

Police

authority

inspection

report

Leicestershire

January 2010



The Audit Commission is an independent watchdog, driving economy, efficiency and effectiveness in local public services to deliver better outcomes for everyone.

Our work across local government, health, housing, community safety and fire and rescue services means that we have a unique perspective. We promote value for money for taxpayers, auditing the £200 billion spent by 11,000 local public bodies.

As a force for improvement, we work in partnership to assess local public services and make practical recommendations for promoting a better quality of life for local people.

Her Majesty's Inspectors of Constabulary are appointed by the Crown on the recommendation of the Home Secretary and report to Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary, who is the Home Secretary's principal professional policing adviser. Her Majesty's Inspectors of Constabulary are charged with examining and improving the efficiency of the Police Service in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. HMIC is independent both of the Home Office and of the Police Service.

The primary functions of HMIC include:

- The formal inspection and assessment of all forces in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (as well as a number of non Home Office funded police forces), HM Revenue and Customs, and the Serious Organised Crime Agency.**
- Undertaking thematic inspections across forces, some in conjunction with other bodies, including the other Criminal Justice System Inspectorates.**
- Undertaking a key advisory role within the tripartite system (Home Office, chief officer and police authority/Northern Ireland Policing Board), where its independence and professional expertise are recognised by all parties. HMIs also provide a crucial link between forces and the Home Office, and contribute to the process of appointments to the most senior ranks in the Police Service.**

Contents

Executive summary	4
Setting strategic direction and priorities	7
Performance scrutiny	9
Engaging with communities	12
Ensuring VFM and productivity	15
Next steps	18
Appendix 1 – Context	19
Appendix 2 – Methodology	21

Executive summary

- 1 Leicestershire Police Authority (the Authority) is performing adequately. The Chair provides strong and visible leadership which has established a sound basis for improvement. The Authority provides adequate strategic direction to the Constabulary and has a clear commitment to Neighbourhood Policing, delivery of the Policing Pledge and improving public confidence. However, performance scrutiny of the Chief Constable and the Constabulary is limited. There are some key areas of concern in relation to the performance of the Constabulary which have not been effectively addressed by the Authority. The Authority needs to do more to ensure that it reaches its diverse communities and most vulnerable groups to understand and address their concerns. The Authority has a proven record of effective financial management and is developing a plan to bridge a challenging budget gap.
- 2 The Authority clearly has committed and dedicated members. It is developing its leadership capability and capacity. The Authority recently conducted a review to identify gaps in the expertise of its membership. It has sought to influence councillor appointments by setting out clear information about the responsibilities and requirements of the role.
- 3 The Authority lacks a comprehensive, evidence based approach to strategic planning. Whilst the Authority sets local policing priorities, the Policing Plan is driven by the Constabulary with little evidence of formal influence by the Authority. Business planning lacks clear milestones and outcomes which makes it difficult for the Authority to set appropriate targets, check progress or scrutinise performance. The Authority took bold action to increase the policing precept by 15.43 per cent to address funding gaps in tackling terrorism, serious crime and other major challenges to public safety (protective services). However, it has not yet exercised effective scrutiny of the impact of this increase in funding to ensure value for money, particularly in high crime areas.
- 4 The Authority failed to effectively monitor the actions of the Constabulary following the tragic deaths of Fiona Pilkington and her daughter Frankie Hardwick two years ago. It failed to provide effective oversight and scrutiny in order to satisfy itself that important lessons had been learnt and changes had been implemented following the Constabulary's own review. The Authority has recently agreed new arrangements to monitor and supervise all relevant critical incidents.
- 5 The Authority has a strong tradition of collaboration and partnership and has worked effectively with some Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRPs) to support improved performance, but this is inconsistent and dependent on the commitment of individual members. The lack of a consistent Authority presence on the Leicester CDRP is of particular concern given the high levels of deprivation and crime in that area.

Executive summary

- 6** Neighbourhood Policing is well embedded in Leicestershire and the Constabulary is recognised as being an example of good practice. Many Authority members play an active part in support of this, through attendance at local Joint Action Groups (JAG) and meetings with local commanders to discuss progress and address local concerns. The Authority has an improving understanding of what drives public confidence in policing which it has used to develop local policing priorities and the allocation of resources, for example by making policing more visible, responsive and accessible to the public.
- 7** The Authority recognises that it needs to develop a strategic, targeted, co-ordinated and shared community engagement strategy but it is at an early stage. Many partners recognise that the Authority listens to them and responds well to their needs. However the Authority needs to engage more effectively with diverse communities and vulnerable groups, to ensure that their voice is heard when setting policing priorities. The Authority has an inconsistent approach to tackling inequalities and has not succeeded in ensuring the Constabulary is more representative of the communities it serves. Whilst the Constabulary has the third highest proportion of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) officers in the country (at 6.6 per cent), it is not representative of the proportion of people from the minority ethnic population of Leicester (in particular), Leicestershire and Rutland. The Authority could do more to work with the Constabulary on officer recruitment, promotion and retention if real progress is to be achieved in improving the diversity of the workforce.
- 8** The Authority works well with the Constabulary to ensure that resources are aligned to priorities, underpinned by a comprehensive assessment of current financial risk. The Authority has played a leading role in driving collaborative working in the region, both with other Constabularies and public service partners but has yet to realise significant cost efficiencies. The Authority needs to develop its processes to give sufficient assurance that it gets the best return from its investment in policing on behalf of the community. The Authority has initiated an independent analysis of resource efficiency which has the potential to increase the Authority's understanding of opportunities for improved resource alignment. The Authority needs to develop a three to five year view of policing within a challenging financial climate and agree a longer term financial plan with the Constabulary.
- 9** The Authority has already recognised some of these issues and has started to take action to address them. It needs to make continued progress on the challenges which it has already identified and to take action to address the others recorded in this report.

Table 1 Summary of inspection scores

Key questions	Score
How does the police authority ensure that both it and the Constabulary have the leadership, capacity and capability needed to deliver good quality service outcomes on behalf of the public?	2
How effective is the police authority in scrutinising and ensuring the Constabulary delivers the priority services that matter to local people?	1
How well does the police authority achieve results through community engagement and partnerships to deliver its ambitions and strategic priorities?	2
How effective is the police authority in ensuring a clear and sustained focus on value for money to secure a good deal for the public?	2
Overall score	2

Setting strategic direction and priorities

How does the Police Authority ensure that both it and the Force have the leadership, capacity and capability needed to deliver good quality service outcomes on behalf of the public?

- 10** The Authority is performing adequately in this area. It is going through a period of transition and displays an awareness of, and a willingness to address, areas of weakness. The Authority is developing its leadership capacity and capability but more work is needed. Several new members have been appointed over the last 15 months, injecting new expertise and experience that bodes well for the future. The Authority effectively supports the Constabulary's priority to deliver Neighbourhood Policing. It sets local policing objectives and is strongly committed to the delivery of the Single Confidence Target. However the Authority lacks a comprehensive, evidence based strategic planning process and does not have effective oversight of the policing plan and policing priorities. The Authority does not have a strategic approach to addressing inequalities and improving outcomes for people in vulnerable circumstances. It can do more to ensure the Constabulary has a workforce which is representative of the local communities it serves.

Strengths

- 11** The Authority actively supports the Constabulary's priority to provide high standards of Neighbourhood Policing across all of its communities. The Chair of the Authority and key members are strongly committed to this area of work, including honouring promises made in the Policing Pledge. The Authority emphasises the importance of meeting the stretching Single Confidence Target set by the Home Office and works proactively with the Constabulary and local partners to support delivery.
- 12** The Authority has identified areas where it needs to develop its skills and capacity to deliver. It conducted a review to identify gaps in the expertise of the membership and recruited new independent members in 2008 and 2009. It is already evident that the Authority will benefit from the particular skills and experience they bring. In addition five new councillor members came onto the Authority following the local elections in June 2009. Whilst acknowledging that the appointment of councillors to the Authority is a matter for the Appointments Joint Committee, advised by party leaders, the Authority has sought to influence the calibre of councillor appointments. In April 2009, the Chief Executive wrote to council leaders setting out the competencies the Authority uses for independent members, the disqualification policy, the time commitment involved in the role and the need for individual commitment to diversity principles.
- 13** A key role for any police authority is to ensure the Constabulary is well led, and the Authority has previously been instrumental in bringing together a strong chief officer team.

- 14** Authority members influenced the Chief Constable to appoint a dedicated HR professional to lead in that area and tackle deficiencies in HR management. These include reviewing shift patterns to meet pressures more effectively, improving the way in which the take-up of employment during career breaks is managed, and reducing the levels of sickness absence. Members engage well with staff associations through the Diversity Panel.
- 15** The Authority ensures high professional and ethical standards are set for itself and the Constabulary. An independent panel determines member allowances and the Standards Committee actively monitors the conduct and behaviour of Authority members. It provides an independent check on decisions to exempt agenda items from public scrutiny, encouraging openness and transparency. The Standards Committee now monitors the recording of business interests and the quality and take-up of member training and Personal Development Reviews (PDRs). The Authority manages an active Independent Custody Visitors Scheme (ICVS) to scrutinise the welfare of detainees; information passed to the Constabulary can be used to monitor custody provision and processes. The Professional Standards Committee oversees both the ICVS and the handling by the Constabulary of formal complaints against individual officers as well as 'direction and control' issues.

Areas for improvement

- 16** The Authority does not provide effective strategic oversight of the Policing Plan and policing priorities. It sets clear local policing priorities such as police station opening times, reduced levels of officers removed from their Neighbourhood Policing duties and improvements in the time taken to answer non-emergency calls. However crime reduction and other performance targets are set by the Chief Constable and not formally influenced by the Authority. The Authority's Community Engagement Strategy needs strengthening to ensure a more comprehensive strategic approach to community engagement, capturing the views of all relevant communities and using consultation responses to better inform strategic plans.
- 17** It is not always clear what informs the objectives contained in the Local Policing Plan and improvement targets are not informed by robust analysis. This makes it difficult for the Authority to set well-argued, deliverable but stretching targets, check progress or rigorously scrutinise its own performance.
- 18** The Authority needs to give more attention to the recruitment, promotion and retention of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) officers within the Constabulary if it is to make real progress in improving the diversity of the workforce. While the Constabulary has the third highest proportion of BME officers in the country (at 6.6 per cent), it is not representative of the proportion of people from the minority ethnic population of Leicester (in particular), Leicestershire and Rutland.

Performance scrutiny

How effective is the Police Authority in scrutinising and ensuring the Force delivers the priority services that matter to local people?

- 19** The Authority is performing poorly in this area. There is limited scrutiny of the Chief Constable, and target setting and performance review are not robust. The Authority recognises this and has recruited a number of new independent members who are helping to develop a more rigorous approach to performance and financial management. It has taken action to address the gaps in the delivery of protective services by increasing the policing precept, but it is not exercising effective scrutiny of the impact of this increase in funding.

Strengths

- 20** The Authority works effectively to influence the delivery of improved public confidence in policing at local and national level. Robust mechanisms are in place for monitoring progress on public confidence through monthly surveys, which have attracted regional and national interest. The Chair demonstrates a strong grasp of issues relating to public confidence and previously chaired the APA's citizen focus and partnership network group.
- 21** Members attend meetings of local Joint Action Groups (JAGs) and have regular meetings with local commanders to discuss progress and address barriers to improved performance. They engage in unannounced visits to Local Policing Units (LPUs) to evaluate the service offered to the public, and take an active approach to resolving issues of concern. For example, members led on the resolution of a street drinking problem in Spinney Hill Park and facilitated engagement between the Leicester LPU and young people through an initiative at Moat Community College. Neighbourhood Policing is now well embedded in Leicestershire and the Constabulary is often cited by the Home Office and National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) as an example of good practice.
- 22** The Authority is actively involved in supporting the governance and delivery of the Policing Pledge. However its own action plan to support implementation lacks specific measurable outcomes which makes it difficult to measure progress.

Areas for improvement

- 23** Whilst individual members are actively involved in reviewing performance, the Authority does not provide systematic robust challenge to hold the Chief Constable to account for the Constabulary's delivery of objectives, priorities and quality outcomes. Its performance regime is improving but from a low starting point.
- 24** The Authority actively monitors achievement of the Single Confidence Target but does not scrutinise most areas of performance effectively. The Authority offers limited challenge to the quarterly monitoring reports presented to the full authority and performance panel. It has failed to identify and challenge significant changes in crime patterns, such as increases in domestic burglary, robbery and the high rates of racially and religiously aggravated crime. Members receive little Authority-led training regarding their role in performance management and scrutiny. Members raise performance issues with LPU commanders but this is inconsistent. Their attendance at Constabulary programme boards has limited impact.
- 25** The Authority cannot effectively monitor how the Constabulary will deliver the 'Second to None' vision which it has endorsed. There are no stretch targets to achieve this, and the Constabulary is not compared with top performing forces outside its Most Similar Group (MSG). This prevents comparison with the best in the country and limits challenge and performance improvement.
- 26** The Authority has provided additional investment and support for collaborative work to address the gaps in tackling terrorism, serious crime and other major challenges to public safety (protective services). But it has not yet exercised effective scrutiny of the impact of this increase in funding to ensure value for money for the public. The Authority has now asked its internal auditors to undertake this task.
- 27** On 17 September 2009 an inquest began into the deaths of Fiona Pilkington and her daughter Frankie Hardwick. There was no reference to the inquest or critical incident in advance of, or during, the on-site inspection. When the inquest verdict was returned, 11 days after the on-site inspection visit, the Inspectorates made an additional, exceptional, visit to the Authority as part of the Police Authority Inspection, recognising the significant implications that the critical incident and inquest verdict would subsequently have on the Constabulary and Authority.
- 28** The Authority lacked a mechanism to track the most significant critical incidents which the Constabulary manages, and had little involvement in 'lessons learnt' reviews. The Authority failed to provide sufficient oversight of actions taken by the Constabulary following the tragic deaths of Fiona Pilkington and Frankie Hardwick two years ago. During this period, there is no evidence that the Authority stepped up their challenge to the Chief Constable on the issue of repeat anti-social behaviour in Barwell, or was aware or briefed on action taken to address concerns.
- 29** The Authority's mechanism for tracking significant critical incidents relied on them being notified by the Constabulary and this did not work satisfactorily. The Authority has recently agreed new arrangements to monitor and supervise all relevant critical incidents.

Performance scrutiny

- 30** The Authority did not have sufficient oversight of the Constabulary's response to the inquest verdict into the deaths. Whilst the Authority responded after the inquest with radio interviews and a public meeting, it appeared largely unprepared to deal with the reaction from the public and media, and did not anticipate the potential impact that this may have on public confidence.
- 31** The Authority acknowledges that it needs to develop 'triage' criteria to identify those few critical incidents where it is required to exercise its governance role. This will involve the Authority actively managing risks associated with such incidents, requesting members to feedback significant local concerns to the Authority and requesting involvement in critical incidents management groups where appropriate.
- 32** The Authority has recognised that it needs to strengthen its performance monitoring and scrutiny arrangements and ensure that the range of performance information that it receives is adequate for its needs. It has recently reviewed the format of the information presented by the Constabulary to committees and has appointed a performance analyst to support this work, including providing informed briefings to members.

Engaging with communities

How well does the Police Authority achieve results through community engagement and partnerships to deliver its ambitions and strategic priorities?

- 33** The Authority is performing adequately in this area. The Authority is developing its understanding of what leads to improved confidence in local policing. It recognises the need to develop a more strategic and co-ordinated approach to community engagement, consultation and sharing of intelligence with the police and other partners, but this is at an early stage. There is a strong ethos of partnership working which delivers good results in some areas largely as a result of the commitment of individual members. However, this is inconsistent, with significant gaps including Authority involvement with the Leicester City Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP). Many groups and partners recognise that the Authority listens and responds well to their needs. There is evidence of some targeted engagement taking place but the Authority needs to engage more effectively with its diverse communities and the most vulnerable groups so that their voice is heard when setting policing priorities. The Authority has acted on community concerns by developing local policing priorities. However, it needs to do more to ensure that local policing services are accessible to all communities.

Strengths

- 34** The Authority has an improving view of local peoples' views about policing priorities. The Authority consulted widely on the proposal to increase the police precept. It undertakes an annual consultation programme which it monitors through its Consultation and Communications Committee. This involves some targeted community engagement and consultation, but specific outcomes are not clear.
- 35** Many groups and partners recognise that the Authority listens and responds well to their needs. For example, the Authority has engaged with local school pupils, 11-18 year olds, distributing 1,600 questionnaires in conjunction with youth councils to seek views on policing; with Asian women at the Peepul Centre in Leicester and has developed a website providing the public with a facility to feedback their views to the Authority via 'Voice Your Views'. However much of this activity is dependent on the commitment of individual members rather than the result of a co-ordinated strategy.
- 36** The Authority has a sound focus on public confidence in policing. This contributes to improving public satisfaction with policing and the Authority's ability to understand and deal with local concerns. It can identify specific examples where it has acted upon community concerns to develop local policing priorities making policing more visible, responsive and accessible to the public. The Authority has responded to consultation through the Council Tax leaflet, local policing summaries and meetings with the public. The Authority led or supported initiatives such as the introduction of text messaging to contact the police, ensuring a faster response to emergency calls, taking action to address underage drinking in Leicester and provide more visible policing in the evenings in Oakham.

Engaging with communities

- 37** Leicestershire is one of a small number of forces using ‘community resolution’ to close certain crimes and non-crime incidents to the satisfaction of complainants and cut down bureaucracy. The initiative was rolled out incrementally between April and July 2008. Data for the year ending April 2009 show that victim satisfaction rose from 60 per cent to 90 per cent, and that over 18,500 person hours had been saved and reinvested elsewhere.
- 38** The Authority balances its focus on local issues with national policing concerns. It has actively supported national policing projects such as the 101 scheme (single national non-emergency number for police) and is participating (with chief officers) in road show events aimed at gaining partner support for the national counter-terrorism strategy (specifically preventing violent extremism). The Authority is proactive in supporting national developments in policing. It has supported the considerable amount of national work undertaken by its chief officers, which has in turn brought benefits to local communities.

Areas for improvement

- 39** The Authority needs to engage more effectively with its diverse communities and most vulnerable groups so that their voice is heard when setting policing priorities. The views of older, white males have dominated annual consultation findings and the Authority needs to develop ways for its consultation to be more representative of all local communities. The Authority recognises the need to develop a more strategic and co-ordinated approach to community engagement, consultation and sharing of intelligence with the police and other partners. It has recently invested in two dedicated policy officers to help its work in this area.
- 40** The Authority could strengthen its analysis of issues that most improve the public’s confidence in policing. For example, results from CDRP, LPUs and other partners’ consultation work, learning from complaints, the custody visitors’ scheme and call centre contacts.
- 41** The Authority needs to do more to ensure that local policing services are fully accessible to all of its communities. Visible, accessible policing is a declared Authority priority and members have in some areas influenced local priorities to drive improvements. Some partners recognise the good work of the Authority here; for example, in reflecting the concerns of young people in Rutland, Charnwood, Market Harborough and Blaby. The Authority needs to improve the use of available data to better understand the impact of policing on local communities. It has processes in place to monitor and analyse complaints and disparities in service delivery. However a ‘silo’ approach exists to reviewing service accessibility through data on complaints, stop and search activity and public satisfaction with policing. The Authority has not explored links across these areas, how they may inform local policing priorities or what action needs to be taken to effectively address concerns.

42 The Authority's influence within CDRPs is inconsistent. The Authority has a strong tradition of partnership working: many partners value the lead and support given by members to shape priorities and act on local concerns. The Authority is in the process of developing members' ability to deliver a consistently effective approach to partnership working, such as providing members with data on partnership performance prior to meetings and asking them to report back key issues to the Authority. There are some good examples of members working well with partnerships to improve delivery. For example, in Charnwood CDRP the lead member was influential in tackling under performance and specific concerns such as violent crime, serious acquisitive crime, anti-social behaviour and drugs misuse. The lack of a consistent presence on the Leicester City CDRP is of significant concern given the profile of crime and deprivation in the area. Effective use of Authority, police and partners' money, time and staff to meet joint local policing and community safety priorities is especially relevant given the substantial savings needed over the next two years.

Ensuring VFM and productivity

How effective is the Police Authority in ensuring a clear and sustained focus on VFM in order to secure a good deal for the public?

- 43** The Authority is performing adequately in this area. External audit and inspection shows a proven record of effective financial management. Plans to cater for an uncertain financial future and bridge a challenging budget gap are developing. The Authority exerts some influence over the way the Constabulary uses its time, staff and money to match the demands made on the police and has delivered some efficiency savings. However, target setting is not based on a robust analysis of the Constabulary's comparative performance and costs which limits the scope for improving value for money and delivering a second to none police force. Financial risk management is mature and risk registers are used to help align resources to priorities. The Authority promotes and supports collaboration and joint working; it is recognised for this and has secured some clear benefits from it. But it needs to do more in identifying opportunities for joint working and has yet to realise significant financial efficiencies from its collaborative working.

Strengths

- 44** The Authority aligns its resources well to its priorities, threats and risks as its precept budget work testifies. Financial risk assessments underpin budget choices and help shape business priorities. For example the potential risk to delivering Neighbourhood Policing from the impact of the Olympics in 2012 has been identified and is actively being planned for, both for continued deployment of neighbourhood team officers and the extra security costs involved in policing the East Midlands Airport. More recently the Authority showed flexibility by responding to the downgrading of ratings of some financial institutions by withdrawing its funds from these organisations and now plans to move into government bonds.
- 45** The Authority manages money well. External audit and inspection highlights the Authority's and the Constabulary's good use of their resources and effective financial management. According to an HMIC report published in September 2008, 'Over the past twelve years, the force has achieved year-on-year efficiency savings totalling £39.5 million and these savings have been re-invested in front-line policing.' Independent members with financial backgrounds, who were appointed in 2008, bring added rigour and challenge on financial matters and a better appraisal of risks. The Authority has good arrangements, such as its Strategic Financial Planning Group, in place to carry out detailed work to find efficiencies to bridge the budget gaps it faces for 2010/11 and 2011/12. Internal audit will test the rigour of its approach. A longer term financial planning strategy and action plan for 2012 and beyond is planned.

- 46** The Authority has played a leading role in using collaborative working to secure better outcomes for the public. It has promoted and supported collaboration in the region, both with other Constabularies and public service partners. This has delivered some clear benefits. For example, working with partners to secure a large grant from NPIA to provide mobile data terminals for frontline staff, enabling them to remotely access all Constabulary IT systems. Other examples of collaboration include the East Midlands Counter-Terrorism Intelligence Unit; various joint training initiatives; shared internal audit services; and the use of regional and national framework procurement arrangements. The arrangements have not yet been subject to a comprehensive, robust benefits realisation appraisal.
- 47** The Authority exerts influence over the use of police time, staff and money to meet the demands made on policing. This was most obvious in the work underpinning its precept increase. The Authority is familiar with supply and demand profiles and is aware of Constabulary activity to manage shift patterns, sickness and overtime. The Authority tracks decisions to improve resources utilisation to ensure they do not have adverse impacts. For example, the move to greater use of single crewing and introducing scheduled response. Monitoring of recent civilianisation within the Call Handling Bureau has ensured that there has been no reported drop in service level; although the Authority has not undertaken any reality checking of the reported improvements. Internal audit is addressing this shortfall. This independent analysis has the potential to increase the Authority's understanding of opportunities to use police time, staff and money to best effect.

Areas for improvement

- 48** The Authority needs to embed a focus on value for money that secures the best deal for the public by delivering a Constabulary that is second to none. The Authority exerts some influence over and undertakes some monitoring of the way the Constabulary uses its time, staff and money to meet the demands made on the police. However, the Authority has not in the past taken a robust approach to performance and financial efficiency target setting that ensures it delivers the best value for money from its policing resources. It has not provided sufficiently challenging scrutiny and comparison of cost and operational policing performance. It needs to do this to test if it is using its and the Constabulary's staff, time and money in the best way to deliver the Constabulary's aim of delivering a second to none policing service. Efficiency target setting has mirrored Home Office targets, which has not helped embed a full value for money focus. The pressing budget gap over the next two years has forced the Authority to rethink its approach to target setting and how it goes about making the Constabulary more efficient.
- 49** The Authority is aware that its investment in collaborative working has yet to realise significant financial efficiencies. It has arranged with its partners to test the benefits gained from existing collaborative work and seek ways to realise the full financial rewards. However, new opportunities to work with partners to ensure joint resources are used to best effect are being missed. For example, the Authority has a clear view of which communities are most disaffected with policing, such as white working class communities in the East Leicester Council estates. However, there is no shared plan with partners to address the issue. This limits the Authority's opportunity to encourage partners to align their resources with local policing needs in a systematic and tailored manner. The Authority needs to seek and embrace more opportunities to work with partners to tackle shared community safety priorities.
- 50** Authority members could test and challenge the benefits flowing from its policing investment and initiatives more robustly. For example, checking first hand the savings resulting from the increased use of IT systems rather than accepting figures provided by the Constabulary.

Next steps

- 51** We expect Leicestershire Police Authority to address the areas for improvement identified in this report and secure targeted and continuous improvement. In doing so, the Police Authority should have regard to the wider improvement planning, support and intervention set out in the Home Office's performance framework and landscape for policing.
- 52** We will publish an interim national report shortly drawing on the findings from the first ten inspections. It will identify thematic issues relevant to all police authorities, helping to secure improvement and sharing of good practice. The Police Authority should refer to and use this report in shaping its improvement planning.

Appendix 1 – Context

- 1 Leicestershire is a mid-sized county in the East Midlands region. It has good transport links with the M1 motorway running through the county; London is just an hour away by train and the East Midlands International Airport, which is in Leicestershire, serves numerous European and world-wide destinations. The local authority arrangements are covered by two county councils, Leicestershire and Rutland, which are currently Conservative controlled, the unitary authority of Leicester City Council (Labour controlled) and seven district or borough councils.
- 2 Leicestershire has a population of approximately one million people. The principal conurbation is Leicester, where more than one third of the population is from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities. The largest single group are residents of Asian origin, who form the largest such community in England and Wales. More than 30 million tourists visit the city and county annually. The county's economy is varied, with manufacturing and wholesale/retail trade accounting for about 40 per cent of employment. Other significant employment includes business activities and the public services sector. Unemployment in the city is higher than the regional and national average, while the county has lower than average levels.
- 3 Leicester is ranked in the bottom 10 per cent of the Government Index of Local Deprivation, as 31st out of the 50 most deprived areas in England. By contrast Rutland has a large number of small settlements with low population density and a high standard of living. Rutland is the smallest county in England, having been awarded unitary status in 1997. It consists of two market towns, Oakham and the county town of Uppingham, and 58 parishes.

The Police Authority

- 4 Leicestershire Police Authority has 17 members: eight independent members and nine councillors nominated by local authorities (four Conservatives, three Labour and two Liberal Democrats). There are four female members and four members from BME communities. The Police Authority has a small executive office with six full time and one part time staff members. Leicestershire Constabulary benefited until recently from a significant period of stability from a strong chief officer team. The Authority is now, however, in the process of recruiting a new Chief Constable.
- 5 In February 2009 the Authority set a budget which represented a 15.43 per cent precept increase on the previous financial year. The justification for this was the identified need to build capacity in protective services. Following representations from the Authority to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in May 2009, the Authority was allowed to keep the 15.43 per cent increase for 2008/09 but was capped to 3 per cent increases for 2009/10 and 2010/11.

The Constabulary

- 6** Leicestershire Constabulary is a good performing Force with a strong chief officer team. In April 2007 the Constabulary restructured, moving from four to three Basic Command Units (BCUs) and realigned its Local Policing Units (LPUs) with local authorities. Leicestershire Constabulary borders the Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire and Warwickshire Constabularies. It has consistently secured good external assessments for its efficiency and effectiveness. The Constabulary has led in supporting and co-ordinating the British police response to the disappearance in Portugal of Madeleine McCann. It is responsible for the investigation into the rioting and fire at Ashwell prison in Rutland, and leads the policing of the East Midlands International Airport with support from Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire.
- 7** Crime levels in Leicestershire are average when compared with peer and national trends except for higher levels of domestic burglary and robbery. The level of racially and religiously aggravated offences is higher than average by a considerable margin when compared with similar Constabularies and is not showing any improvement. There are marked differences between the city of Leicester, which has the highest crime level in the East Midlands, and the county areas of Leicestershire and Rutland - Rutland has the third lowest crime levels in the region. Public confidence in policing is in line with the national average.
- 8** The East Midlands region has been recognised nationally as being at the forefront of collaborative working. The East Midlands Collaboration Board led a successful bid for £8.3 million to introduce enhanced mobile data technology to enable front line staff to remotely access all Constabulary IT systems. Leicestershire Police Authority is represented on the Board and was influential in achieving the bid. There is a strong tradition of partnership working in the county which has led to notable successes in reducing vehicle and alcohol-related crime; Hinckley and Bosworth Council and Leicestershire Constabulary were jointly awarded Beacon status for their success in reducing night-time disorder in 2009.

Appendix 2 – Methodology

- 1 This report summarises the findings from the joint Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Audit Commission inspection of Leicestershire Police Authority which took place in September 2009.
- 2 In July 2009 HMIC and the Audit Commission published the Police Authority Inspection framework.
- 3 The inspection framework comprises four assessment areas:
 - **Setting strategic direction and priorities** - How does the Police Authority ensure that both it and the Constabulary have the leadership, capacity and capability needed to deliver good quality service outcomes on behalf of the public?
 - **Scrutinising performance outcomes** - How effective is the Police Authority in scrutinising and ensuring that the Constabulary delivers the priority services that matter to local people?
 - **Achieving results through community engagement and partnership** - How well does the Police Authority achieve results through community engagement and partnerships to deliver its ambitions and strategic priorities?
 - **Ensuring value for money (VFM) and productivity** - How effective is the Police Authority in ensuring a clear and sustained focus on VFM in order to secure a good deal for the public?
- 4 The Inspection team drew on a range of evidence to form judgements against each of the four assessment themes. This included key documentation that the police authority uses to run its business, interviews, focus groups, observations and reality testing with key police authority partners and stakeholders.
- 5 Each assessment theme was scored separately on a scale of 1 to 4 and is combined into an overall score. The scores of 1 to 4 for each theme represent the following descriptors of performance.

Score	Descriptor of performance	Public reporting
1	Police authority does not meet minimum requirements for this theme	Performs poorly
2	Police authority meets most of the minimum requirements for this theme with some exceptions and areas of concern	Performs adequately
3	Police authority exceeds minimum requirements for this theme	Performs well
4	Police authority significantly exceeds minimum requirements for this theme	Performs excellently

- 6 An accredited peer member inspector and a senior officer from a police authority supported the joint inspectorates during this inspection.
- 7 We have integrated quality assurance throughout the planning, fieldwork and reporting stages of the inspection. In particular, a quality assurance panel of the joint inspectorates ensured the consistency and robustness of the inspection teams' judgements before the publication of reports. A suitably qualified peer joined the quality assurance panel as an observer.
- 8 HMIC and the Audit Commission are grateful for the support and co-operation of the Police Authority, its staff and officers, during the inspection.

If you require a copy of this document in large print, in Braille, on tape, or in a language other than English, please call: **0844 798 7070**

If you require a printed copy of this document, please call: **0800 50 20 30** or email: ac-orders@audit-commission.gov.uk

This document is available on our website.

For further information on the work of the Commission please contact:

Audit Commission

1st Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4HQ

Telephone: **0844 798 3131**

Fax: 0844 798 2945

Textphone (minicom): 0844 798 2946

www.audit-commission.gov.uk

HMIC

For further information about HMIC, visit our website at:

www.inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic



Audit Commission

1st Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4HQ

Telephone: **0844 798 1212**
Fax: 0844 798 2945
Textphone (minicom): 0844 798 2946

www.audit-commission.gov.uk



HMIC

Ground floor
Allington Towers
19 Allington Street
London
SW1E 5EB

Telephone: **020 7035 5713**
Fax: 020 7035 5184

www.inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic