



HMICS HM INSPECTORATE OF
CONSTABULARY FOR SCOTLAND

Thematic Inspection
Productivity of police officers



© Crown copyright 2008

ISBN: 978-0-7559-5750-7

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary for Scotland
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

Produced for Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary for Scotland by RR Donnelley B55957 05/08

Published by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary for Scotland, May, 2008



SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In 2005 HM Inspectorate of Constabulary for Scotland (HMICS) published our thematic inspection report *Managing Improvement*. It described in detail how performance management was then developing and expanding across the Service. That same year the Association of Chief Police Officers for Scotland (ACPOS), in recognition of the importance of performance management and continuous improvement, established the Performance Management Business Area (PMBA).

The PMBA has as its strategic aims:

- develop information and automate data capture to better inform national strategic planning and the identification of renewed policing priorities for Scotland;
- develop information about the policing environment and the performance of the Scottish police service;
- capture learning about operational performance improvement elsewhere; and,
- in partnership with key agencies, develop information sharing which supports the achievement of joint national and community objectives.

These aims fully support the statutory duties of the police and police authorities/boards in relation to the provision of service and the duty to secure continuous improvement and best value.

The objective of this inspection by HM Inspectorate of Constabulary for Scotland (HMICS) was to review how police forces in Scotland address the productivity of police officers in pursuit of these aims and aspirations. The inspection focused on:

- how performance and tasking are managed and monitored at an operational level;
- forces' use of the Scottish Policing Performance Framework (SPPF or Framework), both internally and in reporting to their police authority/board;
- how prepared forces are for the introduction of the Common Performance Management Platform (CPMP) being developed by the Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland (ACPOS);
- the potential of the new national Personal Development Review within forces for enhancing individual performance measures; and
- how activity analysis is being developed for use in performance management.

HMICS makes the following recommendations in this report and anticipates that forces may wish to address most of these collectively under the steerage of the Performance Management Business Area. However, the Inspectorate will continue to expect individual forces to report on progress:

Recommendation 1: So as to promote greater consistency, accountability and transparency across Scotland, all forces should incorporate the Scottish Policing Performance Framework into their own public performance reports and use this as a basis for reporting to their police authority/board.

Recommendation 2: So that frontline performance can best contribute to overall service improvement, all forces should develop their ability to capture, use and analyse performance data which is timely and accessible, and encourage an increased focus at team and individual levels through inspectors and sergeants.



Recommendation 3: That all forces, in keeping with National Intelligence Model processes, introduce clear processes for tasking all staff: directing their performance and activities in line with identified organisational and local priorities, and increasing accountability.

Recommendation 4: That all forces review and develop training provided to sergeants and inspectors to increase their ability to fulfil their organisational role in providing leadership and in achieving continuous improvement in performance and maintaining standards.

Recommendation 5: That all forces adopt all parts of the new objective-driven national PDR system, and ensure that managers and staff are made aware of the value and necessity of these processes.

Recommendation 6: That all forces agree a common methodology for recording activity analysis with primary focus on management and performance information.

Recommendation 7: That all forces carry out the preparatory work necessary to allow the new Common Performance Management Platform to be implemented without delay.





Introduction

1. The police service in Scotland has always considered itself to be accountable to the public as well as to local and national government. In recent years there has been mounting pressure, not just within policing but in the public sector as a whole, for such accountability to be visible and transparent. This has exposed policing to an ever greater range and extent of scrutiny. In response, forces have begun to rely increasingly on more visible performance management processes.
 2. But most public service organisations, including police forces, have also recognised themselves the need to engage in performance management for the improvement of the service they provide to the public.
 3. In 2005 we published our report *Managing Improvement*. In it, we described in detail how performance management was then developing and expanding across the Service. Though we noted areas for improvement, the report painted a positive picture of a burgeoning culture of performance management in forces. It was not intended that this inspection specifically address the previous report's recommendations – though we were pleased to observe how senior managers felt performance management to be integral to the operation of force and territorial commands. Nevertheless, some of the themes touched on will be familiar.
 4. Credit must be given here to the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPOS) and in particular to the Performance Management Business Area (PMBA) which the Association set up in response to *Managing Improvement*. Much has been achieved by the direction and coordination provided by this group. However, it will be seen that our inspection found that the influence of ACPOS does not appear to be as strong as it occasionally needs to be in terms of promoting a consistent approach to service improvement and public reporting. We suspect that this is not necessarily due to any lack of commitment from the members of the PMBA, rather to the lack of formal systems for translating agreed ACPOS policy into reality. This is one of the reasons that HMICS is encouraging ACPOS to review how its policies, strategies and standards are recorded, made accessible, and implemented across Scotland.
 5. Regional and local variations will always be necessary in policing, but not in those areas where the public and their elected representatives reasonably expect consistency and adherence to minimum standards. As far as this thematic inspection report is concerned, we anticipate that both ACPOS and the Police Conveners' Forum will take particular and active interest in progression of the recommendations.
 6. The decision to conduct a thematic inspection on officer productivity arose from our consultation and risk process for identifying and prioritising topics for scrutiny. Initially our focus was on how performance management was dealt with at team and individual levels, and how forces were preparing for the implementation of the Platform Project. But following an approach from ACPOS Performance Management Business Area, we extended our terms of reference to look at how forces were using the Scottish Policing Performance Framework. We also agreed to examine how forces had integrated performance management, from the strategic down to the operational level, and how this linked to the National Intelligence Model.
-



- 7.** Management theorists and organisational consultants may debate long and hard on whether the performance of an organisation is most influenced by its leaders and managers, its individual members, or its operating environment and culture. Most commentators today would agree that the truth lies somewhere in a combination of all of these factors.
 - 8.** It is certainly true that the quickest and perhaps least resource-intensive improvements can be made when managers recognise how procedures, processes, systems, etc, can be altered to allow the organisation to achieve its purposes more efficiently and effectively than before. Learning organisations – which are not afraid to accept that weakness or error is most often organisational and least often individual – do this successfully all the time.
 - 9.** The police services of the world have not been famed in the past as learning organisations, preferring the blame culture which focuses on personal failure. However, this is changing in the UK and evidence for this can be found, for instance, in the way in which some police forces in Scotland are beginning to use complaints about the police as learning opportunities, encouraged by the approach of the new Police Complaints Commissioner for Scotland.
 - 10.** Improvements brought about by changing the performance outputs of individuals or the culture of an organisation are likely to take longer and require more effort. However, it is sometimes the case that they may provide the most sustainable improvements and will certainly increase the quality as well as the quantity of service.
 - 11.** Our new thematic inspections are intended to be of shorter duration, tighter focus and less burden on forces. Consequently we request less written information from forces and try to seek more innovative ways of exploring subjects. In this inspection, only performance issues relating to police officers were fully explored. However, as part of a wider evidence-gathering exercise we conducted an internet survey of all staff working in Scottish forces and policing agencies. Despite the potential constraint of requiring internet access to take part, 2,440 members of staff responded (around 10% of all police personnel).
 - 12.** The results of this survey have been used to augment the findings of this inspection. A copy of the questions can be found at Annex A and more analysis of the results is presented in Annex B. Because of the volume and quality of responses, we will be publishing an additional and separate report giving more detailed analysis and comment on the findings.
 - 13.** During the inspection we visited all eight forces. Interviews were held with members of force executives and divisional/area command teams, as well as with inspectors, sergeants and constables in response and community policing roles. We were pleased to note that the results of the survey validate the findings of the fieldwork.
-



Scottish Policing Performance Framework

“The introduction of a wider range of performance measures have helped to create a more balanced picture.” – *Headquarters Chief Inspector with more than 20 years’ service*¹

“Another problem with measuring performance is that areas that are difficult to measure can be overlooked or undervalued. There are a great many areas in traditional police work that are difficult to measure in terms of performance and effectiveness that still can play a valuable role in many areas. Just because something is difficult to measure or evaluate does not render it ineffective.” – *Training Constable with more than 20 years’ service*²

- 14.** The Framework was launched on 1st April 2007, with its first annual public performance report due to be published in the summer/autumn of 2008. Its purpose is to provide a coherent, core national framework for measuring and reporting police performance at force and national level, fed by a single, commonly agreed, suite of measures. Its contents have been developed in consultation with, among others, Audit Scotland, and therefore include all existing statutory performance indicators. This arrangement should prove a strong basis for managing and improving performance throughout the police service in Scotland, while the performance information it produces will help to enhance accountability.
- 15.** Constructed around four separate performance areas, the Framework covers the breadth of policing activity. High level objectives within each area are supported by specific performance measures. These in turn, fall into one of three categories: outcomes (final results), activities (required to achieve outcomes) and inputs (resources used). A fourth category contains contextual indicators, incorporated to promote better understanding of the environment in which police forces operate. Crucially, there is scope at each stage for local measures to be included.
- 16.** The moderate number of indicators in the first year of the Framework reflected the limitations on what could be measured at that time. A revised and more comprehensive set of measures was anticipated in year 2008/2009, with further adjustments taking place where appropriate on an annual basis thereafter.
- 17.** The anticipated benefits of the framework are as follows:
- accurate performance data that can be used to drive continuous improvement and more effective performance management;
 - improved reporting and greater accountability; and
 - clearer shared understanding between the police service, stakeholders and the public on what policing activity can and cannot achieve.
- 18.** During the inspection it was apparent that most forces had implemented the Scottish Policing Performance Framework to varying degrees. This ranged from being fully accepted by one force, whose internal and external performance measures reflected even the design of the Framework, to non-acceptance by two others.

¹ HMICS Productivity Survey January/February 2008

² *ibid*



- 19.** Furthermore, there were similarities and differences in the ways in which forces had integrated the Framework. Four had incorporated it into their public performance reporting, each having developed, or looking to develop local indicators in conjunction with the Framework. We consider this flexible approach to be good practice. A fifth force had since adopted a different method of publishing its performance information.
- 20.** Three forces were using the Framework as the basis of their performance reporting to police authorities/boards, with another intending to do so in the future. These reports were supplemented by information on matters of local priority and further contextual information.
- 21.** Police authority/board convenors had already received an awareness presentation outlining the rationale behind the Framework, courtesy of the Framework project team. Further presentations to inform other members of authorities/boards were planned. We believe that there are considerable benefits, as well as those of greater transparency and accountability, to be gained from a common approach to performance reporting that uses the framework as its foundation. For example, once the consistency and accuracy of performance reports is secured, Audit Scotland may be able to discharge its statutory duty to report on performance indicators, through the Framework. The Framework could, in the future, also prove a useful source of benchmarking data for forces.
- 22.** The SPPF is therefore of particular value to police authorities/boards, especially in relation to their duty to secure best value. This will become even more evident as forces and their authorities/boards become accustomed to and practiced in the use of the standardised self assessment process which will replace individual force inspections by HMICS from June 2008. The self assessment process uses indicators within the SPPF as evidence for every step of the self assessment process – affording senior staff and the authorities/boards to which they are accountable the opportunities to rate themselves against similar units elsewhere in the same force and eventually elsewhere in Scotland. As well as adding indicators of local interest at that level, police authorities and boards will undoubtedly wish to see the core Framework develop with data of particular, common interest to them. The opportunity exists, through the Scottish Conveners' Forum's representation on the Senior Strategic Steering Group (SSSG), for this to be achieved.
- 23.** Returning to the inspection we found that, in most forces, knowledge of the Framework was restricted to senior managers. Whilst this appeared to be a deliberate strategy in some cases, we believe that, as the Framework becomes increasingly embedded in police business, awareness amongst officers of all ranks will rise.
- 24.** For the Scottish Policing Performance Framework to be a success, the public, the forces and their stakeholders must all have confidence in its reporting processes. In order to achieve this, each force must incorporate the Framework into its performance measurement arrangements; without such a shared national commitment, the value of the Framework diminishes.
-



25. The Senior Strategic Steering Group (SSSG) has agreed that the SPPF will also be reported nationally and that the organisation most able to do this objectively should be HM Inspectorate of Constabulary for Scotland. The first annual report on the data collected for the Framework will therefore appear in the Autumn of 2008, albeit it can only contain historical comparative data in this first iteration for those indicators where this was previously available. Current monitoring of the data being collected for the Framework indicates that, understandably in a new venture such as this, some of the data is not yet consistently recorded, and some has revealed apparent inconsistencies or anomalies in performance or contextual information not previously identified. Exposing this information to public scrutiny will be challenging for forces and therefore time spent now in gaining an understanding of the causes of these variations will be beneficial both from a performance management and public information perspective.

Key Finding: That a common approach to reporting and publishing performance information will significantly improve transparency, accountability, and ultimately confidence, in the police service in Scotland.

Recommendation 1: So as to promote greater consistency, accountability and transparency across Scotland, all forces should incorporate the Scottish Policing Performance Framework into their own public performance reports and use this as a basis for reporting to their police authority/board.

Performance Management Data

26. The development of the Framework and the associated work by ACPOS on routine reporting of performance information has raised considerable concern around how forces gather and report information. Inconsistently applied criteria and counting rules have proved particularly problematic. Added to this are technological restrictions on what information forces can easily produce. This situation is currently being quantified and documented as part of the CPMP project.

27. The CPMP will provide a solution in the future. In the meantime it is important to emphasise that in order to improve performance and the quality of service that the public receives, it is vital that all forces and agencies fully understand their current levels of performance. The new self-assessment process for forces – for which, at the time of the inspection, training was already underway and pilots soon to be carried out – will greatly assist in increasing this understanding, as it will involve members of staff from all roles, ranks and functions. However, based on the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) business excellence model, the Results sections of the self-assessment questionnaire calls for a significant level of organisational performance information over and above that required for the SPPF. This was not well developed in some forces and most have some way to go to if they are to meet the requirements.

28. Senior managers in every force and division/command area therein, clearly appreciated the need for performance management. And all had in place established methods for capturing, analysing and reporting performance information at force and divisional level. However, in some cases information was only collated and examined at monthly or quarterly intervals. This is in stark contrast to the best performing forces in England and Wales, where at all levels performance information is monitored on a daily basis.



29. Forces that examined performance information on a quarterly basis were using information that was in effect historical. Indeed the oldest information we saw being used was almost four months old. In such instances the potential benefits are limited, and what is intended to be performance management is actually only performance monitoring, albeit still better than nothing.

30. Some sergeant and inspector ranks were able to give examples where area/divisional performance information had been broken down to station, team or individual level in a facilitated and co-ordinated manner. However, at an operational level generally, a focus upon performance management was less evident. In part this was due to difficulties in obtaining and accessing such data and then converting it into meaningful information for performance management purposes. But even where information was being captured, some sergeants and inspectors remained unaware of its value. Because of this they neither sought such information out nor used what was readily available.

31. All forces (and police authorities/boards for their duty to secure best value) have a responsibility to make the best use of existing systems to extract, or where appropriate to develop methods of extracting, performance management information for all levels of management.

32. In Grampian Police, we observed an enhanced information technology system capable of doing precisely this. During fieldwork the representative of one territorial division was able to demonstrate the good use made of this technology in analysing the performance of teams and individuals and identifying areas for further scrutiny. The purpose was not to compare the achievements of teams or individuals, the division was keen to stress, but to give managers the information they needed to manage and influence performance effectively.

33. Another positive aspect was the division's noticeable focus on supplementary qualitative data to lend an explanatory context to the figures. A similar finding was apparent in Tayside Police, where managers at all levels believed that a concentration on figures in the past had allowed them to develop a strong, resilient and mature performance culture. Here too, the focus had since moved on to identifying indicators based on quality rather than quantity. Indeed as a general rule across the Service we noted that the more advanced the use of performance data as a management tool by sergeants and inspectors, the greater a focus upon quality. This is a healthy and very encouraging development.

34. Returning to the first force, the same division seemed reluctant, however, to share its performance data with its sergeants. This appeared to stem from a lack of confidence in these ranks and concern as to the manner in which they would employ the data. The engagement of teams and individual members of staff in performance management is central to achieving continuous improvement in forces. Performance data at this level can assist sergeants and inspectors by informing their decisions: providing indicators of performance and serving as a basis for benchmarking. In our view, providing such information to sergeants is essential to improving performance in policing.

35. A number of other forces also captured team and individual performance data. Nevertheless, in some instances we remained concerned about the timeliness of the information gathered, the amount of time supervisors took to locate and collate this information and the lack of supplementary contextual information.





36. During the inspection, officers of both constable and supervisory ranks expressed an interest in performance management information. Many, however, found much of it lengthy and not easily interpretable. We therefore believe that publishing force performance data in a shortened, user-friendly format, with key performance issues highlighted, would be beneficial.

37. We were also aware of the suspicion with which some viewed the collation of performance data, and its perceived association with so-called 'league table' comparisons. The Police Federation and officers of various rank highlighted the wide variety of roles performed by police officers and the difficulties in drawing comparisons across these. We recognise that activities cannot always be quantified, nor should performance management ever focus solely upon quantitative measures. However, we also recognise that, for individual performance comparison, adjustments relating to role, location and *time available for operational duties* can be made. The performance of teams operating in the same area is particularly ripe for direct comparison – experience from Scottish experiments and elsewhere in the world has shown this to be a fruitful area of management.

38. Members of the public may be justifiably surprised to learn that some aspects of individual and team performance is not consistently measured. Can sergeants and inspectors possibly do their jobs properly if they don't know how many quality intelligence reports are submitted by each of their constables? Can they be said to be supervising if they don't know if their teams are performing better or worse than the others in that area? Shouldn't they want to know how many of the search warrants sought by their officers resulted in positive finds, and how that compares to the average in their division or force? These are examples of indicators which are a combination of quantitative and qualitative measurements.

39. The Inspectorate accepts that considerable work is still needed, to develop these and other robust methods of assessing the quantitative and qualitative aspects of policing at individual and team level, as well as at the higher levels of structures. Some of the individual and team measures will need to be different from the SPPF for instance. Some indicators need time to be properly understood or adjusted so that they make more sense. But forces and ACPOS should not wait until everything is developed and can be implemented at the same time. Performance management is a work in progress and always will be. If results are assessed with these concerns in mind, balanced and informed management decisions can be made.

Key Finding: Performance management requires accurate, current and meaningful data. Managers need ready access to easily interpretable performance information, in order to identify performance issues and to inform decisions then taken.

Recommendation 2: So that frontline performance can best contribute to overall service improvement, all forces should develop their ability to capture, use and analyse performance data which is timely and accessible, and encourage an increased focus at team and individual levels through inspectors and sergeants.





National Intelligence Model

“Whilst I am aware of the NIM ethos, its application in my division has very little quantifiable impact at my level – patrol/response supervisor. There is no structure to tasking at this level and is entirely reliant on self-initiation.” – *Operational Patrol Sergeant with more than 20 years’ service*³

“The Deputy Chief Constable has decreed that Officers should not play “the numbers game” which was getting to be the case, to the extent that discretion was not being used for minor crimes or incidents. This dictum has raised morale where it has also left more time for Officers to progress more serious crime and incidents more effectively and thoroughly. This has also had an effect with enquiries being passed on properly which has to be the case due to a recently new shift pattern which has been implemented.” – *Operational Patrol Sergeant with more than 10 years’ service*⁴

40. Since its adoption in 2000, the National Intelligence Model (NIM) has been integrated into the practices and daily business of all forces. The NIM structure allows intelligence and information to be analysed, threats to be identified and high level priorities to be established, at local, force and national levels. Setting priorities is essential to the effective focusing and targeting of police resources.

41. As part of our inspection survey we asked police officers and staff: “How familiar are you with the National Intelligence Model or NIM as it is also called?” The results suggested that NIM was widely understood throughout the Service, with 80% (1,334) of police officers very or moderately familiar with it.⁵

42. To get a picture of how widely the practical implications of NIM were understood, the survey also asked: “How familiar are you with your department, unit, division or force tasking process (e.g. who decides what tasking should be raised, how this is then allocated, how to respond and so on)?”. The responses showed that 89% (1,452) of police officers and 71% (421) of police staff were very or moderately familiar with tasking processes.⁶ These figures, and those above, supported the findings of our fieldwork and demonstrate that considerable progress has been made since implementation of NIM in spreading an understanding of its structure and processes.

43. During the inspection it was clear that briefings were provided to officers on taking up their duty. In most forces front-line officers were being tasked. However, it became apparent that some of the officers involved were not always clear as to the exact lines of communication and protocols associated with carrying out and recording the results of such tasking. Briefing processes are central to ensuring that officers understand both the task and the necessity. Some forces used electronic briefing systems to disseminate key information. However officers and supervisors, by their own admission, were often selective when choosing the material that they read when self-briefing and in what they presented to their teams. An example offered by supervisors and officers in a number of forces was that while force and local priorities are listed as part of every electronic briefing these are usually skipped over.

44. A number of officers voiced concerns at the lack of feedback they received on completed tasks. Our findings indicated too, that evaluations of the effectiveness of completed tasks were carried out on an ad-hoc basis, suggesting a direct correlation between this lack of evaluation and the lack of feedback.

³ *ibid*

⁴ *ibid*

⁵ See Table 10 at Annex B of this report.

⁶ See Table 15 at Annex B of this report.



45. Within each of the forces, front-line officers were aware of the control strategy and priorities set both at force level and locally. This was confirmed by responses to our survey question: “*How familiar are you with your organisational and/or local control strategy and its priorities?*”. Here 83% (1,294) of police officers claimed to be very or moderately familiar with these.⁷

46. Nearly eight in every ten police officers surveyed (79% or 1,239) recognised the link between the control strategy and priorities and how this influenced subsequent activities. Less consolidated though, was an appreciation of how this link should work on a day-to-day basis at operational level.⁸ We recognise that the role of operational officer carries with it many demands and that, in some instances, much of an officer’s working day can be spent attending incidents and processing associated paperwork.

47. Conversely though, there are also occasions when operational officers are not engaged in these activities and have what can be regarded as ‘unallocated patrol time’. In the survey we asked operational officers: “*While on operational duty, do you ever have time that is NOT taken up attending incidents or conducting enquiries?*”. Nearly three-quarters of the officers (73% or 797) replied that they did on occasion have unallocated time.⁹ During our inspection, operational officers indicated that during such periods they would do one of the following:

- attempt to self-generate work;
- direct their patrol in line with their local knowledge and their perceptions of problem issues; or
- on occasions follow pre-determined policing plans.

On the basis of these fieldwork responses, we included the question “*Which of the following statements best describes how you use this unallocated time?*” in our survey. Tables 1 and 2 below show how responses broke down across the categories.

	Police officer, including special constable
On the majority of occasions I tend to decide myself what I should do	350 (45%)
On the majority of occasions I tend to direct my activities to dealing with any tasking received at briefings	263 (34%)
Other	165 (21%)
Total	778 (100%)

Table 1

The ‘other’ category above is of interest, and further comment is made in Annex B under the analysis for question 11.

⁷ See Table 16 at Annex B to this report.

⁸ See Table 17 at Annex B to this report.

⁹ See Table 11 and Table 12 at Annex B to this report.



48. In effect, 45% of officers were aligning activities with their own interests and agenda. Whilst many did so with admirable intent, as Table 2 shows, the result was a dilution of focus on identified priorities.

Which one factor below is the most likely to influence the decision as to what to do with any unallocated time?	Police officer, including special constable
Professional interest	44 (1%)
Knowledge and experience of policing	122 (35%)
Local knowledge of the area	50 (14%)
Identified community concerns	90 (26%)
Intuition	25 (7%)
Other (please specify)	19 (5%)
Total	350 (100%)

Table 2

49. We believe that 'unallocated patrol time' offers forces considerable scope to improve performance. This needs to be achieved by actively directing officers to perform duties in line with identified force or local priorities, using clear, auditable, tasking procedures. HMICS does not argue that anything like 100% of unallocated patrol time needs to be influenced by tasking or other means of giving attention to identified priorities, but we do believe that this ought to have a much stronger influence than it does in the picture implied by our survey. As outlined in Recommendation 4, the role of the sergeant is essential to ensuring appropriate adherence to these procedures, with accountability lying with both them and their officers.

Key Finding: The activities of front-line officers are not always directed in support of identified priorities and protocols for tasking front-line officers often lack transparency. In addition, forces should conduct more evaluations of completed tasks.

Recommendation 3: That all forces, in keeping with National Intelligence Model processes, introduce clear processes for tasking all staff: directing their performance and activities in line with identified organisational and local priorities, and increasing accountability.



Sergeants and Inspectors

“The operation of the police comes down to the performance of first line managers; in organisation, Sergeants and (to a lesser extent) Inspectors.” – *Road Policing Sergeant with more than 10 years’ service*¹⁰

50. As mentioned above, while we found tasking processes to be well established in forces and operational units, implementation was not always seen to be the main priority at operational level. The performance of front-line officers, and the standards that they achieve, ultimately determines the level and quality of service the public receives. It is therefore vital that sergeants and inspectors steer the activities of officers towards identified national and local priorities, and to the results of the tasking process, while continuing to ensure that standards are maintained.

51. For sergeants and inspectors to co-ordinate the performance of officers effectively in this manner, they must understand what is expected of their role and display the leadership qualities expected of their roles. During the inspection we often found significant differences between a sergeant’s perception of what his or her role entailed and those of the divisional commander and other senior managers whose policing plan they were supposed to be implementing. A common theme identified by sergeants and inspectors was the need to try to ‘get through the day’, monitoring and assisting officers responding to and attending incidents; thus preoccupied, it appeared to be all too easy to forget about tasking. Indeed many sergeants felt that the majority of their time was spent in front of a computer, dealing with crime reports, process compliance and other administrative work. Others felt that shortages in resources meant that when out of the office they were treated like another response unit, a perception often reflected in the comments of the constables we spoke with.

52. The situation was frequently exacerbated by a lack of robust performance information. For example, those supervisors whose officers’ duties included responding to calls were often of the opinion that their officers were dealing with calls one after the other without break. Though Fridays and Saturdays are typically very busy, overall the information and research now becoming available does not substantiate the perception of constant call-responding throughout the week. Data relating to resource deployment and activity information was being more routinely captured and analysed in order to inform the introduction of variable shift arrangements (VSA). Regrettably, however, it did not appear to be filtered back to operational units. As outlined above, of those officers surveyed claiming to have unallocated time on occasion, only a third (34% or 263) routinely took the opportunity to pursue any tasking received at briefings.

53. It is essential that inspectors and sergeants are fully aware of and react properly to the changing needs and expectations of the organisation and its partnerships. During the inspection it was not always evident that senior managers at divisions/area commands were doing enough to engage with sergeants to convey these needs and expectations. Our case study of an English force, at Annex C, shows the positive results that can be achieved when senior managers do just this.

¹⁰ HMICS Productivity Survey January/February 2008



54. It became clear during this inspection that what training was available to sergeants and inspectors was not particularly effective in equipping them for their role as operational leaders. A small number of the sergeants with whom we spoke obviously did have the necessary skills and knowledge, and gave examples of how they mentored, coached and developed their team, for the most part while actually dealing with incidents. Inspectors at times also showed leadership and innovation in how they managed their areas or teams. However, both our findings and those of another HMICS team working on a thematic inspection of Customer Feedback, point to the need for training relating to performance and quality management to be introduced.

55. Turning again to our survey, we were interested to see how different ranks gauged the appropriateness of their personal objectives. Table 3 below contains the responses to the question: *“And in your opinion, do you feel that your personal objectives are appropriate for you and your role?”*. It is clear that compared with all the officers surveyed, a lower proportion of constables considered the objectives set for them by their line managers to be greatly appropriate. Fewer sergeants than inspectors too, felt their objectives to be appropriate to a great extent. We can only speculate here, but these findings could be indicative of sergeants’ and inspectors’ poor understanding of what is required.

	Constable	Sergeant	Inspector	Chief Inspector and above	Grand Total
To a great extent	233 (32%)	147 (39%)	101 (49%)	46 (51%)	527 (37%)
To a moderate extent	308 (42%)	145 (38%)	67 (32%)	30 (33%)	550 (39%)
To a slight extent	128 (18%)	54 (14%)	20 (10%)	9 (10%)	211 (15%)
Not at all	60 (8%)	35 (9%)	20 (10%)	5 (6%)	120 (9%)
Grand Total	729 (100%)	381 (100%)	208 (100%)	90 (100%)	1408 (100%)

Table 3

56. We consider the role of sergeants and inspectors to be crucial in improving the level of service provided by Scottish forces. With this acknowledgement comes the need to ensure appropriate investment in training for officers both new to and already in these positions. We recognise that forces offer a wide range of training. In our opinion, a review of that provided to sergeants and inspectors is urgently required, to gauge its suitability, particularly in relation to leadership and corporate responsibility. Consideration should also be given to what value could be added to courses held nationally at the Scottish Police College. The Inspectorate is aware that training abstraction is always a legitimate concern of commanders and chief officers and therefore does not contend that an increase in the total training provided to sergeants and inspectors is necessarily required. But we do believe that room must be made in that overall total for this particularly important part of the supervisory officer’s responsibilities.

Key Finding: The roles of sergeant and inspector are key to improving policing performance, and therefore their training ought to reflect that critical responsibility.

Recommendation 4: That all forces review and develop training provided to sergeants and inspectors to increase their ability to fulfil their organisational role in providing leadership and in achieving continuous improvement in performance and maintaining standards.



Personal Development Review (PDR) System

“I believe waiting a year for an appraisal is too long you lose focus on objectives and goals change throughout the year. In my previous job I received appraisals every month, I do not expect and would not expect the Police to follow suit however one every 3 to 6 Months would assist in maintaining focus on objectives, tasks and goals set that year” – *Operational Patrol Constable with more than 2 years service*¹¹

- 57.** As previously mentioned, the performance of officers directly influences the quality of service received by the public. There is therefore a need to take appropriate time to focus upon officers’ performance in a structured and co-ordinated manner. Force appraisal systems/PDR systems provide line managers with such a mechanism. As our survey revealed, 91% (1426) of officers claimed to have received an appraisal,¹² 88% (1252) indicating that it occurred at least once a year.¹³
- 58.** At the time of our inspection there was little uniformity in the use of appraisals across the Service. Constables and sergeants appeared to hold these systems in poor regard, often seeing them more as an encumbrance than for the positive opportunity they represent. In our view, this kind of attitude unfortunately reflects the negative culture that appears to have developed around appraisal processes throughout Scotland.
- 59.** However, in our survey the majority of police officers, 82% (1154), intimated that personal objectives had been set for them on most, or at least some, occasions during the appraisal process.¹⁴ This is encouraging and is undoubtedly an improvement on practice in previous years. Unfortunately only 37% (527) felt that the objectives set were to a great extent appropriate to their role.¹⁵ Proper use of the appraisal might then be seen as significantly inconsistent across Scotland and this was reinforced by answers to the question “*During your appraisals or performance reviews, is your performance subsequently assessed against these personal objectives?*”. Only 44% (623) of all police officers indicated that this happened on most or all occasions.¹⁶ That said, in Tayside Police and Grampian Police the proportions rose to 67% and 64%. Removing these forces from the calculation brings the proportion for the remaining forces down to 29%, with just over a third (34%) reporting that this happens rarely or not at all.¹⁷
- 60.** We were concerned to note that in response to the question “*Do your appraisals or other regular performance reviews tend to be completed on time?*”, only 35% (484) of police officers were able to respond that this was the case on most or all occasions. Twenty-three per cent (319) indicated that this occurred rarely, if at all.¹⁸ However, Tayside Police performed well in this area, managing to complete appraisals on most or all occasions for 70% of its police officers and only rarely or never achieving this for 7% of respondents. If this force is removed from the calculations, then the proportion of appraisals completed on time falls to 28% and that of appraisals completed rarely if at all rises to 26% of the police officers who responded.¹⁹

¹¹ HMICS Productivity Survey January/February 2008

¹² See Table 21 at Annex B to this report.

¹³ See Table 22 at Annex B to this report.

¹⁴ See Table 25 at Annex B to this report.

¹⁵ See Table 26 at Annex B to this report.

¹⁶ See Table 27 at Annex B to this report.

¹⁷ See Table 28 at Annex B to this report.

¹⁸ See Table 23 at Annex B to this report.

¹⁹ See Table 24 at Annex B to this report.



61. The ongoing implementation of a standard national Personal Development Review (PDR) system provides an opportunity to reinvigorate the review/appraisal process and use it as the beneficial performance management tool it should be. Currently the system has been implemented in Grampian Police, Fife Constabulary and in the Scottish Police Services Agency (SPSA) and a plan is in place for another 2 forces to introduce the system this year with the remaining forces taking the system in 2009. In order for it to be a success, there must be a concerted effort to educate all staff as to the reasons for and benefits of undertaking the process. Equally there must be a determination amongst officers of all ranks to commit to it. HMICS believes that it is also important that all of its constituent elements, including the interim performance reviews, are adopted. If forces were to allow the PDR system to be implemented without instilling the corresponding cultural change which these elements are designed to assist, a significant opportunity to improve organisational performance would be missed.

62. The PDR is an objectives-based appraisal system in which the subject of the appraisal identifies his or her objectives for the forthcoming review period. Importantly, role permitting, the majority of these objectives should be linked to relevant force and local priorities. Officers are also responsible for supplying any evidence of exceptional performance around their core competencies, while the onus is upon supervisors to record evidence of exceptional or less than satisfactory performance. An interim performance review meeting should be scheduled at least once during the appraisal year, to discuss the PDR, the officer's performance and any other matters arising. At these meetings the subjects of review/appraisal themselves should first be encouraged to identify their strengths and weaknesses. The results of any such meetings should be recorded.

63. At the time of the inspection one force was not conducting any annual appraisals. This was due to the delay in implementing the national PDR system, as a result of which the force was looking to introduce temporary measures should there be any further postponement. Another had integrated the completion of PDRs/appraisals into its planning cycle. Whilst this is a significant undertaking, there is an obvious logic to completing an objective-driven PDR once the force's priorities for the coming year have been formulated. We consider this to be an example of good practice.

64. The PDR system had been piloted in one Scottish force though without some of its key elements, such as the interim reviews, we were concerned to note. Officers and supervisors in this same force showed a lack of knowledge of the system and of belief in the benefits of a focused and constructive appraisal process.

65. Traditionally, the failure of supervisors to complete appraisals within the required timescales has contributed to the overall failing of such systems since relevance deteriorates rapidly over time. In order to resolve this problem, some forces had introduced a relevant performance indicator on submission times, with positive results. We consider this too to be good practice.

Key Finding: PDRs/appraisals throughout Scotland are not being used to their full advantage in supporting organisational performance improvement. In addition, neither staff nor supervisors appear to have fully grasped the mutual benefits that an interactive, objective-driven, appraisal process can bring.

Recommendation 5: That all forces adopt all parts of the new objective-driven national PDR system, and ensure that managers and staff are made aware of the value and necessity of these processes.



Activity-based Analysis

66. During this inspection it often became apparent that few forces had a clear picture of how operational officers spent their day. It has been mentioned previously that most forces were expending a great deal of effort in looking at resource management to inform the introduction of new variable shift arrangements (VSA). This information will obviously have a use in future performance management, by helping to target resources more precisely. But in the meantime, there is another related area in which forces are already exerting a considerable amount of effort, and that is activity analysis.

67. Previously, every three years, Scottish forces were required to conduct activity analysis to inform the former grant-aided expenditure process. This involved officers categorising the nature of their activities, throughout their working day and recording this in fifteen-minute periods. The exercises imposed considerable administrative burden on forces, who in turn made little practical use of the results.

68. Recent developments have seen more regular sampling being undertaken, with forces agreeing to adopt a common methodology and form. In practice, though, we found differences in the ways in which forces collected the data. The resulting information could not then be readily compared, and so this detracted from the value of the data.

69. Having the processes in place to gather such information clearly presents considerable opportunities for the Service and police authorities/boards. In order to improve performance it is necessary to understand 'what works', i.e. to make valid connections between cause and effect. Otherwise forces cannot know, for example, whether spending time on enforcement of different aspects of road traffic legislation is an efficient or effective way of increasing road safety, or whether time spent on preparation of reports to the Procurator Fiscal is directly related to the quality of the product and the likelihood of positive action.

70. At the time of the inspection, the focus of forces was purely on providing the data required by the Scottish Government. If this focus were to be extended to capturing internally meaningful performance management data, it would be of considerable value to policing in Scotland. For example, we learned that Central Scotland Police was gathering activity analysis data to use in assessing the impact of a new policing unit. The intention was to conduct a similar exercise in the year following its implementation and to compare the results. We look forward to seeing how this project develops.

71. We are also aware that the ACPOS Performance Management Business Area has recognised that activity analysis has much to offer performance analysis and improvement and the Inspectorate welcomes the decision to move the working group which coordinates activity analysis from the Finance Business Area to the PMBA.

72. The development of both the digital radio system common to all Scottish forces (Airwave) and the incident recording and management system (STORM MA) will significantly increase opportunities for the automated recording of officers' activity, thus reducing the current administrative burden. However, in order to realise the full benefits of these national systems, all forces will have to adhere to national incident codes.

Key Finding: There are variations in the recording of activity analysis information throughout Scotland. Up until very recently, as far as forces were concerned, the sole reason for gathering activity analysis information was to inform the former grant-aided expenditure process.

Recommendation 6: That all forces agree a common methodology for recording activity analysis with primary focus on management and performance information.



Common Performance Management Platform Project

73. A project is currently underway to create a *Common Performance Management Platform* (CPMP) for Scottish forces. The project aims to achieve the following benefits:

- to deliver an effective and efficient common performance management software platform;
- to work towards joined-up performance management between police, government, criminal justice and community planning partners;
- to improve police national force and local performance management businesses processes; and
- to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency by generating effective performance management information and knowledge-sharing.

74. The project is also expected to produce considerable efficiency savings, and has been adopted as one of the top three priority (*super-ordinate*) projects by the ACPOS Business Change Board. A further significant benefit will be that each of these stakeholders (Scottish Government, police authorities/boards, Audit Scotland, and HMICS) will all have direct access to the high level products of the Platform without first going through the police forces.

75. As well as considerably strengthening the tripartite accountability arrangements, this multi-agency access should also achieve further efficiencies within forces by paving the way for the information requirements currently imposed on them by both Audit Scotland (statutory performance indicators) and HMICS (the *Annual Statistical Return* and thematic questionnaires) to reduce dramatically, with some aspects of this disappearing altogether.

76. The introduction of the CPMP flows directly from a recommendation of our 2005 thematic inspection *Managing Improvement*. Its implementation will allow this recommendation to be discharged.

77. The inspection showed forces to be at different levels of preparedness for the Platform. Some were at an advanced state of readiness, with a very clear project plan and project structure in place. Others, less well-prepared, had a great deal of work still to do. Implementing the Platform is undoubtedly a significant commitment for forces. However, the benefits that will accrue to forces, police authorities/boards and other stakeholders are substantial and it is critical that all forces have the necessary arrangements in place.

78. Finally, considerable work is underway nationally in support of the Platform, bolstered in large part by the co-operation of all forces. If this is to continue, it is essential that all forces review their internal arrangements and are content that they can meet the future requirements of this project.

Key Finding: The CPMP is a critical project for the police service in Scotland and its stakeholders. It is important that forces are able to demonstrate a considered and planned approach to its implementation.

Recommendation 7: That all forces carry out the preparatory work necessary to allow the new Common Performance Management Platform to be implemented without delay.



Overall Conclusions

79. The cumulative findings of this inspection lead us to several conclusions. Firstly, performance management within the police service in Scotland has, probably quite properly, started at the top of the organisations (forces and support services), instigated by a successful national partnership amongst the stakeholders in the Senior Strategic Steering Group. This has helped to encourage the belief in leaders and senior managers that performance improvement can be achieved through: accepting responsibility; identifying changes in procedures, processes and systems; and following that through relentlessly.

80. Our second overall conclusion, however, is that the SPPF did not flow uniformly from this promising beginning to reach all parts of upper and middle management and, crucially, police authorities/boards. This has to happen now.

81. Thirdly, this growing belief in and understanding of performance management needs now to be shared with supervisors of frontline policing – and they need to be given the time to achieve that. If supervisors are indeed spending most of their time as administrators and quality controllers then forces both individually and jointly need to question seriously who in their organisations should be doing what.

82. Improvements in organisational performance are taking place across Scotland as a result of improved management of performance through changes to procedures, processes and systems. Once this is combined with improvements in individual productivity then the Scottish public will really notice the difference.



Annex A

Questions used in the survey to support the Productivity of Police Officers Thematic Inspection

Q1. In which force or organisation are you currently working?

Answer Options

- Central Scotland Police
- Dumfries & Galloway Constabulary
- Fife Constabulary
- Grampian Police
- Lothian & Borders Police
- Northern Constabulary
- Strathclyde Police
- Tayside Police
- SCDEA
- Scottish Police College
- Forensic Services
- Information Services
- Other SPSA
- Other (please specify)

Q2. What gender are you?

Answer Options

- Male
- Female

Q3. Which of the following best describes your role in your current force or organisation?

Answer Options

- Police officer, including special constable
- Police support staff, including cadet

Q4. Please indicate your current rank.

Answer Options

- Special Constable
 - Constable
 - Sergeant
 - Inspector
 - Chief Inspector
 - Superintendent
 - Chief Superintendent
 - Assistant Chief Constable
 - Deputy Chief Constable
 - Chief Constable
-



Q5. Different forces and organisations use different support staff categories and grades. Which of the following best describes the position you hold in your current force or organisation?

Answer Options

- Cadet
- Traffic warden
- Traffic warden – supervisory role
- Other police support staff
- Other police support staff – supervisory role

Q6. In the space below, please enter the name of the department and/or division in which you currently work.

Q7. Which of the following best describes the area of policing in which you work?

Answer Options

- Operational patrol (e.g. uniform, foot/mobile)
- Community policing
- Community safety
- Crime investigation department
- Road policing
- Intelligence
- Divisional/sub-divisional support functions
- Force HQ support functions
- Call/communication centre/control-room
- Other (please specify)

Q8. How many years of service in the police service do you have? (Where applicable, please include any time you have spent in forces or police services other than your current place of work)

Answer Options

- Less than two years
 - More than two years but less than ten years
 - More than ten years but less than 20 years
 - More 20 years but less than 25 years
 - More than 25 years but less than 30 years
 - More than 30 years
-



Q9. How familiar are you with the National Intelligence Model or NIM as it is also called?

Answer Options

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Moderately
- Very

Q10. While on operational duty, do you ever have time that is NOT taken up attending incidents or conducting enquiries?

Answer Options

- No
- Yes
- I do not carry out operational duties

Q11. Which of the following statements best describes how you use this unallocated time?

Answer Options

- On the majority of occasions I tend to direct my activities to dealing with any tasking received at briefings
- On the majority of occasions I tend to decide myself what I should do
- Other (please specify)

Q12. And which one factor below is the most likely to influence the decision as to what to do with any unallocated time?

Answer Options

- Professional interest
- Knowledge and experience of policing
- Local knowledge of the area
- Identified community concerns
- Intuition
- Other (please specify)

Q13. How familiar are you with your department, unit, division or force tasking process (e.g. who decides what tasking should be raised, how this is then allocated, how to respond and so on)?

Answer Options

- Not at all
 - Slightly
 - Moderately
 - Very
-



Q14. How familiar are you with your organisational and/or local control strategy and its priorities?

Answer Options

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Moderately
- Very

Q15. In your opinion, to what extent is there a link between your organisational and/or local control strategy priorities and what you do/how you carry out your daily activities?

Answer Options

- Not at all
- To a slight extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- Don't know

Q16. In your opinion, to what extent does having these priorities improve overall individual, team and organisational effectiveness, i.e. what is achieved?

Answer Options

Individual effectiveness

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Moderately
- Very much
- Don't know

Team effectiveness

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Moderately
- Very much
- Don't know

Organisational effectiveness

- Not at all
 - Slightly
 - Moderately
 - Very much
 - Don't know
-



Q17. Do you receive regular appraisals or other regular types of performance review, at least once a year? (For Questions 17-23, if you have been in your current post for less than a year and would not expect to have had an appraisal/review by this time, please answer this and following questions by drawing on experiences from your most recent previous post)

Answer Options

- No
- Yes

Q18. How frequently do your appraisals and/or performance reviews take place? (Please tick as many as apply)

Answer Options

- Once a year
- Twice a year
- Every three months or quarter
- Every month
- Every week
- Every day
- Other (please specify)

Q19. Do your appraisals or other regular performance reviews tend to be completed on time?

Answer Options

- Rarely, if at all
- On some occasions
- On most or all occasions

Q20. During your appraisals or performance reviews, are personal objectives identified and set for you to achieve during the appraisal/review period?

Answer Options

- Rarely, if at all
- Sometimes
- On most or all occasions
- Don't know

Q21. And in your opinion, do you feel that your personal objectives are appropriate for you and your role?

Answer Options

- Not at all
 - To a slight extent
 - To a moderate extent
 - To a great extent
-



Q22. During your appraisals or performance reviews, is your performance subsequently assessed against these personal objectives?

Answer Options

- Rarely, if at all
- Sometimes
- On most or all occasions
- Don't know

Q23. In your opinion, does having set personal objectives have a positive influence on how well you do your job?

Answer Options

- Not at all
- To a slight extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- Other (please specify)

Q24. Whether or not it is done regularly, when you are assessed to what extent do you feel that your performance is measured against specific force and/or local priorities?

Answer Options

- Not at all
- To a slight extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- Don't know

Q25. Thinking of the department, unit or division in which you work, in your opinion to what extent do you think good performance is praised?

Answer Options

- Not at all
 - To a slight extent
 - To a moderate extent
 - To a great extent
 - Not applicable – there is no particularly good performance
-



Q26. And still thinking of the department, unit or division in which you work, in your opinion to what extent do you think poor performance is challenged?

Answer Options

- Not at all
- To a slight extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- Not applicable – there is no particularly poor performance

Q27. Please use this space to provide any further comment that you wish to make e.g. about what you feel are the main issues in this area, anything that we have not covered but about which you feel strongly, or indeed anything that you feel may help us in this inspection.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. We stress again that all the information will be treated as anonymous. Having said that, if there is time during the thematic we would be keen to speak to individuals directly about their views on this topic. If, in theory, you would be happy for us to approach you in person, please provide your Email address in the box below.

Q28. Email address:





Annex B

Analysis of Survey Results

While this is not the first survey that we have carried out in support of a thematic inspection, it is the first time that we have done so using the internet. Although the inspection proper focused on police officers, we felt that it would be useful to allow all members of the police service in Scotland that wished to participate in the survey, to do so. As a result, some 2,440 responses were received. This is a tremendous response, bearing in mind that respondents required internet access and forces adopted a number of different approaches to publicise and support the survey.

As might be expected, the response was not uniform across forces and agencies and therefore our study group was not representative of the Service as a whole. This means that the results cannot be assumed to represent the views of the Service as a whole. We will consult with liaison officers in each force to learn any useful lessons that might help us in future surveys.

This annex does not present a full analysis of the survey, but rather gives a flavour of the results and some of the highlights. As intimated in our introduction, we intend to issue a separate report providing a detailed analysis of the survey results.

In considering the findings below, please be aware that where no answer was given to a question by respondents, these have been omitted from the analysis.

Q1. In which force or organisation are you currently working?

The overall number of responses received from all forces and other agencies (including Scottish Police Services Authority and ACPOS Secretariat) are shown in Table 4 below, together with their percentage share of total responses. Members of staff from the eight forces, and the SPSA, as well as officers on central service all responded to the survey.

Police force/agency	No. of respondents (%)
Central Scotland Police	64 (3%)
Dumfries & Galloway Constabulary	87 (4%)
Fife Constabulary	54 (2%)
Forensic Services	14 (1%)
Grampian Police	630 (27%)
Lothian & Borders Police	765 (32%)
Northern Constabulary	7 (0%)
Strathclyde Police	412 (17%)
Tayside Police	323 (14%)
Other Agencies	15 (1%)

Table 4



Q3. Which of the following best describes your role in your current force or organisation?

	Total
Police officer, including special constable	1734 (73%)
Police support staff, including cadet	637 (27%)
Grand Total	2371 (100%)

Table 5

Q4. Please indicate your current rank.

	Total
Constable	918 (53%)
Sergeant	453 (26%)
Inspector	242 (14%)
Chief Inspector and above	109 (6%)
Grand Total	1722 (100%)

Table 6

Responses from Chief Inspector and above include all ranks up to and including Chief Constable.

Q5. Different forces and organisations use different support staff categories and grades. Which of the following best describes the position you hold in your current force or organisation?

	Total
Other police support staff	464 (73%)
Other police support staff – supervisory role	159 (25%)
Traffic warden – supervisory role	1 (0%)
Traffic warden	3 (0%)
Cadet	7 (1%)
Grand Total	634 (100%)

Table 7



Q7. Which of the following best describes the area of policing in which you work?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Call/communication centre/control-room	66 (4%)	150 (25%)	216 (9%)
Community policing	153 (9%)	5 (1%)	158 (7%)
Community safety	72 (4%)	13 (2%)	85 (4%)
Crime investigation department	239 (14%)	28 (5%)	267 (12%)
Divisional/sub-divisional support functions	109 (6%)	83 (14%)	192 (8%)
Force HQ support functions	136 (8%)	136 (22%)	272 (12%)
Intelligence	134 (8%)	45 (7%)	179 (8%)
Operational patrol (e.g. uniform, foot/mobile)	513 (31%)	6 (1%)	519 (23%)
Road policing	113 (7%)	26 (4%)	139 (6%)
Other (please specify)	145 (9%)	118 (19%)	263 (11%)
Grand Total	1680 (100%)	610 (100%)	2290 (100%)

Table 8

Q8. How many years of service in the police service do you have? (Where applicable, please include any time you have spent in forces or police services other than your current place of work)

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Less than two years	47 (3%)	110 (18%)	157 (7%)
More than two years but less than ten years	304 (18%)	229 (38%)	533 (23%)
More than ten years but less than 20 years	661 (39%)	141 (23%)	802 (35%)
More 20 years but less than 25 years	330 (20%)	43 (7%)	373 (16%)
More than 25 years but less than 30 years	289 (17%)	21 (3%)	310 (14%)
More than 30 years	49 (3%)	66 (11%)	115 (5%)
Grand Total	1680 (100%)	610 (100%)	2290 (100%)

Table 9



Q9. How familiar are you with the National Intelligence Model or NIM as it is also called?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Very	612 (37%)	48 (8%)	660 (29%)
Moderately	722 (43%)	114 (19%)	836 (37%)
Slightly	288 (17%)	212 (35%)	500 (22%)
Not at all	44 (3%)	230 (38%)	274 (12%)
Grand Total	1666 (100%)	604 (100%)	2270 (100%)

Table 10

Although the *very* and *moderately familiar* responses were encouraging, it was of some concern to us that 3% (44) of the responding police officers claimed to be *not at all familiar* with the National Intelligence Model. These officers consisted of three sergeants, 40 constables and one special constable and were spread across participating forces. Many classified themselves as being in operational roles. Of these same officers, only eight responded that they were not at all familiar with the tasking process in response to question 13. Since the majority did indicate some knowledge of the tasking process – including 12 claiming to be very familiar – it may be that the links between the terminology of NIM and its practical application have not always been understood or made clear during training or awareness sessions.

Q10. While on operational duty, do you ever have time that is NOT taken up attending incidents or conducting enquiries?

The response in Table 11 is based only on police officers.

	Total
Yes	797 (48%)
No	290 (17%)
I do not carry out operational duties	579 (35%)
Grand Total	1666 (100%)

Table 11

If only officers who indicated that they carry out operational duties are considered, then Table 12 below suggests that some 73% (797) have some unallocated time.

	Total
Yes	797 (73%)
No	290 (27%)
Grand Total	1087 (100%)

Table 12



Q11. Which of the following statements best describes how you use this unallocated time?

	Total
On the majority of occasions I tend to decide myself what I should do	350 (45%)
On the majority of occasions I tend to direct my activities to dealing with any tasking received at briefings	263 (34%)
Other (please specify)	165 (21%)
Grand Total	778 (100%)

Table 13

It is interesting to note that of the officers who responded in Table 13 above, only 34% (263) perceived that on the majority of occasions their activity was directed towards tasking received at briefings. A large number – 21% (165) – gave an alternative explanation for how they directed their activities. These responses will be analysed in detail and commented on in our separate report.

Q12. And which one factor below is the most likely to influence the decision as to what to do with any unallocated time?

	Total
Professional interest	97 (12%)
Knowledge and experience of policing	265 (34%)
Local knowledge of the area	98 (13%)
Identified community concerns	222 (29%)
Intuition	36 (5%)
Other (please specify)	60 (8%)
Grand Total	778 (100%)

Table 14



Q13. How familiar are you with your department, unit, division or force tasking process (e.g. who decides what tasking should be raised, how this is then allocated, how to respond and so on)?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Very	915 (56%)	219 (37%)	1134 (51%)
Moderately	537 (33%)	202 (34%)	739 (33%)
Slightly	150 (9%)	117 (20%)	267 (12%)
Not at all	37 (2%)	60 (10%)	97 (4%)
Grand Total	1639 (100%)	598 (100%)	2237 (100%)

Table 15

Q14. How familiar are you with your organisational and/or local control strategy and its priorities?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Very	704 (45%)	122 (22%)	826 (39%)
Moderately	590 (38%)	219 (39%)	809 (38%)
Slightly	227 (14%)	144 (26%)	371 (17%)
Not at all	47 (3%)	72 (13%)	119 (6%)
Grand Total	1568 (100%)	557 (100%)	2125 (100%)

Table 16



Q15. In your opinion, to what extent is there a link between your organisational and/or local control strategy priorities and what you do/how you carry out your daily activities?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
To a great extent	666 (42%)	154 (28%)	820 (39%)
To a moderate extent	573 (37%)	192 (34%)	765 (36%)
To a slight extent	224 (14%)	106 (19%)	330 (16%)
Don't know	35 (2%)	66 (12%)	101 (5%)
Not at all	70 (4%)	39 (7%)	109 (5%)
Grand Total	1568 (100%)	557 (100%)	2125 (100%)

Table 17

Q16. In your opinion, to what extent does having these priorities improve overall individual, team and organisational effectiveness i.e. what is achieved?

Individual effectiveness

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Very much	359 (23%)	156 (28%)	515 (24%)
Moderately	625 (40%)	193 (35%)	818 (38%)
Slightly	343 (22%)	92 (17%)	435 (20%)
Not at all	196 (13%)	32 (6%)	228 (11%)
Don't know	45 (3%)	84 (15%)	129 (6%)
Grand Total	1568 (100%)	557 (100%)	2125 (100%)

Table 18



Team effectiveness

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Very much	484 (31%)	188 (34%)	672 (32%)
Moderately	609 (39%)	186 (33%)	795 (37%)
Slightly	278 (18%)	74 (13%)	352 (17%)
Not at all	147 (9%)	25 (4%)	172 (8%)
Don't know	50 (3%)	84 (15%)	134 (6%)
Grand Total	1568 (100%)	557 (100%)	2125 (100%)

Table 19

Organisational effectiveness

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Very much	613 (39%)	213 (38%)	826 (39%)
Moderately	546 (35%)	172 (31%)	718 (34%)
Slightly	248 (16%)	65 (12%)	313 (15%)
Don't know	58 (4%)	89 (16%)	147 (7%)
Not at all	103 (7%)	18 (3%)	121 (6%)
Grand Total	1568 (100%)	557 (100%)	2125 (100%)

Table 20

Q17. Do you receive regular appraisals or other regular types of performance review, at least once a year? (For Questions 17-23, if you have been in your current post for less than a year and would not expect to have had an appraisal/review by this time, please answer this and following questions by drawing on experiences from your most recent previous post)

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Yes	1426 (91%)	487 (88%)	1913 (90%)
No	138 (9%)	68 (12%)	206 (10%)
Grand Total	1564 (100%)	555 (100%)	2119 (100%)

Table 21



Q18. How frequently do your appraisals and/or performance reviews take place? (Please tick as many as apply)

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
Once a year	1252 (88%)	395 (83%)	1647 (87%)
Twice a year	79 (6%)	39 (8%)	118 (6%)
Every three months or quarter	45 (3%)	27 (6%)	72 (4%)
Monthly or more frequently	40 (3%)	16 (3%)	56 (3%)
Grand Total	1416 (100%)	477 (100%)	1893 (100%)

Table 22

Q19. Do your appraisals or other regular performance reviews tend to be completed on time?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
On most or all occasions	487 (35%)	237 (50%)	724 (38%)
On some occasions	605 (43%)	186 (39%)	791 (42%)
Rarely, if at all	319 (23%)	52 (11%)	371 (20%)
Grand Total	1411 (100%)	475 (100%)	1886 (100%)

Table 23



We were greatly concerned to learn of appraisals and performance reviews not being completed on time. This was particularly apparent amongst police officers. The failure of supervisors to complete appraisals within the required timescales has traditionally contributed to the overall failing of such systems since the relevance of this sort of review deteriorates rapidly over time. The figures were to some extent skewed by one force that managed to complete 70% of appraisals on time on most or all occasions. If the responses for this force are taken out then Table 24 below gives a more representative picture of the situation for our wider sample.

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
On most or all occasions	328 (28%)	198 (48%)	526 (33%)
On some occasions	547 (46%)	169 (41%)	716 (45%)
Rarely, if at all	303 (26%)	47 (11%)	350 (22%)
Grand Total	1178 (100%)	414 (100%)	1592 (100%)

Table 24

Q20. During your appraisals or performance reviews, are personal objectives identified and set for you to achieve during the appraisal/review period?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
On most or all occasions	770 (55%)	306 (64%)	1076 (57%)
Sometimes	385 (27%)	103 (22%)	488 (26%)
Rarely, if at all	247 (18%)	58 (12%)	305 (16%)
Don't know	9 (1%)	8 (2%)	17 (1%)
Grand Total	1411 (100%)	475 (100%)	1886 (100%)

Table 25



Q21. And in your opinion, do you feel that your personal objectives are appropriate for you and your role?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
To a great extent	527 (37%)	185 (39%)	712 (38%)
To a moderate extent	551 (39%)	179 (38%)	730 (39%)
To a slight extent	213 (15%)	81 (17%)	294 (16%)
Not at all	120 (9%)	30 (6%)	150 (8%)
Grand Total	1411 (100%)	475 (100%)	1886 (100%)

Table 26

Q22. During your appraisals or performance reviews, is your performance subsequently assessed against these personal objectives?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
On most or all occasions	623 (44%)	240 (51%)	863 (46%)
Sometimes	432 (31%)	133 (28%)	565 (30%)
Rarely, if at all	314 (22%)	77 (16%)	391 (21%)
Don't know	42 (3%)	25 (5%)	67 (4%)
Grand Total	1411 (100%)	475 (100%)	1886 (100%)

Table 27

Table 28 below shows the responses for officers in the rest of Scotland having removed the two best performing forces.

	Police officer, including special constable
On most or all occasions	240 (29%)
Sometimes	275 (33%)
Rarely, if at all	284 (34%)
Don't know	25 (3%)
Grand Total	824 (100%)

Table 28



Q23. In your opinion, does having set personal objectives have a positive influence on how well you do your job?

Objectives positive	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
To a great extent	279 (20%)	110 (23%)	389 (21%)
To a moderate extent	511 (36%)	150 (32%)	661 (35%)
To a slight extent	302 (21%)	89 (19%)	391 (21%)
Not at all	287 (20%)	111 (23%)	398 (21%)
Other (please specify)	32 (2%)	15 (3%)	47 (2%)
Grand Total	1411 (100%)	475 (100%)	1886 (100%)

Table 29

Q24. Whether or not it is done regularly, when you are assessed to what extent do you feel that your performance is measured against specific force and/or local priorities?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
To a great extent	247 (16%)	73 (14%)	320 (15%)
To a moderate extent	538 (35%)	160 (30%)	698 (34%)
To a slight extent	410 (27%)	108 (20%)	518 (25%)
Not at all	308 (20%)	145 (27%)	453 (22%)
Don't know	28 (2%)	53 (10%)	81 (4%)
Grand Total	1531 (100%)	539 (100%)	2070 (100%)

Table 30



Q25. Thinking of the department, unit or division in which you work, in your opinion to what extent to you think good performance is praised?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
To a great extent	302 (20%)	101 (19%)	403 (19%)
To a moderate extent	602 (39%)	206 (38%)	808 (39%)
To a slight extent	490 (32%)	164 (30%)	654 (32%)
Not at all	136 (9%)	66 (12%)	202 (10%)
N/A – there is no particularly good performance	1 (0%)	2 (0%)	3 (0%)
Grand Total	1531 (100%)	539 (100%)	2070 (100%)

Table 31

Q26. And still thinking of the department, unit or division in which you work, in your opinion to what extent to you think poor performance is challenged?

	Police officer, including special constable	Police support staff, including cadet	Grand Total
To a great extent	428 (28%)	92 (17%)	520 (25%)
To a moderate extent	547 (36%)	165 (31%)	712 (34%)
To a slight extent	381 (25%)	171 (32%)	552 (27%)
Not at all	119 (8%)	79 (15%)	198 (10%)
N/A – there is no particularly poor performance	56 (4%)	32 (6%)	88 (4%)
Grand Total	1531 (100%)	539 (100%)	2070 (100%)

Table 32

Q27. Please use this space to provide any further comment that you wish to make e.g. about what you feel are the main issues in this area, anything that we have not covered but about which you feel strongly, or indeed anything that you feel may help us in this inspection.

A large number of respondents – 21% (491) – provided further comments. These will be analysed in detail and commented on in the separate report that will be issued on the survey.



Annex C

Case Study – Lancashire Constabulary

When examining any subject for a thematic inspection, it is often very useful to look at how the same matter is dealt with by forces and agencies in other parts of the country. When that subject is performance management, particular issues arise.

In England and Wales, the way in which performance is assessed is significantly directed and influenced by central government. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary for England, Wales and Northern Ireland (HMIC) has an important formal role in this process, by producing and publishing formal ratings and league tables. The reliance south of the Border on the relatively rigid Police Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF) has perhaps led the Service in Scotland until recently to disregard other real and positive benefits available from a strong emphasis on performance management. In the past this may have led to the relevance of the experience in England and Wales being discounted more than it deserved. This is compounded by the difficulties inherent in comparing the performance of Scottish and English/Welsh forces because of the different legal, recording and counting systems.

Nevertheless, we felt that it was important to extend our inspection research to forces elsewhere in the UK. In an initial scoping exercise we contacted a number of forces and attended the Association of Chief Police Officers' (ACPO) Conference *Excellence in Police Performance*. Through this we were able to speak to many senior officers involved in performance management and to practitioners not only from the service but from HMIC and the various parts of the Home Office. As a result, we decided to visit Lancashire Constabulary in order to examine its approach and procedures in relation to performance management.

In 2007, HMIC (England & Wales) assessed Lancashire Constabulary as being one of the two joint top performing forces in England and Wales under PPAF. At the time of our visit, the force had 3,586 police officers, 159 police and community support officers (PCSOs) and 1,709 police staff, covering an area of some 2,000 square miles and a population of 1.4 million. It had six territorial Basic Command Units (BCU), each commanded by a chief superintendent.

Lancashire Constabulary had implemented performance management at all levels within the organisation, from the force executive down to how services were provided operationally. Performance management was clearly recognised as being the responsibility of every member of staff, not just of senior managers or performance departments. And there was impressive, widespread knowledge of what the force was trying to achieve, how that was to be done and how well it was doing.

The opportunity arose during our visit to attend the force's monthly strategic tasking and co-ordinating meeting. The Chief Constable chairs these meetings, prior to which participants, and others invited as required, gather for a breakfast meeting. This latter forum is informal and allows the Chief Constable to cover matters such as promotions and retirements, presentations, updates on selected issues, and generally provides an opportunity to bring items to the attention of the senior management team.





The strategic tasking and co-ordinating meeting that we attended had performance as the first item on the agenda. It should be pointed out that the force appeared not to differentiate between performance information and information for tasking, but instead looked at the picture as a whole. NIM purists may claim that this confuses and diffuses effort but, we would suggest that, as long as the outcome is positive both in respect of short-term operational tasking and longer-term performance improvement, then people should use what works for them.

It was evident to us that all participants in the strategic tasking and co-ordinating meeting had a good level of knowledge about the information that was being discussed. We also learned that the BCUs held meetings beforehand in order to discuss any items that might cause particular debate or conflict. This allowed them to participate in the strategic tasking and co-ordinating meeting with a shared understanding of the issues, or to put forward a consensus view should this be required. It was clearly evident that the force operated within a culture that had embraced performance management.

We also visited one of the force's BCUs. Here we found a well established structure, built upon distinct geographic sectors each commanded by an inspector. These inspectors had control over the resources for their sector, including response policing teams, and were both responsible and accountable for performance in their area. Senior managers were clearly pleased with the way that performance was being handled at the BCU. They were also aware of the crucial role of sergeants in making sure that continuous improvement underpinned all their processes and procedures. In spite of this, it was accepted that, at that time, investment in that rank by the force was limited.

After consultation within the BCU, a new process for inducting and managing sergeants was introduced. This new process involved all newly promoted sergeants and those transferred into the BCU spending half a day with the chief superintendent and the superintendent, during which their expectations of the sergeant role were outlined. These messages were reinforced in a booklet issued to each sergeant, setting out these expectations and priorities.

Newly promoted sergeants were also subjected to a detailed appraisal process, culminating nine months after promotion in a detailed report on the individual's strengths and weaknesses against the competencies for the role. The report was compiled from different sources and included elements of 360° appraisal. The superintendent then met with the sergeant and formulated an action plan to address any identified areas of weakness or development needs. Progress against the action plan was then considered when deciding whether the officer should be confirmed in rank. Indications were that officers welcomed the guidance and clarity that this process provides.

The BCU has now introduced a process whereby any member of its management team can nominate a sergeant to go through this appraisal process if there are concerns about the officer's performance. This has been found to be beneficial, and other sergeants are nominating themselves for the process because they feel that it is good preparation when applying for promotion.





Having spoken with several sergeants during our visit, we were impressed by the professionalism, focus on priorities and the leadership displayed. The sergeants clearly understood their role and the need to provide clear leadership to their teams while retaining a focus on quality. The tasking process clearly provided direction for them and they demonstrated that they were very familiar with the processes involved and were very clear that for it to work properly that the results of the tasks carried out had to be collated and fed back into the process. To the inspection team this illustrated what could be achieved when senior management had confidence in its sergeants and provided them with appropriate support and guidance. It was also apparent that sergeants had a very good understanding of how their officers performed individually and how, as a team, they performed in relation to others. This has undoubtedly contributed towards the strong performance that Lancashire Constabulary has achieved.

About Lancashire Constabulary

Lancashire Constabulary has been assessed as one of the joint two top performing forces in England and Wales. In the Police Performance Assessments 2006/07 published by HMIC for England and Wales and the Home Office this force's performance is summarised as:

Performance Area	Delivery
Tackling Crime	Excellent
Serious Crime and Public Protection	Good
Protecting Vulnerable People	Good
<i>Child abuse investigations</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Domestic violence</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Missing persons</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Public protection</i>	<i>Good</i>
Satisfaction and Fairness	Excellent
Implementation of Neighbourhood Policing	Excellent
Local Priorities	Good
Resources and Efficiency	Excellent
Performance Area	Direction of Travel
Tackling Crime	Improved
Satisfaction and Fairness	Improved
Resources and Efficiency	Stable

In the summary comments the force is described as a “*high performing organisation giving value for money*”.



Methodology and Acknowledgements

1. HMICS thematic reports are prepared after careful but focused inspection of the subject matter. Our broad methodology is explained on our website. This shorter report contains far less detailed evidence than has been presented in past thematic inspection reports; this is a deliberate effort on our part to present accurate but concise and focused reports on a wider range of issues than has previously been the case.
 2. The project initiation document (PID) was adapted from our standard inspection format, based on the EFQM model and circulated to forces. Following an initial consultation exercise and desktop research, we visited all eight police forces in Scotland as well as Lancashire Constabulary in England. We also met with the Scottish Police Federation and the Association of Scottish Superintendents. We also liaised with HMIC (England and Wales), the Association of Chief Police Officers of Scotland, Audit Scotland and the Justice Department within the Scottish Government.
 3. An initial questionnaire was circulated, the resulting responses and information forming the foundation of our later fieldwork visits. These visits included interviews with members of force executives, divisional/area commanders as well as operational inspectors, sergeants and constables. We are grateful for the valuable assistance of the nominated liaison officers and all those involved in the fieldwork. We are particularly grateful to Mr Stephen Finnegan, Chief Constable of Lancashire Constabulary for his assistance in providing access to his force and insight into how performance is managed.
 4. As the inspection unfolded it became apparent that there would be benefit from providing an opportunity for a wider spectrum of police officers and staff to give their experience and views on some of the emerging themes. To achieve this it was decided that an electronic survey should be designed and distributed to all Scottish forces. The survey itself is shown at Annex A and a summary of the results given at Annex B. This is the first time that such a technique has been used by HMICS and, despite some issues of access within some forces, was successful with in excess of 2,400 responses. While the results of the survey have been used within this report the volume of the responses has meant that a full analysis could not be completed within the timescales laid down for the inspection. To realise the full value of the survey and in acknowledgement of the commitment of the respondents a separate report will be published providing a full analysis of the survey results.
 5. The report focuses very specifically on the areas related to the seven recommendations. We anticipate that forces will consider all of the comments in the report when considering their response to the recommendations.
 6. The inspection was carried out by Superintendent John McDougall, assisted by Detective Sergeant Alan Waddell under the direction of Malcolm R Dickson QPM, HM Assistant Inspector of Constabulary.
-