

## GLA IPA – MPA: Key Lines of Enquiry. *Track changes draft post consultation, 18 November 2003*

### 1. What is MPA trying to achieve?

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
<b>1) AMBITIONS</b>			
1.1) Has the organisation developed specific longer-term ambitions based on national and London-wide priorities, and those rising from local need & developments?	Evidence of ambitions for modernising the service and improving London's quality of life over the mid to long term (eg 5-15 years). Evidence that ambition is informed by the Police reform programme, National Policing Plan and London priorities.	MPA understands the scale of the problems and opportunities London is facing and knows what it and other stakeholders can achieve for London. MPA is developing and owning independent and accountable ambitions. It has an understanding of the broader issues nationally and regionally.	MPA is unclear about the scale of the problems and opportunities London is facing and how its own services and those of other stakeholders could contribute. MPA adopts ambitions emanating from the MPS. There is little interest in the broader issues which relate to the national and regional levels. Ambitions do not correlate with national standards.
1.2) How realistic and robust are its ambitions?	Extent to which the ambitions are realistic - reflecting the scale of the problems and the opportunities the area is facing, and the needs and diversity of the communities the organisation serves; and are achievable within the constraints and delivery capabilities – and robust – as shown by clarity around sustainable outcomes and long-term targets. Comparison with other police authorities in Britain and internationally as far as is reasonably practicable.	The ambitions are clear, focused and realistic, identifying what long-term sustainable outcomes the organisation and others are seeking to achieve.	The organisation has not developed an overall vision or ambitions for the area, or they are vague aspirations and underdeveloped with few identifiable linkages to their own strategies or those of its functional bodies.

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
1.3) How effectively is the organisation offering leadership to London communities and to its own services through its ambitions?	Effectiveness of leadership within MPA to ensure ambitions are clearly understood and owned by all its members and staff, understood by the management board of the MPS and embedded into MPS planning processes. The ambitions are reflected in the MPA's three year and annual planning cycles.	MPA members and staff are clear about the ambitions which have been set and their role in delivering these. MPA objectives are reflected in MPS plans. MPA's ambitions drive its three year and annual planning cycles.	MPA members and staff are unclear about what the organisation should and should not be focussing on and are unclear of their roles around this. MPS plans do not reflect MPA objectives, or they contradict them The planning cycles are not driven by stated ambitions.
1.4) Has the organisation included stakeholders & the community in developing ambitions?	Evidence of MPA's engagement with CDRPs, and extent to which MPA priorities influence local CDRP strategies and vice versa. Evidence that the ambitions are based on engagement, consultation and dialogue with stakeholders and service users.	MPA's priorities are shared and understood by stakeholders and are reflected in local strategies. MPA has included stakeholders and the community in developing its strategies and reflects their concerns. MPA has developed its ambitions using guidance from the National Policing Plan, plus engagement, consultation and dialogue with stakeholders and service users.	MPA's ambitions are not shared by boroughs or reflected in local strategies. MPA has failed to engage with stakeholders and the community.
1.5) How well have the GLA's ambitions for London been translated into ambitions for the organisation	Evidence of relevant Mayoral ambitions being shared by the MPA and incorporated into plans. Evidence of implementation of Mayoral/GLA budgetary deliverables and conditions and extent to which deliverables are reflected in MPA planning process Effectiveness of leadership within MPA to ensure ambitions are clearly understood and owned by all members and staff.	MPA is clear about and acts on relevant Mayoral ambitions and has effectively translated them into its planning mechanisms.	MPA is unclear about or does not act on relevant Mayoral ambitions and has not incorporated them effectively

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
1.6) Do the organisation's ambitions reflect and demonstrate the strategic need for partnership working?	<p>Evidence that MPA's ambition also covers important partnership areas such as the London Crime Reduction Delivery Board, London Youth Crime Management Board, Crime and Disorder Plus Steering Group.</p> <p>Evidence that MPA addresses its role in achieving wider governmental and GLA ambitions at a local level including via partnerships.</p>	MPA sees partnership working as integral to its delivery and ensures that this forms part of its overall ambitions. It has a clear idea of where it can impact on wider social and regeneration issues and includes this in its ambition.	MPA is inward focused and sees partnership work as a 'bolt on' to its core delivery. It sees its role as purely around policing and does not contribute much to any wider issues. MPA is not aware or not having an impact where partnerships are not working well.

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
<b>2) PRIORITISATION</b>			
2.1) Has the organisation made clear what are priorities for improvement and what are not?	Ability of the MPA to set clear priorities for improvement which underpin the ambitions, and make explicit choices about what are not priorities. Extent to which the MPA ensures the community understands the priorities, and uses consultation evidence to inform this.	There is clarity about which things are, and are not priorities. The MPA ensures that the community fully understands the priorities and the rationale for them, and gathers and uses consultation evidence to inform this	There is no clarity about which things are, and are not priorities. The MPA fails to ensure that the community understands the priorities and the rationale for them, and does not gather or use consultation evidence to inform this.
2.2. Is there a clear basis for these priorities?	Evidence that MPA has looked at the range of priorities it has from the GLA/Mayor, Home Office/National Policing Plan, its own assessments, London needs, the wider policing sector etc and has balanced them accordingly. Evidence that the priorities influence the achievement of borough CDRP plans, and the work of parternships, where appropriate	MPA has balanced the range of priorities from different bodies, reconciled any competing ones and brought them together as a single tranche.	MPA has discrepancies between priorities or competing priorities, or has not managed the full range of its priorities together as a single tranche.
2.3. How effectively have priorities been communicated internally and externally?	Extent to which MPA has communicated its priorities to its staff and members, and MPS Management Board, partners, stakeholders and the public.	MPA has won over its staff to its priorities and has communicated its priorities to a broad range of stakeholders in appropriate and accessible ways.	MPA is not communicating its priorities to its staff and stakeholders, or is communicating but not doing so in an appropriate, inclusive and accessible way.

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
2.4. Has the organisation shifted resources/raised resources to match priorities?	Extent to which resources are allocated and targeted against these priorities and/or shifted out of non-priority areas both within and between services, as demonstrated in the Policing Plan.	MPA has an integrated approach to setting priorities and allocating resources against priorities. It moves resources away from areas that are not priorities, both within and between functions.	MPA has little or no linkage between resource allocation and its priorities. The budget changes only incrementally and the organisation is poor at disinvesting from things that are not priorities.

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
<b>3) FOCUS</b>			
<p>3.1. Does the organisation stay focussed on what matters?</p>	<p>Evidence that MPA has been able to sustain its focus over time to deliver on what matters to London communities, as shown by specific examples. Evidence that MPA maintains an appropriate level of influence over MPS. Evidence that MPA does not get distracted even in the face of other pressures, unexpected events, or too many initiatives. Ability of the service to re-focus, absorbing Home Office developments and developing its own plans without a suffering of service standards. Effectiveness of the mechanisms and tools used by MPA to sustain its focus on priority areas. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ whether committee agendas reflect the key areas of focus</li> <li>▪ forward planning</li> <li>▪ use of performance information</li> <li>▪ action planning arising from decisions and ability to follow up delivery structures, and roles and responsibilities which reflect priorities</li> </ul>	<p>MPA knows what matters most to London and concentrates its efforts in proportion to this. Its focus is on achieving impact in priority areas. There are examples of where this sustained focus has begun to show an impact in terms of delivering positive outcomes for London. MPA clearly maintains appropriate and effective influence over MPS. Members and senior managers maintain their focus on agreed areas and are not distracted by minor insignificant operational matters or crises. National developments are being implemented with no negative impact on service standards. Specific initiatives are undertaken with a clear purpose and MPA sustains its focus on these to ensure the desired impact is achieved, using a credible robust strategy.</p>	<p>MPA does not maintain focus on the key issues that matter most to London and therefore on what needs improving, or doesn't know what matters most to London communities. MPA is unable to maintain appropriate influence over MPS, and is driven by MPS's own agenda. Evidence shows members &amp; senior managers are distracted by minor insignificant managerial problems and fire-fighting with little regard for the future. MPA moves from one initiative to another without a clear focus on what it is seeking to achieve. Service standards are falling as the authority focuses on national developments. Ability to focus is hindered by a lack of effective mechanisms and tools. There is no credible robust strategy that ensures that MPA remains focussed on future risks and priorities, or that strategy isn't being used.</p>

## 2. How has MPA set about delivering its priorities?

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
<b>4) CAPACITY</b>			
4.1. Does the organisation currently have the capacity and skills it needs to achieve change?	<p>Quality and capacity of members, management and staff.</p> <p>Extent to which training and development is used to develop their skills and abilities.</p> <p>Evidence that MPA is meeting its own management development aims, and has the capacity to develop and maintain independent ambitions, and an appropriate level of influence, including over large scale projects..</p> <p>Existing financial capacity including levels of reserves, &amp; attitude/approach to exploring alternative methods of service delivery that maximise capacity (inc. through procurement).</p> <p>Evidence that MPA is willing to look outside of established procurement practices, and to encourage MPS to do so..</p>	<p>MPA is self-aware about capacity and has the people, skills, suppliers and capability it needs to deliver its priorities.</p> <p>MPA has the capacity or exceeding its own management development aims; can develop and maintain independent and accountable ambitions and an appropriate level of influence at all levels.</p> <p>MPA has the financial capacity it needs to deliver its priorities and will explore alternative methods of procuring supplies and delivering services where appropriate to maximise capacity.</p>	<p>MPA has little self-awareness and does not know where skills and capacity gaps exist. It does not have sufficient capacity to deliver its priorities. MPA relies on police intelligence and data to make decisions, due to a lack of its own capacity.</p> <p>There are financial difficulties which limit delivery of priorities. Alternative methods of supply and service delivery are not explored, with traditional practices going unchallenged.</p>
4.2) Are the Mayor/members/board members and officers clear about what they are responsible and accountable for?	<p>Quality and effectiveness of top level meetings and the decision making process.</p> <p>Degree to which the different top structures and roles are working effectively – for example scrutiny and engagement of stakeholders.</p> <p>Clarity about roles and responsibilities within the organisation and externally, including the relationship with MPS. Mutual respect and ability to</p>	<p>Members and senior management are clear about respective roles, responsibilities and accountabilities and the boundaries between them. Delegation is appropriate and set out in protocols/ standing orders. There are effective relationships at top level aimed at improving services and leading London.</p> <p>Its own internal capacity is maximised through</p>	<p>Members and senior management are unclear about roles and there are no protocols. Standing orders are unclear and not adhered to. Little strategic operating &amp; routine interference in operational issues.</p> <p>There are tensions at the top and decision-making processes are slow and often operationally focused</p>

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
	<p>work together effectively.</p> <p>Management of staffing resources through the use of HR policies and practices.</p> <p>Capacity and robustness of staffing resources in relation to issues such as morale, recruitment and retention, sickness absence and turnover rates, and how these have been addressed.</p> <p>Capacity to deliver a diverse workforce, reflective of London's communities. Evidence of an effective race equality scheme.</p> <p>Evidence of achievement in its own people development aims including the implementation of relevant parts of the good practice 'People Matters' Human Resources Framework where appropriate</p> <p>Robustness of health and safety arrangements</p> <p>Understanding of, and effective response to, new ethical framework by members and officers.</p> <p>Full compliance with Nolan whistle-blowing procedures in place, open meetings held, clear transparent auditing and the thorough investigation of complaints into corruption.</p> <p>Evidence of effective oversight of complaints and discipline/professional standards processes</p>	<p>effective HR practice including training and development linked to priorities, and by clear strategies to address any important limitations on staffing resources such as recruitment and retention, and sickness absence; and health and safety issues.</p> <p>The "People Matters" framework is well embedded and adhered to.</p>	<p>MPA has not sought to get the best out of its own internal capacity for example, there are weaknesses in HR practice and key issues such as sickness absence have not been dealt with effectively.</p> <p>The MPA is struggling with the implementation of the "People Matters" framework.</p>
<p>4.3. Does the organisation use partnerships effectively to deliver complex priorities?</p>	<p>Ability to work in partnership with the statutory, voluntary, community and private sectors, Home Office, MOD, the City of London and British Transport Police and other police authorities to deliver positive outcomes which meet the diverse needs of service users and London in general.</p> <p>Evidence that MPA is working with neighbouring police authorities on cross border and close border issues and developing integrated responses.</p>	<p>MPA is innovative with partners and points to successes that have positively affected people's lives. It has developed effective partnerships with relevant agencies and other police authorities ensuring resources are maximised. It works with other bodies to provide improved services, integrated responses and achieve economies of scale.</p>	<p>Partners tend to focus on the difficulties of achieving outcomes with MPA. MPA can only point to things like the number of partnerships when identifying results, rather than real outcomes. There is little or no joined up working with government. There are problems in the relationships with other partners and police authorities.</p>
<p>4.4) Are relationships with common partners co-ordinated effectively across the GLA group?</p>	<p>Extent to which relations with government departments and common partners are co-ordinated across the group.</p> <p>Evidence of MPA working collaboratively with GLA group organisations and partners</p>	<p>The MPA ensures it speaks consistently with other GLA group organisations and co-ordinates its activities with common partners/stakeholders.</p>	<p>The MPA sometimes sends contradictory or differing messages on behalf of the GLA group to common partners/stakeholders through lack of co-ordination.</p>

<b>THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT FOCUS</b>	<b>AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO</b>	<b>AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO</b>
4.5) Does the organisation respond flexibly to changing circumstances and emerging challenges?	Evidence that the MPA has ensured that the MPS has planning capacity for forecasting foreseeable changes and identifying new ones such as the mobility, transience and diversity of London's population, recruitment and retention issues and terrorism.	MPA is an organisation with good intelligence on developments in London, predicting change, responding and influencing the MPS where necessary	MPA is continually found lacking in intelligence gathering and analysis and is unable to predict changes in environment.
4.6) Is there a thorough and robust approach to equality and diversity issues?	Evidence of thorough policy development and training around equality and diversity issues. Engagement with MPS Independent Advisory Groups Thorough planning for new equality legislation and guidance.	The MPA has clear policies and procedures around equalities and diversity backed up by thorough training and engagement processes.	The MPA is muddled in its approach to diversity with disjointed initiatives, lack of training and tokenistic engagement.



THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
<b>5) PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</b>			
5.1) Are mechanisms and information in place, enabling the measurement & management of performance?	Extent to which ambitions and priorities are translated into corporate and service plans and targets in a way that allows the members and management to monitor achievement, and individuals to understand their role in that achievement. Evidence of an effective performance review process in place for the force's chief officer team. Evidence of adequate planning for the implementation of the Police Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF)	MPA's planning and performance management culture is driven by the ambitions and corporate priorities. These are cascaded down to the service and individual level across the body with staff aware of their role in achieving ambitions. There is an effective performance review process in place for the force's chief officer team. There are robust arrangements for the future implementation of the PPAF	Planning across MPA is disjointed, opportunistic, reactive and not driven by the ambitions and corporate priorities. Staff are unaware of their role in achieving targets. There is not an effective performance review process in place for the force's chief officer team. There is no or inadequate preparation for the implementation of PPAF.
5.2 Do staff know what is expected of them and do managers know if they are achieving it?	Evidence of the establishment of the IPDS system which is enabling individuals to understand their role in achievement of ambitions and priorities, and allows managers to monitor their performance	Staff understand how what they do contributes to overall achievement of priorities. Across the body there are clear performance targets contributing to corporate priorities and understood by people delivering services.	There is no performance management of staff, or where it exists, it only covers some. Staff operate in a vacuum in the absence of clear targets and do not understand how their work contributes to the overall achievement of its priorities.
5.3) Has the organisation assessed the risks inherent in its strategies and service plans?	Evidence that the MPA utilises robust risk management strategies and has ensured that the MPS adopts robust risk management strategies that are used in planning and delivering services.	MPA is risk aware particularly when entering new arenas and always assesses risks inherent in the things it does. MPA ensures a robust approach by MPS.	MPA is at risk when entering new arenas. It does not carry out risk assessments in relation to what it currently does. MPA is unaware of the approach to risk management by MPS or has failed to influence it.
5.4. Does the organisation ensure that it is making its resources work in the best way to deliver value for money?	Ability of MPA to manage its financial performance and determine the extent to which it achieves value for money. Evidence of performance information and other data being used to target service delivery such as patterns of crime, vulnerable groups etc. Evidence that the data is robust and useful in ensuring priorities are met. Ability of MPA to use the system to understand	There is a record of sound financial management and resources are used flexibly in line with priorities. MPA demonstrates it achieves value for money. MPA gathers the right data it needs to ensure it is meeting priorities and predicting future need. This information is robust and of high quality. Performance monitoring focuses on outcomes and is effective in enabling politicians and	MPA has a mediocre or poor approach to financial management. It does not know whether it gets value for money from what it does. MPA collects just the basic information. This is of poor quality or is not used to drive improvement or achievement of priorities. Performance monitoring is weak and does not focus on outcomes. Members and senior

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
	<p>reasons for differences in the quality and effectiveness of its activities as experienced by stakeholders/London communities, and to manage performance taking appropriate corrective action where necessary.</p> <p>Evidence that there are good qualified staff collecting and analysing the data.</p>	<p>senior officers to understand the reasons for variations in performance against targets. Appropriate corrective action is taken and followed up. Staff are appropriately skilled in managing the data.</p>	<p>officers have little or no understanding about the reasons for variations in performance and are unable to take appropriate corrective action. Staff collecting the data are not sure how it is used.</p>
<p>5.5) Is there an effective cross-GLA group process translating Mayoral ambitions and priorities into service plans?</p>	<p>Extent to which planning and performance management ensures that mayoral ambitions and priorities are translated, where relevant, into ambitions, plans and targets of MPA.</p>	<p>MPA's planning and performance management culture is driven by group ambitions and priorities. Mayoral ambitions and priorities, where relevant, are appropriately translated into planning.</p>	<p>Planning of services is disjointed, opportunistic, reactive and not driven by group ambitions and priorities. There is no link between relevant group ambitions and performance management within MPA.</p>
<p>5.6) Does the organisation provide robust monitoring/scrutiny of the service/functions for which it is responsible?</p>	<p>Extent to which the MPA regularly reviews targets and performance, overseeing inspections and establishing a robust scrutiny function.</p>	<p>The MPA provides effective scrutiny for the force, ensuring targets and priorities are met and holding the Commissioner to account for this.</p>	<p>The MPA fails at holding the force and Commissioner to account and its scrutiny function is not effective.</p>

### 3. What has MPA achieved / not achieved to date?

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
<b>6) ACHIEVEMENT IN QUALITY OF SERVICE</b>			
6.1. What level of quality is the organisation currently achieving in its service delivery?	Current level of quality of strategic planning, strategy development, oversight and scrutiny provided by MPA as shown by self assessment, appropriate comparisons, external and internal validation, stakeholders, and by the results delivered by MPS	There is clear evidence that MPA is achieving a high level of quality in its strategic functions. MPA is meeting or exceeding its own challenging targets and standards.	Internal and external commentary and performance measurement is showing that MPA is failing to meet its standards or has not set sufficiently challenging standards or targets.
6.2) Is this in line with its priorities?	Evidence that MPA is achieving a high level of quality in its priority areas.	The level of quality MPA is achieving in its strategic planning, strategy development, oversight and scrutiny functions is in line with its priorities.	MPA is failing to provide good quality strategic planning, strategy development, oversight and scrutiny in its priority areas.
6.3) Is the level of quality realistic in view of context & constraints?	Extent to which this level of quality is realistic in relation to the context and constraints in which MPA operates.	The level of quality in service delivery is what could realistically be expected in relation to the context and constraints in which MPA operates.	The level of quality in service delivery is substantially below expected in relation to the context and constraints in which MPA operates.
6.4) How satisfied are stakeholders, communities and users with the quality of service?	Current level of stakeholder satisfaction with the quality of strategic planning, strategy development, oversight and scrutiny as shown by feedback, surveys, inspection evidence etc	Stakeholders and Londoners are clear about the service they can expect from MPA. They recognise the high quality of the strategic functions and express high levels of satisfaction.	Stakeholders and Londoners show low levels of satisfaction with strategic functions.

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
<b>7) ACHIEVEMENT OF IMPROVEMENT</b>			
7.1. What is improving in services and in cross-cutting areas which impacts on Londoners' quality of life?	Evidence of achievement of Mayoral objectives where appropriate, improvements in cross cutting areas which impact on quality of life, as shown by self assessment, appropriate comparisons, external and internal validation, and by the results delivered by MPS. Evidence of commitment and 'cultural buy-in' to tracking improvements Evidence of an established baseline on which to measure improvement.	There is clear evidence that services and the quality of life of Londoners is improving as a direct result of things MPA is doing itself and in effective partnerships.	There is clear evidence that services and the quality of life of Londoners is in decline, static or is not making sufficient progress, and MPA seems unable to reverse this situation and bring about service improvement.
7.2. What is not improving in services and in cross-cutting areas?	Lack of evidence of achievement of Mayoral objectives where appropriate, or of improvements in cross cutting areas which impact on quality of life, as shown by self assessment, appropriate comparisons, external and internal validation, and by the results delivered by MPS.	As above	As above
7.3. Are these improvements in line with priorities?	Evidence that improvements are sustainable and in line with priorities. Evidence of the efficiency of integration of new developments.	Improvements are in line with agreed priorities and can be maintained. The MPA plans ahead for new developments, which are assessed and incorporated appropriately	Planned improvements in priority areas have not materialised or where they have they cannot be maintained. The MPA is constantly thrown by new developments and there are often damaging periods between change regimes.
7.4. Would stakeholders, communities and service users recognise these improvements?	Evidence of real outcomes seen and experienced by users and the residential and commuting community, showing that MPA has contributed to a more sustainable and cohesive community.	Londoners have experienced improvements in MPS service delivery and their quality of life and can identify these.	Londoners have limited awareness of any improvement in services or their quality of life.
7.5. How much progress has the organisation made?	Extent of this improvement in relation to the baseline performance and context of MPA. Effectiveness with which baseline performance has been established.	The rate/extent of improvement is realistic in relation to a clearly established baseline performance of MPA and the context and constraints in which it operates.	The rate and extent of improvement, where it exists, is below what would be expected from MPA; or is not known because baselines are poorly established..

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
<b>8) INVESTMENT</b>			
8.1. Is the organisation putting the right building blocks in place which will enable future improvements in services and cross-cutting issues?	Evidence that MPA is investing and putting in place the right building blocks to enable improvement, especially where there are currently major gaps. Evidence of any gaps where appropriate investments are not being made which will impact on the ability to secure future improvement.	There is clear evidence that MPA has put in place building blocks to address gaps & drive improvement. These will contribute to service improvement, effective partnership working & meaningful community engagement. The building blocks are already bringing about change.	MPA lacks many key building blocks needed to improve services and no investment is being made to address this. MPA is unable to identify or implement what it needs to put in place to improve, work effectively with partners, and engage with the community.
8.2. Is the organisation securing the necessary resources for investment?	Ability to identify and secure the resources for investment including robustness of medium-term financial planning, and appropriate use of external funding. Evidence of modernisation of procurement to ensure robustness and explore greater value for money.	MPA has secured the necessary resources to drive future improvements in priority areas, for example from external sources and has clearly identified exit strategies in place where necessary. It has a robust medium-term financial plan in place to guide its investment decisions	MPA has had limited or no success in securing the necessary resources to drive future improvements in priority areas, and does not carry out any medium-term financial planning, or it is only at an early stage.
8.3. Does the organisation have a track record of opening itself up and responding to internal and external challenge?	Evidence that MPA is open to internal and external challenge and its investment decisions show that it is receptive to different ways of doing things. Evidence of the effective use of different kinds of external challenge. Evidence that MPA has developed benchmarks and role models against which to compare itself.	MPA exposes itself to external challenge, inviting partners/stakeholders/communities to comment on its approaches and encouraging external input. The scrutiny process is robust at providing challenge to the decision-making process. MPA is receptive to different ways of doing things	MPA doesn't encourage external challenge or respond to it, adopting a defensive approach. It doesn't welcome suggestions for change. Scrutiny is weak & there is an internal focus. Changes are incremental, focusing on doing the same things differently rather than doing different things.

#### 4. In the light of what MPA has learned to date what does it plan to do next?

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
<b>9) LEARNING</b>			
9.1. How self-aware is the organisation about what it has done well and the problems it still faces?	Level of self-awareness about its successes and what remains to be achieved, and a clear understanding of problems and solutions to problems. MPA has in place processes for self assessment and review and actively implements and manages change.	MPA is self-aware and has a well informed and realistic understanding of what it has achieved, what remains to be achieved and possible solutions. There are clear processes for self assessment and review, driving effective change.	MPA lacks self-awareness and has limited understanding of the problems it faces and the possible solutions. Self assessment is poor or lacking in honesty and not linked to the change agenda.
9.2. Has the organisation learnt from its own experiences and made changes in the light of this?	Track record of proactively learning through experience from both successes and failures and making changes in the light of this which have had a positive impact on service delivery. Ability to use leadership and management styles appropriate to the stage of organisational development and a culture that encourages staff to test out ideas and develop solutions which will benefit service users.	There are successes in priority areas & learning from this experience. There are clear examples of overcoming barriers to change. Review and monitoring learns from what works & informs change to strategies that are not working effectively. A learning organisation where the leadership encourages staff to contribute to the learning process, to test out new ideas and develop solutions.	MPA doesn't learn from successes & failures, thus failing to deliver improvements. Delivery arrangements are generally traditional and rarely change. Staff are not encouraged to take part in learning or contribute to driving improvement.
9.3. Does the organisation actively learn from others and make changes as a result?	Ability to proactively seek out learning and better practice from other police authorities, partners, users, regional bodies and other organisations nationally and internationally and use this learning effectively, for example to overcome barriers to change and promote the modernisation agenda	MPA proactively seeks out learning from others and has used this to drive improvements	MPA does little to seek out learning from others, and there are few or no examples of this being used to drive improvements.
9.4. Is learning shared throughout the organisation?	Evidence that learning is systematically shared across MPA and beyond.	Learning is effectively shared across the organisation and beyond.	Any learning that takes place is 'locked' into administrative areas and not shared.
9.5. How effectively does the organisation share, and benefit from, learning across the GLA group?	Evidence that learning is systematically shared across the GLA group; and that MPA learns from other group organisations.	MPA systematically and effectively shares learning across the GLA group organisations. MPA learns from the experiences of other group organisations, and from their partners and stakeholders	Any learning is 'locked' within MPA and is not systematically shared across the group. MPA does not learn from the other organisations, their partners or stakeholders.

<b>THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT FOCUS</b>	<b>AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO</b>	<b>AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO</b>
<b>THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT FOCUS</b>	<b>AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO</b>	<b>AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO</b>
<b>10) FUTURE PLANS</b>			
10.1. Does the organisation have robust future plans and strategies, including statutory plans, which set out a sustained focus to achieving its ambitions?	Evidence of robust plans for the future with milestones to monitor progress that underpin ambitions and the needs of the police reform programme. The quality and suitability of the statutory plans in place, in relation to providing a consistent framework supporting delivery of ambitions.	MPA has robust plans & strategies in place linked to ambitions for London, and including clear milestones/ a framework for the short and long term. High quality statutory plans which link together and support delivery of ambitions.	MPA's future plans are under-developed, lack clear milestones and provide a poor framework for the short and long-term. Statutory plans are of poor quality & do not link to ambitions or conflict with future planning.
10.2. Is the organisation addressing areas where it has not achieved what it wanted to?	Evidence of responding to failure to improve and building this into future plans.	Where services are not improving the functional body understands why and what it needs to do. This is reflected in future plans.	Where delivery isn't improving it struggles to understand why and what it needs to do to address this. Plans in these areas are therefore weak or do not exist.
10.3. Are staff, partners and communities effectively engaged in planning for the future?	Extent to which staff, partners, stakeholders and communities are getting involved in future planning. This engagement continues to be developed for the future.	Staff, partners, stakeholders and communities are effectively engaged in developing plans and this process is subject to improvement.	There is little engagement of staff, partners, stakeholders & community in developing plans and no evidence of any plans to improve engagement.
10.4. How will the organisation ensure that it has the capacity to identify, implement and maintain further improvements?	Future plans are effectively linked to an assessment of what capacity is needed to implement these, and there is evidence of the ability to make difficult decisions about what can and cannot be delivered and to use reviews to consider options for change.	MPA has assessed the capacity it needs to implement plans & is addressing gaps. It is committed to improvement and willing to tackle difficult problems, taking and sticking to tough decisions, & considering radical options for change.	MPA struggles to resolve plans & resources, has little vision of future priorities & their impact on resource allocation. Little awareness of current or future skills/capacity requirements. Difficult decisions are avoided.
10.5. Does the organisation regularly reassess its future plans and capacity in line with changing national and	Evidence of continual reassessment of current and future priorities and the resources, skills and technology needed to meet these priorities, in line with changes in national and community expectations. Future plans appropriately anticipate the diverse needs, wants and	MPA's continual review of progress against priorities ensures that it is aware of where it has not achieved desired outcomes or where regional and national priorities have changed and is able to review plans in the light of this knowledge and respond effectively to the needs	MPA's plans are not dynamic or reviewed regularly in the light of performance or changing regional and national priorities.

THEMES AND KEY QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT FOCUS	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS CLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO	AN ORGANISATION THAT IS UNCLEAR ABOUT WHAT IT IS TRYING TO DO
community priorities?	expectations of a changing population.	of Londoners.	
10.6. How effectively is future planning coordinated and integrated across the GLA group?	Evidence of effective joint planning across the GLA group to co-ordinate and integrate organisational and group plans in defined areas where appropriate.	MPA effectively co-ordinates and integrates future plans. MPA's plans are well integrated and coordinated with other organisational and group plans where appropriate.	MPA fails to co-ordinate and integrate future plans. MPA's plans exist in isolation from those of the other organisations and are incompatible with them.

Version: 18 November 1110 (TC)