



MANAGEMENT AUDIT UNIT

CUMBRIA POLICE INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT

POLICE OPERATIONAL SUPPORT PLANNING & PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Draft Report Issued: October 2006
Final Report Issued: November 2006

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This audit was carried out to review the controls in place over planning and performance management arrangements in Operational Support. It is not a review of the actual performance of Operational Support, but assesses the adequacy of systems that are in place to enable managers to do this. The audit was included in the annual audit plan agreed by the Police Authority because these controls are a key part of the Authority's overall SIC (Statement of Internal Control). Effective performance management has also been highlighted as a major risk for the Constabulary.
- 1.2 Since the last internal audit review of Operational Support in December 2004, there have been significant changes in management. In December 2004, J Rush was acting as Chief Superintendent, whilst J Taylor acted as Assistant Chief Constable. Mr Taylor subsequently returned as Chief Superintendent, but then retired and was replaced by G Horlacher, who then retired in February 2006, to be replaced by R Smith. Mr Smith was then unavoidably absent for April and early May, as he had other responsibilities during the Cumbria:Lancashire Amalgamation Project.
- 1.3 The Support Inspector in December 2004 was Adrian Parry. In April 2005 the role changed to Performance Inspector and reports to the Strategic Development Department. Adrian Parry was unavoidably absent for a lengthy period in early 2006, and since returning to work has left OS. Norman Atkinson is the new Performance Inspector with effect from 13th September 2006.
- 1.4 The audit visit was based on a review of planning and performance records and discussions with the Performance Inspector (Norman Atkinson) and the Chief Superintendent (Ron Smith), who is overall manager for Operational Support. Jane Sauntson, Acting Director of Strategic Development, also provided information. Discussions were held on 29 September 2006.
- 1.5 The recommendations made in this report are graded in accordance with their perceived importance. The grading falls into the following categories:
 - Grade 1: Major recommendation that indicates a fundamental control weakness that must be addressed.
 - Grade 2: Recommendation which should be addressed in order to establish a satisfactory level of internal control.
 - Grade 3: Minor recommendation made to improve the system under review.
- 1.6 Recommendations to this report are included as Appendix 1 – Summary of Recommendations & Action Plan.

2.0 OVERALL EVALUATION & CONCLUSION

2.1 The evaluation of controls is based on testing carried out at the time of the audit, usually based on sampling. Management Audit assesses the controls operating in each audited area as ‘good’, ‘satisfactory’, ‘fair’ or ‘weak’. This assessment is based on the number and grading of recommendations made.

2.2 Controls have been evaluated as follows:

CONTROL AREA	REPORT SECTION	EVALUATION
Planning	5.1	Satisfactory
Performance management	5.2	Fair

2.3 Some progress on developing effective performance management in Operational Support has been made, but this has been delayed by staff turnover at the most senior level, and in the performance support function. The recently drafted performance management arrangements for OS are thorough and adopt a logical, tiered approach to performance reporting and monitoring. Once these are implemented, the arrangements should improve significantly.

2.4 The nature of Operational Support’s role has meant that the introduction of the Constabulary’s PDC arrangements has had less impact than it has on the BCU’s. Some OS performance data is reported, but this does not fully reflect OS’s contribution to overall policing or the resources that are devolved to it. The diversity of its work also makes developing meaningful PI’s more of a challenge.

2.5 OS plans have been reviewed and there are some actions that would improve the planning process and plan content. These include formal authorisation, plans for all teams, checks that the overall OS plan objectives are fully reflected in team plans and the inclusion of prior year actual data, to set current year targets in context.

3.0 FOLLOW UP TO PREVIOUS AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The previous audit review was carried out in December 2004 and 8 actions were agreed. Performance management arrangements were assessed as weak at the previous review. Progress on the implementation of previously agreed actions is reviewed in the relevant sections of this report.
- 3.2 Three additional recommendations relating to risk management have not been specifically followed up, as the Constabulary is currently reviewing its approach to risk management. Operational Support risks are to be included in the Operations Board risk register and training on how the new risk management arrangements will operate is to be provided at the next Force Performance Development Conference (PDR).

4.0 AUDIT SCOPE

- 4.1 Key control areas and associated risks are set out below:

<i>Key Control Area</i>	<i>Report section</i>	<i>Key Potential Risks</i>
Planning		
Drafting and approval of local plans	5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan does not reflect outcomes of consultation Plan does not accord with Constabulary objectives Plan is not approved by management Plan not broken down into operational team plans
Performance Management		
Performance management process, including reporting & review	5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of clarity in performance management process Reports are irregular and out-of-date Reports focus on key areas in plan Reports are not easily understood Reports do not use comparative data and do not carry forward issues from previous periods Data in reports is unreliable Reports are not reviewed by management Action is not taken to address areas of concern BCU does not respond promptly or fully to corporate queries on performance

- 4.2 The accuracy and completeness of performance data is not included in this review as this aspect is specifically reviewed by the Audit Commission.

5.0 DETAILED FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 DRAFTING AND APPROVAL OF LOCAL PLANS

CONTROL	COMMENT	EVALUATION	REC. REF.
Plan duly reflects outcomes of local consultation	Consultation is carried out at a Constabulary level on an annual basis and this is reflected in the annual Constabulary Policing Plan. The planning process is top-down, so priorities included in the Policing Plan are included in the Operational Support Performance & Resources Plan 2006/07.	N/A (Done at Constabulary level)	
Plan accords with Constabulary objectives	A review of the Operational Support Performance & Resources Plan 2006/07 confirmed that Constabulary priorities were included, and the contribution made by OS to achieving these was noted. All plans (BCU,OS & Depts) are quality assured by Strategic Development to ensure that they are consistent with the Constabulary Policing Plan.	Good	
Plan is approved by management	The OS plan was approved by the local Senior Management Team (SMT) but this is not recorded in the SMT minutes. All plans (BCU,OS & Depts) were approved by the Constabulary Chief Officer Group (COG) on 12 June 2006. This is formally minuted.	Satisfactory	R1

RECOMMENDATIONS

R1	The approval of the annual OS Performance & Resources Plan by SMT should be formally minuted (Grade 2)
----	--

CONTROL	COMMENT	EVALUATION	REC. REF.
<p>Plan is broken down into operational unit plans</p>	<p><i>A previous agreed action was that all teams within OS would prepare an annual plan.</i></p> <p>Plans had been completed for 12 of the 13 units within OS. The only team without a plan for 2006/07 was Scientific Support. This was discussed with Chief Supt Smith who explained that this was a result of there being no manager in post and that this area was also subject to joint work with Lancashire Police.</p> <p>It was agreed that a plan is required, particularly as there has been restructuring in this area (eg transfer from BCU's of CSI function), and given the budgetary control issues in 2005/06.</p> <p><i>A previous agreed action was that all team plans would be finalised and approved by the Team Manager on a timely basis.</i></p> <p>The 12 team plans were reviewed by MAU, and a number of these had evidence of review by either Chief Supt Smith or Supt Turnbull. The reviews were dated May and June 2006. Ideally all plans should be reviewed and agreed and a timetable to achieve this should be agreed in advance.</p> <p>It was noted that copies of all plans are available on the local network but in addition, a hard copy of each Team Plan authorised by the relevant senior manager (Supts or C/Supt Smith), should be retained by the OS Performance Manager.</p>	<p>Satisfactory</p>	<p>R2</p> <p>R3</p> <p>R4</p>
RECOMMENDATIONS			
R2	A plan for 2006/07 should be completed for the Scientific Support Unit, which highlights action being taken to integrate the CSI function into the Unit and also the approach to budget management (Grade 2)		
R3	A timetable should be drafted for the preparation of Unit Plans for 2007/08, to include draft completion date for Team Managers and deadline for formal approval by the relevant Senior Manager (Grade 3)		
R4	Final versions of all Team Plans, with evidence of authorisation by the relevant Senior Manager should be retained by the OS Performance Manager (Grade 3)		

5.2 PERFORMANCE REPORTING

CONTROL	COMMENT	EVALUATION	REC. REF.
<p>A clear process for performance management has been documented and communicated to all staff</p>	<p><i>A previous agreed action was that OS would prepare a performance management framework (PMF)</i></p> <p>Since the last audit review of OS, the Constabulary has introduced a structured PMF, which applies to all areas, including OS. The main focus for this is a quarterly Performance Development Conference (PDC), together with interim monthly PDC's, involving senior managers only.</p> <p>This is at a high level, and focussed more on BCU's than support departments. The Performance Packs produced do include some OS activities, such as KSI's, 999 & non-999 call response times and crime data input timeliness.</p> <p>OS has recognised that a system of local performance management is necessary to supplement this, and one of its six key objectives in 06/07 is to "develop an internal performance review process". A draft framework has recently been produced by the Performance Inspector, and this will be implemented in the second half of 2006/07.</p> <p>The framework, which is continually evolving, is logically structured and clearly sets out performance reporting at 4 levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Organisation (via PDC/IPDC); o Department (quarterly dept perf meeting and monthly SMT meeting (perf standing agenda item) 1 week prior to PDC/IPDC); o Section (team meetings, 1 week prior to above); o Individual (every 6 months). <p>It also shows which performance measures will be required at each level.</p> <p>Individual performance management</p> <p>Statistics on completion of performance appraisals (PDR's) are included in the Force Performance Pack. Progress on these is included for OS.</p> <p>Progress on PDR completion is also reviewed at monthly OS SMT's as evidenced in the minutes</p>	<p>Good</p>	

CONTROL	COMMENT	EVALUATION	REC. REF.
<p>Regular and up-to-date performance reports are produced</p>	<p><i>A previous agreed action was that OS would maintain up-to-date performance information for all PI's in the OS plan, and make this available to the Performance Manager.</i></p> <p>There are currently no regular performance reports produced, other than for information required for the PDC's and IPDC's (interim reviews).</p> <p>The Performance Inspector is aware of some ad hoc reporting via Team Managers, but this is not collated into an OS performance report.</p> <p>The Chief Supt recognises this weakness and this will be addressed when the performance framework is implemented.</p>	<p>Weak (but will improve when new PMF introduced)</p>	<p>R5</p>
RECOMMENDATIONS			
<p>R5</p>	<p>Regular & up-to-date performance reports should be produced for review, in line with the OS Performance Framework, at the earliest opportunity (Grade 1)</p>		

CONTROL	COMMENT	EVALUATION	REC. REF.
<p>Report content is adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Measures report performance against key areas in plan o Are comprehensible o Targets are included, and are up-to-date & consistent with other plans o Effectively bring forward issues from previous periods o Use comparative data to add context 	<p>There are no regular reports to date, so content cannot be evaluated as such, but the planned content according to the framework is clear and comprehensible.</p> <p><i>A previous agreed action was that OS would develop meaningful performance information for all key areas of activity.</i></p> <p>The Performance & Resources plan 06/07 includes performance measures for each of the main objectives in the OS plan. These should then cascade into Team plans.</p> <p>A review of Unit plans showed that this process needs to be more robust, to ensure that all OS targets are included in Team plans.</p> <p>In some cases (eg Force Intelligence Bureau), the Team plan had less detail than the OS overall plan.</p> <p>There is no annual report, which sets out actual performance against the previous year's plan. This would be useful in setting targets for the next year and ensuring that planned tasks still outstanding are carried forward. It would also be helpful in keeping staff informed about performance.</p> <p>The Performance & Resources plan includes no prior year or trend data relating to performance, so the targets have no context.</p>	<p>Fair</p>	<p>R6 R7 R8</p>
RECOMMENDATIONS			
R6	The Team Plans should be reviewed overall in conjunction with the OS Finance & Resources plan, to check that all objectives have been fully reflected in Team Plans (Grade 2)		
R7	An annual report should be produced which sets out performance against target for all key areas in the plan. This should be used to evaluate targets for the next year and to ensure that any incomplete tasks are carried forward (Grade 2)		
R8	The OS Performance & Resources plan should include prior year actual data, so that the current year's targets can be seen in context (Grade 2)		

CONTROL	COMMENT	EVALUATION	REC. REF.
<p>Data in reports is reliable and obtained in a cost-effective manner</p>	<p>The method and systems from which performance information is to be collected is unclear.</p> <p>The draft framework prepared by the Performance Manager clearly sets out all the measures that will be reported, but this does not state the source of the data or who will extract and compile this. This will be necessary from a practical point of view.</p> <p>Some systems are well established (ie Communications Centre data, KSI statistics and information on CIB – Crime Input Bureau - input), and should not take long to document. Other areas may need further work.</p>	<p>Fair</p>	<p>R9</p>
<p>Performance information is reviewed by management and appropriate actions taken to address areas of concern</p>	<p><i>A previous agreed action was that OS SMT would review progress against Team plans by exception at the monthly SMT, under a standing item on performance.</i></p> <p>Senior managers are not required to report performance updates to the monthly SMT. There is no standing item on performance according to the minutes for 2006/07 to date.</p> <p>The new performance framework sets out a requirement for monthly performance meetings of SMT, to review performance information.</p> <p>At a corporate level, requests for information on OS activity arising from PDC's is fairly limited. The Performance Inspector was unaware that any specific information had been requested this year.</p> <p>The July 06 Performance Pack (as reviewed by the Audit & Performance Committee in September 06) included some OS data. Performance was generally on target, except for the response times to emergency calls. The report had a detailed explanation of the reasons for this and what action was proposed.</p>	<p>Weak (but will improve when new PMF introduced)</p>	<p>R5</p>
RECOMMENDATIONS			
<p>R9</p>	<p>The systems and procedures for collating the performance information required in the new performance framework need to be identified and documented. Individual officers should be nominated to provide data on a timely basis (Grade 2)</p>		

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & ACTION PLAN
(TO BE COMPLETED BY POLICE)

REPORT REFERENCE	GRADE	RECOMMENDATION	PERSON RESPONSIBLE (to be completed by client)	AGREED / INTENDED ACTION (to be completed by client)	IMPLEMENTATION DATE (to be completed by client)
R1	2	The approval of the annual OS Performance & Resources Plan by SMT should be formally minuted.	C/Supt OS	Formal approval of 2006/07 OS Performance & Resources Plan at next SMT. Plan was approved by COG June 06. On going for 2007/08 Plan.	31.12.06 (on going)
R2	2	A plan for 2006/07 should be completed for the Scientific Support Unit, which highlights action being taken to integrate the CSI function into the Unit and also the approach to budget management.	D/Supt Operations	2006/07 Scientific Support Team Plan to be completed.	31.12.06
R3	3	A timetable should be drafted for the preparation of Team Plans for 2007/08, to include draft completion date for Team Managers and deadline for formal approval by the relevant Senior Manager.	Performance Inspector	Timetable for 2007/08 Team Plans to include dates for drafts and completion in accordance with timescales to be determined by the Force planning processes.	31.12.06
R4	3	Final versions of all Team Plans, with evidence of authorisation by the relevant Senior Manager should be retained by the OS Performance Inspector.	Performance Insp	All Team Plans to show evidence of formal authorisation by the relevant Senior Manager and retained by the Performance Inspector. (Team Plans, when approved, are presently filed electronically on the Force network and are replaced with updated versions when amended.)	1.12.06 (on going)
R5	1	Regular & up-to-date performance reports should be produced for review, in line with the OS Performance Framework, at the earliest opportunity.	Performance Insp	Performance reports to be produced in line with the latest version of the OS Performance Framework.	31.12.06 (on going)
R6	2	The Team Plans should be reviewed overall in conjunction with the OS Performance & Resources plan, to check that relevant objectives have been fully reflected in Team Plans.	Performance Insp Supt Uniform, Ops, Intel.	Performance Insp and relevant Supt to review Team Plans to ensure they reflect the OS Performance & Resources Plan.	31.12.06 (on going)

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & ACTION PLAN
(TO BE COMPLETED BY POLICE)

REPORT REFERENCE	GRADE	RECOMMENDATION	PERSON RESPONSIBLE (to be completed by client)	AGREED / INTENDED ACTION (to be completed by client)	IMPLEMENTATION DATE (to be completed by client)
R7	2	An annual report should be produced which sets out performance against target for all key areas in the plan. This should be used to evaluate targets for the next year and to ensure that any incomplete tasks are carried forward.	Performance Insp C/Supt OS	OS Performance & Resources Plan to be maintained as a 'living document', documenting progress against actions. Where relevant, carry forward tasks to next years plan.	31.12.06 (on going)
R8	2	The OS Performance & Resources plan should include prior year actual data, so that the current year's targets can be seen in context.	Performance Insp	OS Performance & Resources Plan to include relevant previous year's data for comparison purposes where it adds value.	1.4.07 (on going)
R9	2	The systems and procedures for collating the performance information required in the new performance framework need to be identified and documented. Individual officers should be nominated to provide data on a timely basis	Performance Insp Relevant Supt, OS Team Managers	Develop and document processes for the recording OS Performance Framework data. Identify staff responsible for supplying data.	11.12.06

ACTION PLAN AGREED BY:	Chief Superintendent R.Smith	DATE:	6.11.06
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------	----------------

Draft Report Issued: October 2006
Final Report Issued: November 2006