

**ACTION PLAN PROGRESS SUMMARY : DISTRICT AUDIT REPORT ON POLICING AND PERFORMANCE PLAN 2001/2**

March 31<sup>st</sup> 2002

No	Subject	Lead	Timescales when action likely to be complete	Recommendation	Progress Update and degree to which recommendation met
R1	<p>Performance information to be included in the plan.</p> <p>STATUTORY</p>	ACPRS/ Head of Corporate Performance	This depends on future amendments to the BVPI suite. Home Office drugs data for example is unlikely to ever be available in time for the annual plan.	The Authority needs to ensure that all of the necessary performance information is included in next year's BVPP	<p>Where the MPS is responsible for the collation of data, steps were put in place to ensure that, where possible, information was available this year, with more extensive use of estimates. Estimation methodologies were discussed with the district auditor, particularly regarding repeat burglary rates, where we were unable to carry out a lengthy address-matching exercise in advance of the end of the financial year.</p> <p>An additional survey of accessibility of buildings to the disabled was carried out in November. Efforts have been made to improve the quality of repeat victimisation flagging on the crime system. The Home Office released the necessary BVPIs from the British Crime Survey so we were able to include fear of crime information this year. We have been unable to provide data for BVPI 153b (relating to partner violence). In addition the Home Office has not yet made data available for BVPI 129 (re drugs).</p> <p>Recommendation met: partially</p>
R2	<p>HMIC work to be included in the plan</p> <p>Non-statutory</p>	ACPRS/ Head of Corporate Planning	31 March 02	The BVPP does not include details of work undertaken by HMIC in the last year.	<p>This information was included in this year's BVPP.</p> <p>Recommendation met: completely</p>

R3	Integration of Best Value principles  STATUTORY	ACPRS/ Head of Best Value group	Ongoing	Integrate best value principles into day to day processes to ensure that managers across the organisation are adopting a consistent and effective approach to continuous improvement	<p>A performance management framework (previously known as the corporate governance framework) is being developed to co-ordinate continuous improvement activity through the Quality, Performance and Risk Management Group; work commissioned to develop links between best value and excellence model at corporate level; excellence model used to baseline BOTJ BVR; presentations to Federation and BOCU commanders; input to the QA course; relaunch of best value intranet and internet sites; article in Metline (Federation magazine); planned enhanced involvement of MPSCG staff in best value reviews provides opportunity for them to transfer bv principles to their other project work.</p> <p>Future work includes the development of policy on continuous improvement with supporting standard operating procedures; major drive on communication of continuous improvement ethos and practices; input to training and development events to be extended; best value newsletter planned.</p> <p>Recommendation met: moderately</p>
R4	Resourcing for Best Value reviews  Non-statutory	ACPRS/ Head of Best Value group		Review the resourcing needs for undertaking and supporting best value reviews to ensure that staffing arrangements and skills continue to meet the evolving needs of the best value programme.	<p>Resourcing has been monitored throughout the year and information provided regularly to BVPB. As part of the budget setting process for 2002/03 and in the light of a challenging budget position for the MPA/MPS, a zero based budgeting exercise was conducted within PRS. The resource needs for supporting reviews have been examined and proposals for change accepted by BVPB on 17 January 02. Implementation of revised support structure underway</p> <p>Recommendation met: completely</p>
R5	Definition of principles for partner working	ACPRS/ Head of Best Value group	September 02	Define the principles to be applied in working with partners on cross cutting reviews to ensure clarity on the objectives of the work, responsibilities and expected	<p>The setting up and managing of the bringing offenders to justice (BOTJ) review has provided the opportunity to develop appropriate principles and a draft of guidelines for cross cutting reviews was presented to BVPB on 7 March 2002. Work</p>

	Non-statutory			outcomes.	<p>continues to monitor the development of our cross cutting review; learn from the debrief of the equalities review and the BOTJ review; include in our best value toolkit as interim guidelines. Interim guidelines were available at the end of March 2002, final version September 2002 to take account of outcome of BOTJ and Equalities for All reviews.</p> <p>Recommendation met: completely</p>
R6	<p>Staff appraisal process to support performance management</p> <p>Non-statutory</p>	ACHR	Dec 2002	<p>Ensure that the staff appraisal process consistently supports performance management arrangements. In particular, individual staff should have clear objectives and development plans which are connected to departmental and corporate priorities.</p>	<p>The new appraisal system being developed is based on the national competency framework. The principle is that all staff will have a role profile to set out what is required of that individual, both in terms of activities, standards and desired outcomes. Some of the activity required will be corporately required (eg activities of leaders) and some will reflect business group needs (eg TP may require patrol officers to undertake particular activities to enable TP to deliver its objectives). In addition managers have the opportunity to include in the performance development review any objectives required to support MPS or local objectives. Training in the new system for police officers will complete by the end of June. Work is in hand to develop role profiles for specialist police roles. There is a phased roll out for all police officers to be completed by the Summer. The national project is identifying civil staff support activities and the MPS should be able to begin creating civil staff role profiles in the summer. All members of the MPS will have a role profile by the end of December 2002, and the next appraisal due for each will be based upon it.</p> <p>Recommendation met: significantly</p>

R7	<p>Corporate standards and guidance to support the PMF</p> <p>Non-statutory</p>	ACPRS/ Head of Business Change Group	<p>Guidance to be agreed by QPRMG in April 2002.</p> <p>Compliance checking timetable to be agreed by QPRMG in May/June 2002</p>	<p>Provide corporate standards and guidance to support the implementation of the performance management framework and ensure the consistent and appropriate application of these requirements.</p>	<p>In May 2001, an informal self-audit of each business group took place to help identify how far aspects of the performance management framework had been implemented. It was originally planned that implementation would be inspected in autumn 2001. However, the PMF Project Board agreed that, given known difficulties in resourcing some areas of the framework in business groups, a further self-audit would take place instead of a formal inspection. This audit was completed in January 2002 and forms the basis of guidance to business groups for 2002-03 - this to be approved by the QPRMG Strategic Committee in April 2002.</p> <p>Currently the framework sets out <i>what</i> is expected to be in place across the MPS. In general, Business groups decide <i>how</i> to implement the framework according to their needs. Where corporate guidance is required, this is identified via the self-assessment audits, other inspections and by practitioners at the PMF User Assurance Group. In future, the need for additional guidance can also be raised at the QPRMG Strategic Committee which will have overall responsibility for this area. Notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- planning guidance for 2002-03 has been provided by Corporate Planning group and is updated each year;</li> <li>- guidance on the EM self assessment (how to apply this and when these must be carried out each year) is maintained and updated by PRS 12;</li> <li>- the Inspectorate are currently carrying out a thematic inspection into 'level 1 and level 2 management checks' which will also result in clarification of policy and good practice.</li> </ul> <p>The PMF User Assurance Group, established in early 2000, is used as a forum to share good practice and enable practitioners to provide each other with mutual assistance and guidance. This forum may be subsumed within the committees</p>
----	---	---	--	--	---

					<p>supporting the new QPRMG Strategic Committee, ensuring that practitioners still have an opportunity to share good practice, raise issues relating to this matter and can comment on any proposed changes in policy.</p> <p>Future work will establish review and compliance checking timetable and format for the PM Framework for 2002-03 - timetable to be drafted and agreed by QPRMG in May/June 2002. As a minimum, a self-audit will take place in the summer and then again later in the year, but QPRMG will need to decide if/when a more formal inspection should take place.</p> <p>Recommendation met: significantly</p>
R8	<p>SMART performance measures</p> <p>Non-statutory</p>	ACPRS/ Head of Corporate Performance	Ongoing development work	Identify and put in place SMART performance measures and targets for all areas of activity to facilitate the delivery of pre defined outcomes	<p>As part of the PMF implementation, each business group is required to develop MI and PIs to monitor their business plans. Progress has been made in many business groups but there have been difficulties in resourcing this work in some areas. Staff from the Corporate Performance Group will continue to work with staff in all business Groups to ensure continued progress. A project was set up to enhance to MetStats service ahead of the 2002/2003 planning year and development work to enable the handling of a wider range of corporate data will continue.</p> <p>Recognised gaps in management information include customer satisfaction and quality of services, process measures and costing of processes.</p> <p>While there is work taking place in different business groups to define processes and identify PIs to monitor these (eg for the MPS Policing Model), there is not yet a prioritised programme of development of corporate management information. The development of the MPS Corporate Strategy should help to focus energy on the key areas where improved PIs/MI are needed.</p> <p>Recommendation met: moderately</p>

R9	Define reporting hierarchies  Non-statutory	ACPRS/ Head of Corporate Performance	End of 2002/2003	Define appropriate hierarchies for reporting performance information in all business areas to ensure that performance is monitored appropriately at key levels.	As part of the work to implement the PMF, business groups have reviewed the existing levels of performance reporting. The recent PMF audit shows that further progress is planned in this area within business groups for the next financial year. However, the redefined role of former Performance Review Unit staff to support the new local inspection process has hampered development of the PMF in some business groups. Although there are performance hierarchies in place, there is patchy use of these structures to monitor and drive performance improvement and further development is planned. This aspect will be included in guidance to business groups.  Corporately, there is still work required to ensure that high level committees consider aspects of performance appropriate to their roles. Changes to the role of PRC - to focus on strategic performance issues, remitting actions and tactical solutions to more appropriate levels - still have to be worked through and some changes rely on other committees being in place to deal with actions from the PRC.  Recommendation met: significantly
R10	Tighten implementation planning arrangements for Best Value reviews  STATUTORY	ACPRS/ Head of Best Value group	Strategy to be finalised and presented to May meeting of BVPB	Tighten implementation planning arrangements for best value reviews to ensure that delays are minimised in developing clear and measurable improvement plans for completed reviews.	Difficulties experienced with early reviews recognised. More effective approach taken with Crime review involving those who will be responsible for implementation at an early stage. Strategy for transition between review and implementation being developed.  Recommendation met: completely
R11	Review scrutiny and progress chasing	ACPRS/ Head of Best Value group	Complete	Review scrutiny and progress chasing arrangements to ensure that they provide sufficiently frequent challenge to the	Standard review highlight report in use; MPA lead member identified for each review; independent challenge put in place for each review; terms of reference for BVPB revised to

	arrangements for reviews  Non-statutory	Value group		progress and emerging outcomes of reviews	strengthen monitoring role; progress monitored by project boards and BVPB; QA checklist in place; BVPMT liaison officer appointed for each review; process enhanced to include optional MPA workshops on emerging findings of reviews.  Recommendation met: completely
R12	Confirm that 5 year review programme provides full coverage of functions.  Non-statutory	ACPRS/ Head of Best Value Group	July 2002	To comply with statutory requirements, confirm periodically that the 5 year review programme provides full coverage of all MPA/MPS functions (white paper may impact on this recommendation)	Decision taken to review content of programme to ensure it provides full coverage of all functions. Programme already reviewed annually. The programme will be reviewed in June/July 2002, and will take particular account of the white paper, which in particular removes the need for all functions to be reviewed in a 5 year period.  Recommendation met :completely
R13	Rigorous prioritisation and monitoring of the implementation of action plans	ACPRS/ Head of the Inspection Liaison Analysis Unit	Process in place by end of 2002	Rigorous prioritisation and monitoring of the implementation of action plans developed by internal and external agencies is required to ensure that improvement opportunities are realised and that the cost and effort invested in review activity is not wasted.	The Inspection Liaison & Analysis Unit (ILAU) has the responsibility to collect, record and disseminate information about all inspection, audit and review activity affecting the MPS whether undertaken by internal or external teams; this includes Internal Audit reports, Best Value reviews and the Mayor's Efficiency & Effectiveness reviews (Accenture). The ILAU has always, since its formation in 1999, had responsibility for monitoring the progress on implementation of recommendations from HMIC reports and for preparing MPS corporate responses on behalf of the Commissioner. The ILAU's independence has been demonstrated, and its strategic role enhanced, by its recent removal from the MPS Inspectorate into the Business Change Group . The process described above for HMIC reports will eventually be extended to cover all other inspection, audit and review reports, both internal and external. The ILAU's network of contacts in Business Groups and Directorates will be strengthened and formalised and procedures will be established to ensure that

					<p>the Unit receives all necessary information to enable progress to be monitored. This process has recently been enhanced by the appointment of a sergeant in DAC TP's office with specific responsibility for tracking and chasing implementation of recommendations.</p> <p>Ultimately, the recipients of reports are responsible for implementation and they must bring to light any difficulties or conflicting priorities which jeopardize progress. To be successful, the process will need to be rigorously overseen by QPRMG (or its successor) which will, in turn, require firm leadership to drive compliance. These issues are currently being addressed in conjunction with the setting up of a series of strategic level committees across the MPS.</p> <p>Recommendation met: significantly</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---