

**To:** Joint Audit Committee  
**Date:** 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015  
**By:** Ian Perkin, Treasurer  
**Title:** Governance and Performance Management

---

**Purpose of Report/Issue:**

To brief the Committee on the non-financial processes that the PCC has in place for Surrey Police and the performance management process in place in Surrey Police.

---

**Recommendations**

That the Committee notes the report.

---

**Risk –** None arising.

---

**Equalities / Human Rights Implications –** no specific implications are raised by this report.

---

**Contact details:**

**Name:** Johanna Burne  
**Job Title:** Chief Executive  
**Telephone number:** 01483 630 200  
**Email address:** [Johanna.burne@surrey.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Johanna.burne@surrey.pnn.police.uk)

---

**Contact details:**

**Name:** Jenny Stone  
**Job Title:**  
**Telephone number:**  
**Email address:**

---

## 1. Governance Processes

- 1.1 It is one of the core responsibilities for the PCC to hold the Chief Constable to account for delivery against the Polcie and Crime Plan set by the PCC. The PCC has set out in his Police and Crime Plan how he will carry out this duty as follows:

*“I do not believe in micromanagement or setting a raft of targets which could skew police activity towards chasing numbers rather than doing the right thing for the public. I don’t want our senior officers and staff tied up with bureaucracy or wasting time in unnecessary meetings. Nor do I want to wrestle operational independence from the Chief Constable or undermine her ability to direct and control the Force. I believe in supporting the Chief Constable and her team in their difficult and demanding roles.*

*I will be asking the Chief Constable to report to me in person at monthly management meetings on how Surrey Police is meeting the people’s priorities. Key to this will be updates on the areas I have highlighted, such as reducing anti-social behaviour, crime rates, seizure of assets, how victims are being treated, public engagement opportunities and standards.*

*I intend to conduct my scrutiny of the Chief Constable in an open and transparent way by webcasting these management meetings. In this way I can demonstrate publicly that the Chief Constable is policing Surrey according to this Plan and that she is fulfilling her duties around equality and diversity, co-operation with partners in community safety and criminal justice, meeting the Strategic Policing Requirement and safeguarding children. “*

- 1.2 The main ways in which the PCC ensures non-financial governance and performance oversight is:

- Webcast management meetings – these are held every other month. The PCC, Deputy PCC, Chief Executive and Treasurer scrutinise the Chief Constable and her team on performance against the 6 People’s Priorities as set out in the Police and Crime Plan. Over the years 100’s of people have watched these webcasts, proving much more popular than attendance at governance meetings. The Surrey PCC was the first governacne body of policing to carry out such transparent scrutiny. Papers, minutes and links to to the webcasts are published on the PCC’s website.
- Quarterly scrutiny meetings. These meetings allow the PCC and his team to cover areas of performance against the Police and Crime Plan in greater detail than can be done at management meetings. Topics in the past have included responding to domestic violence, budget development, roads policing, complaints and tackling drugs in school. A work plan has been set out for 2015, although this can be changed if new or emerging issues arise. A formal agenda is set, minutes taken and Surrey Police provide information and experts in the area being scrutinised.

- Bi-weekly meetings – these are informal meetings between the PCC, Deputy PCC and others as required and the Chief Constable and members of her Chief Officer group as required. At these meetings the PCC is briefed on topics by the Chief Constable that she judges to be of high importance. For example, high profile cases or investigations, short-term performance issues, national policing issues.
- Access to Surrey Police and national police performance information. The OPCC has full access to Surrey Police management information and to national police performance information. National information includes iQuanta, which is a database only for policing performance professionals, and open websites such as Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabularies (HMIC) data and policeuk.
- Independent performance advice. The PCC’s Senior Policy Officer has overarching responsibility for provide advice to the PCC on Surrey Police performance issues. This member of staff has a background in performance management and regularly considers Surrey Police reports and information on local and national systems to provide the PCC with areas which he may wish to provide a scrutiny or governance focus.
- Complaints oversight – the PCC has a dedicated officer who handles complaints into the OPCC and also oversees the Surrey Police complaints process and advises the PCC. This includes dip-sampling cases and monitoring trends
- Independent Custody Vistor Scheme – the PCC is responsible for this scheme whereby volunteers carry out unannounced visits to custody centres in Surrey. The OPCC has a part-time member of staff who manages the scheme and 50 volunteers in place. Data is captured and the conditions in Surrey Police custody are monitored.
- Gold groups – these are Surrey Police groups where high profile incidents or themes are governened. The PCC or member of the OPCC attends these groups where Surrey Police feel that either the PCC needs to be kept briefed or where OPCC input would be helpful.
- Collaboration board – this board oversees the collaboration between Surrey and Sussex and is co-charied by the Deputy PCC. Business plans, financial savings plans and performance are all scrutinised.
- South East Regional Meetings. Some policing functions that impact on Surrey residents are carried out regionally due to their specialist nature, for example counter-terrorism, tackling Serious and Organised Crime, undercover policing etc. The PCC, Chief Constables and supporting staff are part of a South East governance board (with rotating PCC chairs) which scrutinise the performance of regional units.

1.3 Beyond Surrey Police, the PCC or his team in the OPCC is also involved in performance oversight of other organisations – fulfilling his ‘and crime’ part of his role. This includes:

- The Community Safety Board – the PCC chairs this board which brings together all partners with a statutory responsibility for delivering community safety in Surrey (Surrey County Council, local councils, Surrey Police, Fire and Rescue, Health). This board sets community safety

strategy, brings together the local Community Safety Partnerships and considers cross-agency working.

- The Surrey and Sussex Criminal Justice Partnership – this board is split into a two meetings, one each for Surrey and Sussex, which meet on the same day to discussed delivery of justice in Surrey. The Deputy PCC co-chairs the Surrey part of this board (with the Deputy Chief Constable). Agencies across the criminal justice system are represented (e.g. police, the Crown Prosecution Service, Courts, Youth Offending Team etc) to look at how justice is delivered in Surrey, to scrutinise performance and to direct work being undertaken to improve joint working.
- Services to victims – the OPCC is represented at a number of different groups which look at the standard of services provided to victims. This includes the Victim Care Board, Sexual Assault Referral Centre governance board and the Domestic Violence Commissioning Group.

## **2. Performance Management within Surrey Police**

The new Crime Performance Board was launched in August 2013 by Deputy Chief Constable Nick Ephgrave. The Crime Performance Board aimed to

- To identify areas of current performance risk and present analysis to inform discussion and action
- To hold unit commanders to account for the performance of their respective command, to identify areas of high performance and promulgate best practice
- To identify performance trends and plan activity in advance to mitigate anticipated performance challenges, to co-ordinate force initiatives in line with known seasonal trend
- To ensure consistent messaging and compelling communication of performance across the Force via the Monthly Force Performance Bulletin

The Crime Performance Board has used a thematic approach make successful step changes in performance in certain areas. An example of this is Domestic Burglary where:

- The Crime Performance Board reviewed Domestic Burglary performance using logic tree analysis- enabling identification of what factors led to a successful investigation
- Findings from the Logic tree analysis were presented to the Crime Performance Board with recommendations for action
- Crime Performance Board attendees were then asked to make 'Commitments to Action'
- Specific communications were then rolled out across the Force

- Improvements in performance were then monitored through the Board. Notable improvements in Domestic Burglary reduction and detection were achieved
- A review was undertaken by the Superintendent thematic lead for Domestic Burglary evaluating the strategies and tactics that had been used to improve performance. Best practice was identified presented to back to the Crime Performance Board

It has been recognised that the Crime Performance Board's primary focus has been on crime and public protection. There has been limited capacity to replicate the Crime Performance Board's thematic approach across all areas of performance. As a result a new performance governance framework has been developed for Surrey Police and will be launched in April 2015.

- The new framework mirrors the HMIC's 'PEEL' inspection framework of the three pillars of Effectiveness, Legitimacy and Efficiency whilst ensuring that performance against all six of the People's Priorities as set out in the Police and Crime Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan will be captured and scrutinised.
- A high level dashboard has been developed that contains around 40 key performance and risk measures that have been identified within the three pillars, and have been mapped to six People Priorities and the Force's strategy of Keeping people safe from harm, giving them confidence that we will be there when they need us and relentlessly pursuing criminals.
- Two new Performance Boards are being set up alongside the existing Crime Performance Board: the 'Legitimacy Performance Board' and 'Efficiency Performance Board' to ensure there is capacity to scrutinize all areas of performance effectively.
- In addition there will be a Performance Cabinet which will act as performance accountability mechanism overarching the three Performance Boards (refer to diagram below). The Performance Cabinet will be the point for; the escalation of performance risks, the assessment performance holistically; the reviewing of data integrity and organisational risk findings as identified by the SCIRG (Strategic Crime Incident and Risk Recording Group) and the SRALG (Strategic Risk and Learning Group) and the tasking of the three Performance Boards

Performance Group and Public Protection	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Offenses: Total	2,215,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
Offenses: Total (Excl. Self-Reported)	2,215,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
Offenses: Total (Excl. Self-Reported) (Excl. Misdemeanors)	2,215,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
Offenses: Total (Excl. Self-Reported) (Excl. Misdemeanors) (Excl. Felonies)	2,215,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
Offenses: Total (Excl. Self-Reported) (Excl. Misdemeanors) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies)	2,215,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
Offenses: Total (Excl. Self-Reported) (Excl. Misdemeanors) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies)	2,215,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
Offenses: Total (Excl. Self-Reported) (Excl. Misdemeanors) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies)	2,215,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
Offenses: Total (Excl. Self-Reported) (Excl. Misdemeanors) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies)	2,215,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
Offenses: Total (Excl. Self-Reported) (Excl. Misdemeanors) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies) (Excl. Felonies)	2,215,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000

