and the future direction to be taken by the Scottish Executive.

6.4.3 In this context, HMIC considers that future discussions on Best Value within the Police Service in Scotland would usefully be served by the inclusion of the major stakeholders such as the Scottish Executive, Audit Scotland, COSLA, ACPOS and the staff associations. Utilising the findings and recommendations of this Best Value Thematic Inspection, HMIC will seek to contribute to taking matters forward at the earliest opportunity.

6.4.4 It is self evident that the anticipated results of forces utilising the process of Best Value are demonstrable benefits and improved outcomes. It is the opinion of HMIC that the concluding judgement is not based solely on the approach to and processes of Best Value adopted by forces but more particularly on whether a force is 'improving' on the basis of the findings of its service reviews. As commented upon in Chapter 5, the thematic inspection found few completed and actioned reviews and consequently limited evidence upon which to judge improvement.

6.4.5 HMIC recognises that there have been a number of 'inspection generated' improvements across all of the key areas of Best Value and forces are to be congratulated for their efforts. It is important that a model for Best Value inspection is agreed incorporating a clear view of what is expected of forces.

6.4.6 To this end a number of key questions are posed, namely:

- *Would a more centralist drive forward by the Scottish Executive secure greater commitment and resources within forces to Best Value?*

6.4.7 In contrast to the experience of England and Wales, the Scottish Executive has relied upon a voluntary commitment to the Best Value regime within the police service in Scotland and progress within Scottish forces is given in this thematic report. It is a matter of some conjecture as to the likely impact of legislation and any statutory guidance, which may follow.

6.4.8 Nevertheless, HMIC considers that a key measure in the development of a Best Value approach within forces is the progress made in fulfilling the service review programme. Taking cognisance of what was found during the inspection, HMIC suggests that wider consideration of the concept and practicality of a 5-year target period for the review of all services be given. The importance of setting a timescale is well understood however, in this context, such a finite parameter without specific additional resources or penalties for default may be

considered over ambitious and arguably a precursor to failure.

6.4.9 HMIC consider an inflexible five-year framework to be less valuable than a thorough review process, which is focussed on priorities and areas likely to bring maximum gain. HMIC recommends that ACPOS debate the issue of timescale for a review of all service with the Scottish Executive, and agree an appropriate management of the five-year timeframe.

Recommendation 9

HMIC recommends that ACPOS debate the issue of timescale for a review of all services with the Scottish Executive and agree an appropriate management of the five-year timeframe.

6.4.10 Such a debate should encompass consideration of the appropriate strategic level at which a 'service' is to be reviewed.

- *What would the Scottish Executive's role in intervention be?*

This introduces the issue of how to take action if the approach taken by a force or police authority seems to be failing. This is a matter for the Scottish Executive in setting the future direction of the Best Value Regime as it applies to the Police Service in Scotland. It is also an issue that is closely linked to the need for scrutiny of force arrangements and the statutory duties of those responsible for their inspection and audit.

- *Should there be scrutiny by an independent inspectorate, so that the public will know whether Best Value is being achieved?*

Current scrutiny rests within the audit/inspection regimes of the Accounts Commission (Audit Scotland) and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary. To avoid the burden of duplication and to manage the examination of the Best Value process within forces and more particularly the actions arising from the product of service reviews, HMIC supports the design, development and publication of a joint approach by HMIC and the Accounts Commission (Audit Scotland) for the audit/inspection of Best Value within the police service in Scotland.

6.5 A Joint Approach to 'Best Value' Inspection

6.5.1 In pursuit of this joint approach, HMIC, working in close collaboration with Audit Scotland, have sought to design and develop a co-operative model for the future monitoring and inspection of Best Value that limits bureaucracy and duplication in inspectorial scrutiny.

6.5.2 The broad framework for this model is introduced in this thematic report and will be further developed by appropriate consultation.

6.5.3 HMIC view the Best Value regime as a core element in the future delivery of policing services within Scotland and as such demands a prominent position within the inspection process of HMIC.

6.5.4 Currently, at 'Primary Inspection' (year 1) forces are subject to in depth examination and scrutiny over a set period of time and against a framework of pre-determined 'protocols'. Following the Primary Inspection, HMIC conduct 'Review' inspections (in years 2 and 3) which

focus on the action taken by the force in response to the recommendations and suggestions made in the primary inspection.

6.5.5 The protocols provide the opportunity for a force to submit, in answer to questions posed, a written evaluation of its structure, policy, practice and performance for examination by HMIC. As this process develops, and the HMIC protocols are fully shared, forces may consider the use of individual protocols as an appropriate self-assessment tool.

6.5.6 In partnership with Audit Scotland, HMIC will design and develop a 'Best Value protocol' as part of this framework. This protocol will be utilised by HMIC at Primary Inspection with a 'lighter touch' approach applied at the second and third year 'Review' stage. This will allow HMIC to examine, annually, progress towards delivering Best Value.

6.5.7 Examination of individual service reviews will be undertaken as part of the Best Value protocol and a copy of all completed reviews and any accompanying action/implementation plans will be requested by HMIC. HMIC will examine a sample of these reviews, however during a primary inspection a force will be requested to self-select a Best Value service review, representative of their overall approach, for in depth consideration. Specific emphasis will be placed upon progress in the service review schedule during the review inspections.

6.6.8 It is planned that the Best Value protocol will be structured in accordance with the headings given in the Excellence Model, namely:

- Leadership,
- Policy and Strategy,
- People,
- Partnership and Resources,
- Processes, and
- Results.

6.5.9 The protocol will encompass criteria analogous to those utilised by Audit Scotland in their approach to assessing the progress of a Scottish council, namely arrangements for performance management and planning, known as the PMP audit. The aim is that the framework for inspection and self-evaluation prior to an inspection will be sufficient to allow Audit Scotland and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary to discharge their statutory duties in a co-ordinated and integrated way.

6.5.10 To effect this joint approach, Audit Scotland will be invited to nominate a member of staff who will be a member of the inspection team for the relevant part of an inspection. The Audit Scotland nominee will be drawn from each force's appointed external auditor. External auditors have a statutory duty to satisfy themselves 'that the authority has made proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources' (Local Government Act 1988 S.35(4)). The same statutory duty applies to Police Boards and Forces in ensuring that they have such proper management arrangements in place. The collaboration will be designed to provide efficient and effective external inspection and scrutiny by utilising the general and particular knowledge, understanding and skills of HMIC, Audit Scotland, and external auditors. The respective roles and statutory responsibilities of the parties will be recognised in the arrangements which will be informed by a 'Memorandum of Understanding' between the organisations and encompass 'Terms of Reference' for the inspection team.

6.5.11 HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary will have overall responsibility for planning, managing and reporting on inspections.

6.5.12 HMIC's Inspection Programme 2001/2003 for forces is shown at Appendix C.

6.5.13 The introduction of the Best Value protocol and Joint Inspection Team will commence, as a pilot, with the Primary Inspection of Grampian Police.

Appendix A

Service Review Schedules

Force Status Report January 2001

Note:

At the request of HMIC, forces provided information, where readily available, on savings gained from their Best Value service reviews. The figures provided are included within the column headed 'Benefits'. It is anticipated that forces will continue to enhance their ability to report on benefits gained from service reviews in terms of savings, efficiency gains or improved effectiveness.

Central Scotland Police

	Subject	Report Status	Costs	Benefits
1	Custody Management	Complete	1,382 hours (£24,000) allocated to review process	
2	Typing Services	Complete	Not quantified	
3	Police Cadets	Complete	225 hours (£3,000) allocated to review process	Review identified potential improvements and/or options for further consideration
4	Call Handling	Complete	586 hours (£8,000) allocated to review process	Review identified potential improvements and/or options for further consideration
5	Crime Management Units	Complete	922 hours (£10,000) allocated to review process	
6	Catering	Complete	Not quantified	Review identified potential improvements and/or options for further consideration
7	Fleet Management	Ongoing	Not yet quantified	Review identified potential improvements and/or options for further consideration
	Comprehensive Strategic Review			
8	Phase 1 Senior Management and Departmental Structure	Complete	824 hours (£17,000) allocated to review process	
9	Phase 2 Review of Operational Policing and Detailed comparative analysis of resources	Ongoing		

Dumfries and Galloway Constabulary

	Subject	Status	Costs	Benefits
	Financial Services			
1	Mail-internal & external	Ongoing		
2	Payroll	Ongoing		
3	Catering Services	Complete		£20,000 saving pa
	Corporate Services			
4	HQ Management Structure	Complete		£45-50,000 saving pa
5	Warrants	Ongoing		
	Crime Management Services			
6	HOLMES	Ongoing		
	Operational Services (HQ)			
7	Motorway Policing	Complete		significant operational improvements
8	General Purpose Dog Section	Complete		£53,000 saving pa
	Operational Divisional Policing /Divisional Policing			
9	Staffing Arrangements for the Lockerbie Trial	Complete		30% savings
10	Force Staffing Review	Ongoing		
11	In Force Communications	Ongoing		
12	Shift Review	Ongoing		enhanced working practices benefiting both the Force and the staff

(Note: Service Reviews are not currently costed – this is being considered for next financial year.)

Fife Constabulary

	Subject	Status	Costs	Benefits
	Operating Processes			
1	Millennium Contingency Planning	Complete	£14,112	Reduced risk
	Management & Support Processes			
2	Catering	Ongoing	£7,244	
3	Cleaning	Ongoing	£3,702	
4	Financial Services	Ongoing	£1,784	
5	Legal Services	Ongoing	£1,130	
6	Supplies & Printing	Ongoing	£3,177	
7	Repair & Maintenance	Onhold	To be assessed	
8	Fleet Management	Complete	£6,552	Savings of £24,000
9	IS/IT Security	Complete	£3,000	Reduced risk
10	Management Information	Complete	£18,345	Improved management information
11	Medical Service Provision	Ongoing	£3750	

(Note: Attribute Additional Salary Cost of Best Value Officer and Research Officer £32,500 per annum)

Grampian Police

	Subject	Status	Costs	Benefits
1	Cleaning	Complete	£10,000	£100,000 expected saving pa
2	Mail Delivery	Ongoing	£1,000	N/A
3	Funeral Directors	Complete	£1,800	£4,800 over 18 months
4	Dog Section	Ongoing		
5	Liquor Licensing	Ongoing	£2,000	N/A
6	Vehicle Workshops	Ongoing	£4,000	N/A
7	Police Surgeon Services	Ongoing	£3,000	Force identified that service improvements would be likely to incur significant extra costs
8	Medication for Custodies	Complete	£2,300	£21,000 expected saving pa
9	Distribution of Ranks	Ongoing	£52,343	£230,000 expected saving pa
10	Blood Alcohol/Drug Analysis	Ongoing	£3,000	N/A
11	Firearms Licensing	Ongoing	£5000	Force identified that service improvements would be likely to incur significant extra costs
12	Payroll Procedures	Complete	£1500	Unquantified time savings
13	Procurement	Complete	£30,000	1st Yr £80,000 2nd Yr £240,000
14	Local Intelligence Administration	Ongoing		
15	Television Unit	Complete	£2,000	£64,000–£77,000 expected saving pa
16	Forensic Science Laboratories	Ongoing	£5,000	Force identified that service improvements would be likely to incur significant extra costs
17	Legal Documents	Delayed		
18	Waste Paper and Clinical Waste	Complete		
19	Property and Employee Insurance Cover	Complete		
20	Community Safety	Ongoing		
21	Finance Department	Deferred		
22	Force Control Room (Call Handling)	Ongoing	£60,000 pa	Force identified that service improvements would be likely to incur significant extra costs
23	Recruitment	Complete		
24	Architectural Liaison	Delayed		
25	Catering Services	Ongoing		
26	Housing Policy	Not required		
27	Vehicle Recovery Scheme	Complete	£5000	To be confirmed
28	Stores	Complete		
29	Criminal Records Office	National review		
30	Training	Complete		
31	Human Resources Department	Ongoing		
32	Public Consultation	Complete		
33	Road Policing			

Lothian and Borders Police

	Subject	Status	Costs	Benefits
	Policing Communities			
1	Management of Crime	Complete	£45,200	
	Managing Human Resources			
2	Personnel & Recruitment Personnel – Staff	Ongoing	£17,400	
	Managing Physical Resources			
3	Finance	Ongoing	£5,000	
4	Admin Support	Ongoing	£60,000	

Northern Constabulary

	Subject	Status	Costs	Benefits
1	Finance and Asset Management	Complete	No costings available	
2	Force Operations Rooms and Call Management	Ongoing	To be fully costed	To be detailed

Strathclyde Police

	Subject	Status	Costs	Benefits
1	Interim Review of Divisional Administration	Ongoing		
2	Review of Customer Interface Processes	Ongoing		
3	Review of Criminal Justice Processes Phase 1	Ongoing		
4	Activity Analysis	Ongoing		
5	Review of Transport Management	Ongoing		
6	Review of Statistics Section	Ongoing		
7	Review of Diving Services	Ongoing		
8	Review of Police Surgeon Service	Ongoing		
9	Review of Occupational Health and Welfare Unit	Ongoing		
10	Review of Management Services	Completed	Further work ongoing	
11	Review of Deployment of Operational Resources	Not yet commenced		

Tayside Police

	Subject	Status	Costs	Benefits
1	Driver Services	Complete	No data available	No data available
2	Eastern Division Review	Complete	No data available	No data available
3	Estates Management	Complete	No data available	No data available
4	Financial Management	Complete	No data available	No data available
5	Absence Management	Ongoing		
6	Call Handling	Ongoing		
7	Community Safety, including Public Consultation	Ongoing		
8	Corporate communication	Ongoing		
9	Crime Recording	Ongoing		
10	IS/IT Provision	Ongoing		
11	IT Training	Ongoing		
12	Medical Services	Ongoing		
13	Missing Persons	Ongoing		
14	Mobile Support	Ongoing		
15	Professional Standards	Ongoing		
16	Sponsorship/Income Generation	Ongoing		
17	Strategic Planning, including Performance Monitoring	Ongoing		

Appendix B

Benchmarking Code of Conduct

This is the Benchmarking Code of Conduct for the Scottish Police Service, which is closely based on the European Benchmarking Code of Conduct (1996). Note that this code of conduct is not a legally binding document - it is for guidance only and does not imply protection or immunity from the law. Its use will, however, provide an assurance that all parties behave professionally and ethically, with due regard to issues of confidentiality.

The code is based around a number of guiding principles, and adherence to these principles should form the basis of all benchmarking exercises involving Scottish Police Forces, regardless of whether the partnership is initiated by a police Force or another organisation.

The Principles of Benchmarking

1. Principles of Preparation

- 1.1 Demonstrate commitment to the efficiency and effectiveness of benchmarking by being prepared prior to making an initial benchmarking contact.
- 1.2 Make the most of your benchmarking partner's time by being fully prepared for each exchange.
- 1.3 Help your benchmarking partners to prepare by providing them with a questionnaire and agenda prior to benchmarking visits.
- 1.4 Before any benchmarking contact, especially the sending of questionnaires to source benchmarking information, consider whether legal advice may be necessary.

2. Principles of Contact

- 2.1 Respect the corporate culture of partner organisations and work within mutually agreed procedures.
- 2.2 Use benchmarking contacts designated by the partner organisation if that is its preferred procedure.
- 2.3 Agree with the designated benchmarking contact how communication or responsibility is to be delegated in the course of the benchmarking exercise. Check mutual understanding.
- 2.4 Obtain an individual's permission before providing their name in response to a contact request.
- 2.5 Avoid communicating a contact's name in open forum without the contact's prior permission.

3. Principles of Exchange

- 3.1 Be willing to provide the same type and level of information that you request from your benchmarking partner, providing that the principle of legality is observed.
- 3.2 Communicate fully and early in the relationship to clarify expectations, avoid misunderstanding and establish mutual interest in the benchmarking exchange.
- 3.3 Be honest and complete.

4. Principles of Confidentiality

- 4.1 Treat benchmarking findings as confidential to the individuals and organisations involved. Such information must not be communicated to third parties without the prior permission of the benchmarking partner who shared the information. When seeking prior consent make sure that you specify clearly what information is to be shared with whom.
- 4.2 An organisation's participation in a study is confidential and should not be communicated externally without their permission.

5. Principles of Use

- 5.1 Use information obtained through benchmarking only for the purposes stated to and agreed with the benchmarking partner.
- 5.2 The use of communication of a benchmarking partner's name with the data obtained or the practices observed requires the prior permission of the benchmarking partner.
- 5.3 Contact lists or other information provided by benchmarking networks in any form may not be used for purposes other than benchmarking.

6. Principles of Legality

- 6.1 If there is any potential question on the legality of an activity, take legal advice.
- 6.2 Avoid discussion or actions that could lead to or imply an interest in restraint of trade, market and/or customer allocation schemes, price fixing, bid rigging, bribery, or any other anti-competitive practices. Don't discuss your pricing policy with competitors.
- 6.3 Refrain from the acquisition of information by any means that could be interpreted as improper.
- 6.4 Do not disclose or use any confidential information that may have been obtained through improper means, or that was disclosed by violation of a duty of confidentiality.
- 6.5 Do not, as a consultant, client or otherwise, pass on benchmarking findings to another organisation without first getting the permission of your benchmarking partner and without first ensuring that the data is suitably 'blinded' and anonymous so that participants' identities are protected.

7. Principle of Completion

- 7.1 Follow through each commitment made to your partner in a timely manner.
- 7.2 Endeavour to complete each benchmarking study to the satisfaction of all benchmarking partners as mutually agreed.

8. Principle of Understanding and Agreement

- 8.1 Understand how your benchmarking partner would like to be treated and treat them that way.
- 8.2 Agree how your benchmarking partner expects you to use the information provided, and do not use it in any way that would break the agreement.

Appendix C

Inspection Programme

Start Dates	Force	Inspection	Formal Inspection Dates 2001	Target Publication
18-Dec-00	D&G	3rd YR	22-26 Jan	16-Mar-01
20-Nov-00	Fife	Primary	12-16 Feb	25-May-01
10-Feb-01	Central	2nd YR	12-16 Mar	06-May-01
07-Mar-01	L&B	3rd YR	9-13 Apr	03-Jun-01
09-May-01	Strathclyde	2nd YR	11-15 June	05-Aug-01
16-Apr-01	Grampian	Primary	6-10 August	08 Oct-01
18-Jul-01	Tayside	3rd YR	20-24 Aug	14-Oct-01
01-Aug-01	Northern	2nd YR	3-7 Sept	31-Oct-01
			2002	
29-Oct-01	D&G	Primary	21-25 Jan	29-Mar-02
09-Jan-02	Fife	2nd YR	11-15 Feb	05-Apr-02
09-Feb-02	Central	3rd YR	11-15 Mar	05-May-02
21-Jan-02	L&B	Primary	15-19 Apr	21-Jun-02
08-May-02	Strathclyde	3rd YR	10-14 June	04-Aug-02
13-Jun-02	Grampian	2nd YR	15-19 July	09-Sep-02
27-May-02	Tayside	Primary	19-23 Aug	25-Oct-02
07-Aug-02	Northern	3rd YR	9-13 Sept	03-Nov-02
			2003	
18-Dec-02	D&G	2nd YR	20-24 Jan	14-Mar-03
15-Jan-03	Fife	3rd YR	17-21 Feb	11-Apr-03
16-Dec-02	Central	Primary	10-14 Mar	16-May-03
12-Mar-03	L&B	2nd YR	14-18 Apr	08-Jun-03
17-Mar-03	Strathclyde	Primary	9-20 June	22-Aug-03
12-Jun-03	Grampian	3rd YR	14-18 July	08-Sep-03
16-Jul-03	Tayside	2nd YR	18-22 Aug	12-Oct-03
23-Jun-03	Northern	Primary	15-19 Sept	21-Nov-03

Appendix D

Consultative Group Members

Organisation	Represented by:
ACPOS	Mr Peter Wilson, (now Chief Constable Fife Constabulary) Mr Douglas Cross, Tayside Police
ASPS	Mr Jack Urquhart Superintendent Donald Urquhart, Lothian And Borders Police
Audit Scotland	Mr Alan Neilson Ms Lesley Bloomer Mr Derek Stewart
COSLA	Mr Jon Harris
Scottish Executive Police Division	Mr George Vine
Scottish Executive Local Government Division	Ms Mary Newman Mr Greig Chalmers
Scottish Police Federation	Mr Douglas J Keil
UNISON	Ms Margaret O'Neill

Appendix E

Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

ACPOS	<p>Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland.</p> <p>The membership of the Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland is made up of all Chief Constables, Deputy Chief Constables and Assistant Chief Constables in Scotland.</p> <p>ACPOS operates through eight Standing committees, which determine policies for policing throughout Scotland.</p>
ASPS	<p>Association of Scottish Police Superintendents.</p> <p>The Association, which is the sole representative body for all officers of the rank of Superintendent in police forces in Scotland and on central service, exists to further the professional and welfare interests of its members. It has the role of bringing to the attention of Chief Constables, Police Authorities, Government Ministers and the Police Negotiating Board for the UK, matters which affect the service.</p>
Audit Scotland Accounts Commission	<p>Audit Scotland was set up on 1 April 2000 to provide services to the Accounts Commission and the Auditor General for Scotland. Together they help to ensure that the Scottish Executive and public sector bodies in Scotland are held to account for the proper, efficient and effective use of around £17 billion of public funds</p>
Annual Statistical Return (ASR)	<p>A report containing statistics relating to major areas of force activity, completed by each of the forces and submitted to HMIC on an annual basis.</p>
The 'Balanced Scorecard'	<p>The 'Balance Scorecard' approach translates an organisation's strategic objectives into four sets of performance measures, which can be further sub divided. This is based on the premise that no single performance indicator can capture the full complexity of an organisation's performance. The technique can be applied at all levels of an organisation by creating a cascade of key performance indicators at each level, all designed to assess the contribution made towards achieving corporate goals.</p>
Benchmarking	<p>Benchmarking is a structured approach to finding ways to improve an organisation's performance so that it conforms to – or moves towards – best practice. In the context of HMIC inspections it is to lay down points of reference to which other or future inspections can be compared and assessed for compliance.</p>

CIPFA	Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy CIPFA is a leading professional accountancy body in the public sector. It provides education and training in accountancy and financial management and set and monitor professional standards.
COSLA	Convention of Scottish Local Authorities COSLA is the representative voice of Scotland's unitary local authorities. Its main objectives are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and maintain effective working relationships with the Scottish Parliament, Scottish Executive, UK Government, European institutions and partner organisations, with a view to promoting the role of councils and ensuring that local government has greater control over its own affairs • Support councils in providing leadership for the communities they represent, strengthening local democracy and increasing the public's awareness of and support for local government • Support councils in the continuous improvement of service delivery and in providing the best possible value for money
Common Police Services (CPS)	These are organisations that have been set up to support all 8 police forces from central units e.g. Scottish Police College.
European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) Business Excellence Model (BEM)	The Excellence Model is a comprehensive framework for assessing the strengths and areas for improvement of an organisation across the whole spectrum of its activities. It has been developed for over ten years and is based on the practical experience of hundreds of organisations across Europe – both in the private and public sectors. It is widely used by private and public sector organisations of all sizes.
Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness	Drawing from the experience of Audit Scotland, these terms can be understood as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economy measures deal with the cost of acquiring the various resources that are used in providing the service. The aim is to ensure that, for a specified standard, the organisation is not paying more than it needs to. • Efficiency measures are used to evaluate how much output is produced for the resources used in providing a service. • Effectiveness is about whether the service is achieving what it was intended to achieve. Clearly, effectiveness depends upon first having decided what the objectives are for the service.

Performance Indicator	An aspect of force activity, usually quantifiable, which has been specifically selected to represent a measure of force performance relating to that activity.
PINS	<p>The Police Information Net for Scotland</p> <p>The Police Information Net for Scotland was developed from paper based references, primarily the Scottish Criminal Law and Road Traffic Law manuals. In April 1997 the responsibility for updating the manuals was passed to the Scottish Police College with the remit to convert them into an electronic reference source. Since that time, the College has developed PINS using the latest internet technologies.</p> <p>The current release of PINS incorporates updated electronic versions of the Scottish Criminal Law and Road Traffic Law and includes official guidance from Scottish Office Circulars. The system also offers access to national flexible learning materials and provides details of the range of training currently delivered by the Scottish Police College.</p>
Prince 2	PRINCE, which stands for Projects in Controlled Environments, is a project management method covering the organisation, management and control of projects. The latest version of the method, Prince 2, is designed to incorporate the requirements of existing users and to enhance the method towards a generic, best practice approach for the management of all types of projects.
Police Authorities	These bodies consist of members drawn from elected representatives of local councils within the force areas and oversee police expenditure and efficiency.
Scottish Police Federation	The Scottish Police Federation was established by the Police Act, 1919. It is now covered by the Police Act, 1964. It is the representative body of the Constables, Sergeants, Inspectors and Chief Inspectors in the Scottish Police service. It operates nationally through an executive known as the Joint Central Committee and locally through Joint Branch Boards. Nationally and locally it is the duty of the Scottish Police Federation to consider and bring to notice matters affecting welfare and efficiency.
Thematic Inspection	The inspection of a specific theme across all forces and common police services to identify good practice and shortcomings and to provide a 'snapshot' position statement with which to benchmark future inspections.
UNISON	UNISON is a trade union whose members work in the public services or for private companies providing services to the public or for voluntary organisations. They include manual and white collar staff working full or part time in local authorities.

© Crown copyright 2001

Further copies are available from The Stationery Office Bookshop
71 Lothian Road, Edinburgh, EH3 9AZ
Tel: 0870 606 5566

Produced on behalf of the Scottish Executive by Astron B19399 6-01

I S B N 0 - 7 5 5 9 - 0 0 4 9 - 9



9 780755 900497