

Leicestershire Police Authority

Performance Management
13.09/10

Internal Audit Report
10 December 2009

FINAL

Contents

| | Section | Page |
|---|------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Executive Summary | 1 |
| 2 | Action Plan | 3 |
| 3 | Findings and Recommendations | 4 |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------------|--|
| Debrief meeting: | 16 November 2009 | Auditors: | Chris Harris - Partner |
| Draft report issued: | 4 December 2009 | | Suzanne Lane - Client Manager |
| Responses received: | 10 December 2009 | | Linda Coppa - Senior Auditor |
| Final report issued: | 10 December 2009 | Client sponsor: | Vanessa Cookson – Performance Review Manager |
| | | Distribution: | Chris Smith – Treasurer |
| | | | Paul Dawkins – Director of Finance |
| | | | Vanessa Cookson – Performance Review Manager |



This review has been performed using RSM Bentley Jennison's bespoke internal audit methodology, **i-RIS**.

The matters raised in this report are only those which came to our attention during our internal audit work and are not necessarily a comprehensive statement of all the weaknesses that exist, or of all the improvements that may be required. Whilst every care has been taken to ensure that the information provided in this report is as accurate as possible, based on the information provided and documentation reviewed, no complete guarantee or warranty can be given with regard to the advice and information contained herein. Our work does not provide absolute assurance that material errors, loss or fraud do not exist.

This report is prepared solely for the use of Authority and senior management of Leicestershire Police Authority. Details may be made available to specified external agencies, including external auditors, but otherwise the report should not be quoted or referred to in whole or in part without prior consent. No responsibility to any third party is accepted as the report has not been prepared, and is not intended for any other purpose.

© 2009 Bentley Jennison Risk Management Ltd

Bentley Jennison Risk Management Ltd

Bentley Jennison Risk Management Ltd is wholly owned by RSM Bentley Jennison
Registered in England and Wales No. 3444889
Registered Office 1 Hollinswood Court Stafford Park 1 Telford TF3 3DE

1 Executive Summary

1.1 Introduction

An audit of Performance Management was undertaken as part of the approved internal audit periodic plan for 2009/10.

The Statutory Performance Indicators for Policing and Community Safety and Local objectives are monitored through the Performance Management Team. Data is recorded in various systems (Crime – CIS, OIS, NSPIS HR, etc.) depending on the type of indicator. The Force actively monitors the performance against these through the monthly Performance Delivery Group and Delivering Performance Excellence Group as well as through a new Crime Group which has recently been set up.

Performance against the Statutory Performance Indicators is to be reported in the Returns to the Home Office. The Police Authority also receives updates on the Performance of the Force against these and the various local objectives and the Policing Pledge throughout the year.

Through the Local Area Agreement partnerships the Force provides cleansed data to the County/City Councils and Rutland, to process performance data for the Programme Boards across the County, to monitor activity against the National Indicators they have each agreed for the year, which are produced in accordance with agreed arrangements / protocols.

The specific risk considered as part of this audit was:

- Poor Police Force performance

1.2 Scope of the review

The objective of our audit was to evaluate the adequacy of risk management and control within the system and the extent to which controls have been applied, with a view to providing an opinion. Control activities are put in place to ensure that risks to the achievement of the organisation's objectives are managed effectively. When planning the audit, the following controls for review and limitations were agreed:

Control activities relied upon:

- LPA monitoring processes established and followed.
- Accurate entry of performance indicators onto the system.
- Data checking of actuals against the performance indicators.
- Regular reporting of actuals against the performance indicators to management and Authority.

Limitations to the scope of the audit:

- The scope of the work will be limited to those areas examined and reported upon in the context of the objectives set out in scope for this review.
- The testing undertaken as part of this audit will be compliance based and sample testing only.
- As part of this review we will not verify the accuracy of the performance indicators only the controls in place to record, monitor and report against these.
- Our work does not provide any guarantee against material errors, loss or fraud or provide an absolute assurance that material error, loss or fraud does not exist

The approach taken for this audit was Systematic Audit and included the following:

- Establishing the controls for which external audit intends to place reliance on internal audit testing
- Reviewing the adequacy and application of the controls in place to mitigate the risk.

1.3 Conclusion

Taking account of the issues identified, in our opinion the Authority can take substantial assurance that the controls upon which the organisation relies to manage this area, as currently laid down and operated, are effective.

This assurance level has been formulated on the basis of conclusions drawn on the individual elements of design and application of controls in place:

| | SUBSTANTIAL | ADEQUATE | LIMITED |
|--|-------------|----------|---------|
| DESIGN OF CONTROL FRAMEWORK | X | | |
| APPLICATION OF AND COMPLIANCE WITH CONTROL FRAMEWORK | X | | |
| OVERALL OPINION | X | | |

The above conclusions feeding into the overall assurance level are based on the evidence obtained during the review. There were no significant issues arising from this review.

1.4 Recommendations Summary

The following tables highlight the number and categories of recommendations made. The Action Plan at Section 2 details the specific recommendations made as well as agreed management actions to implement them.

Recommendations made during this audit:

| RISK | FUNDAMENTAL | SIGNIFICANT | MERITS ATTENTION |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| POOR POLICE FORCE PERFORMANCE | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1.5 Additional Feedback

| GOOD PRACTICE IDENTIFIED DURING THE AUDIT |
|---|
| The Performance Team communicated a good level of knowledge and understanding of their role/ responsibilities and the requirements they need to employ in ensuring the data they produce and report upon is accurate. |
| The design of the LAA data reports has been nationally recognised. |
| Data checked at review was readily traced back to source data / records. |

2 Action Plan

The priority of the recommendations made is as follows:

| FUNDAMENTAL | SIGNIFICANT | MERITS ATTENTION |
|--|---|--|
| ACTION IS IMPERATIVE TO ENSURE THAT THE OBJECTIVE FOR THE AREA UNDER REVIEW IS MET | REQUIRES ACTION TO AVOID EXPOSURE TO SIGNIFICANT RISK IN ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVE FOR THE AREA UNDER REVIEW. | ACTION IS ADVISED TO ENHANCE CONTROL OR IMPROVE OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY |

| REF | RECOMMENDATION | CATEGORISATION | ACCEPTED Y/N | MANAGEMENT COMMENT | IMPLEMENTATION DATE | MANAGER RESPONSIBLE |
|--|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| THERE WERE NO RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM THIS REVIEW. | | | | | | |

3 Findings and Recommendations

| | CONTROLS (ACTUAL AND/OR MISSING) | ADEQUATE DESIGN(YES/NO) | TEST RESULT / IMPLICATIONS | RECOMMENDATION | CATEGORISATION |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| | RISK: | POOR POLICE FORCE PERFORMANCE | | | |
| 1 | <p>The Performance Indicators for Policing and Community Safety are outlined in the Home Office guidance document 2009/10.</p> <p>These include performance indicators for Analysis of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) framework which includes indicators that are part of the National Indicator (NIs) for Local Government, some of which are reported upon through the Local Area Agreements in place.</p> <p>The Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Community Safety Programme Board (LLRCSB) have identified the National Indicators they will monitor under the LAA's performance reporting and monitoring arrangements.</p> <p>Local Performance Indicators for the six priorities were agreed by the Police Authority for 2009/10.</p> | Yes | <p>We confirmed that details of the APACS performance indicators are set out in the Home Office Guidance document 2009/10. The Force has been advised of the Local Area Agreement Indicators and they provide the data required (for City, County and Rutland) on a monthly basis.</p> <p>The Local Priorities for 2009/10 were approved by the Finance and General Purposes meeting of 24 March 2009, after consideration by Members at a discussion day in February 2009, based upon endorsements by the Chief Officers Group of the Force.</p> | | |
| 2 | <p>The specific titles, definitions and requirements for collection of data and reporting are set out under each of the Performance</p> | Yes | <p>We were provided with the key information for the APACS performance indicators which are used to produce the data required to be provided / reported upon.</p> <p>Details of outcomes are to be reported to the</p> | | |

| | CONTROLS (ACTUAL AND/OR MISSING) | ADEQUATE DESIGN(YES/NO) | TEST RESULT / IMPLICATIONS | RECOMMENDATION | CATEGORISATION |
|---|---|-------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| | <p>Indicators for the Home Office.</p> <p>The Local Priority targets have been set out and data is collected in Force to provide performance information against the targets set and outcomes are reported to the Police Authority.</p> | | <p>Home Office through their Return process.</p> <p>Progress against the Local Performance Indicators is produced by the Performance team and outcomes against the targets are subject to internal reporting through the Force as well as being reported back to the Police Authority.</p> <p>We confirmed that the definitions for each of the targets for the APACS are clearly set out and that the Team each have a copy of these for reference as well as the Local Performance targets for 2009/10.</p> | | |
| 3 | <p>The data input to the CIS system are downloaded via text files and subject to validation checks within the data fields to identify potential inaccuracies in input to ensure data meets the criteria required. This may prompt a check back to the source input.</p> <p>Where HR data is collated this is confirmed through the NSPIS HR system and checked to ensure the accuracy of data.</p> <p>For one of the Local Performance Indicators being sampled the data is presently provided through submission of completed paper returns directly to the Performance Team and this is checked against the agreed opening times for each facility to ensure accuracy of data</p> | Yes | <p>We selected a sample of 7 various performance indicators (APACS / LAA and Local Performance) and through overview and discussion with the team member responsible for collating the data outputs for each of the indicators selected confirmed there are suitable controls in place to validate the source data. Some of the mechanisms applied include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scrutiny of data input on CIS to verify it meets the required criteria. ▪ Review / query by management when the outputs are initially completed, which may involve more detailed review of cases. ▪ Random visits (e.g. regarding station opening hours). ▪ Checks made back directly to HR re data held on NSPIS HR system. ▪ When the Home Office Returns are completed (via electronic direct input) these may show conflicts on information which would prompt a further check to | | |

| | CONTROLS (ACTUAL AND/OR MISSING) | ADEQUATE DESIGN(YES/NO) | TEST RESULT / IMPLICATIONS | RECOMMENDATION | CATEGORISATION |
|---|---|-------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| | returns. | | ensure that details are correctly entered onto the system. | | |
| 4 | <p>Performance against the Local Priority targets for 2009/10 is collated and details confirmed prior to reporting.</p> <p>We selected two of these to confirm the system control arrangements in place for producing the data Those sampled included:</p> <p>A) To maintain excellent performance by continuing to exceed 95% compliance against published opening hours</p> <p>B) To resolve at least 30% of incidents as defined with a stretch target of 35%.</p> | Yes | <p>Through sample testing on two of the Local Performance indicators for 2009/10 we followed the control arrangements through the process to produce the data covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Source data. ▪ Processes applied to validate/ check data input. ▪ Mechanisms used to input data/ to produce the data outputs. ▪ Review of arrangements over the data outputs. ▪ Mechanism to report the outcomes. ▪ Reporting back to the Police Authority (confirmed for meeting of 3 November 2009). <p>From the testing completed we confirmed the process to produce the data and check outcomes is adequately controlled.</p> | | |
| 5 | The APACS Performance Indicators are subject to data input checks to ensure correctly classified prior to production of the outcome reports which are discussed with management and subject to report to the Home Office as well as being reported upon internally and up to the Police Authority. | Yes | Through sample review and walk-through on the control process for 5 of the APACS performance indicators for 2009/10 we confirmed that adequate control arrangements are maintained in the processes in place in collecting the data, production of the data output statistics. We were able to follow the process through to completion of the Returns for the Home Office and the data submitted to the Police Authority meeting of 3 November 2009, which included performance for the period April to September 2009. | | |
| 6 | The data reports produced | Yes | Through the work completed on the | | |

| | CONTROLS (ACTUAL AND/OR MISSING) | ADEQUATE DESIGN(YES/NO) | TEST RESULT / IMPLICATIONS | RECOMMENDATION | CATEGORISATION |
|---|--|-------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| | <p>are also updated on completion, to the Management Information Gateway (MIG) on the Force systems providing a means for all to access the information.</p> | | <p>Performance Indicators sampled in this review we confirmed that the MIG is updated on an ongoing basis to reflect current trends and data outputs providing a good means for management / staff to check how well they are performing against the performance indicators in place.</p> <p>We were advised that the Areas do monitor activity closely and compare themselves with the activity outcomes across the other areas on all areas of performance in Force.</p> <p>We were informed that some performance data reports are also produced daily / weekly and are put on the MIG to provide up to date information in relation to various aspects of crime levels occurring across the Force areas.</p> | | |
| 7 | <p>The Performance Development Group (PDG) in Force is attended by ACPO / senior management and they discuss progress against the Performance Indicators and we were advised they may request actions in meetings for particular reports to be submitted to future meetings on specific issues as they arise.</p> <p>The Delivering Service Excellence meetings also receive monthly updates on performance activity against targets including results relating to the CRAVE survey and the Policing Pledge.</p> | Yes | <p>We confirmed the PDG meetings are generally held on a monthly basis and confirmed that various aspects of performance are discussed at these meetings and any required actions arising from the meetings are included in an Action Log, as confirmed for the meeting held on 28 September 2009.</p> <p>In our discussions with the Temporary DCC he advised that a lot of work goes on outside these meetings to deal with low performance against the targets to help and assist managers and staff responsible towards achieving increased levels of performance where they are having problems in meeting the required standard.</p> <p>By review of the Delivering Service Excellence Group report for the meeting of 29 October 2009 we confirmed that the latest CRAVE results, IQUANTA confidence</p> | | |

| | CONTROLS (ACTUAL AND/OR MISSING) | ADEQUATE DESIGN(YES/NO) | TEST RESULT / IMPLICATIONS | RECOMMENDATION | CATEGORISATION |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|
| | | | Measures (to June 2009), Crime and incident data / satisfaction and Policing Pledge Performance were included in the reports for the meeting. | | |
| 8 | The Force also has an Internal Audit regime which is carried out by the Performance Improvement Unit. They have an Annual Audit Strategy and Plan for the work to be carried out across the year to provide assurances over the level of compliance with national reporting requirements. | Yes | Through discussions with the Head of Performance Improvement Unit and the Audit Inspection Manager they confirmed that they undertake various audit reviews throughout the year to ensure that management systems, procedures and practices remain up to date and fit for purpose to ensure that data quality and integrity is maintained. They are presently working through the Audit Plan for 2009/10. In a recent audit on Detected Crime "Conditional Cautions" they tested a sample of data for all crime reports detected between July and September 2009 to check the level of compliance with the required set criteria, leaving recommendations to deal with the issues arising from the review. | | |
| 9 | The Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Community Safety Programme Boards have determined which of the national indicators they wish to target and monitor. The Force sends the data to them on a monthly basis and they produce the outputs against the targets they are monitoring. | Yes | We were provided with a list of the relevant performance targets set for each of the Programme Boards within the Local Area Agreements (LAA) and in discussions with the Performance Team in the Force we confirmed they pass the de-personalised crime data over (secure means in place) to the County as agreed under the partnership arrangements with the City Council/County Council and Rutland on a monthly basis. The information provided is used to produce the performance data required under the Local Authority Agreements in place to be used to produce the data required by each | | |

| | CONTROLS (ACTUAL AND/OR MISSING) | ADEQUATE DESIGN(YES/NO) | TEST RESULT / IMPLICATIONS | RECOMMENDATION | CATEGORISATION |
|----|---|-------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| | | | <p>of the Programme Boards in the County.</p> <p>Once the data is produced the Force also includes the information on the Force MIG system for information.</p> <p>(We were advised that some joint working is presently carried out between the County Council and the Force on the outputs on Crime data to provide extra analysis (including a geographical breakdown) and that they are looking into how they can best use the resources available to ensure that the information is collated in the most efficient and effective way to keep costs to a minimum.)</p> <p>In discussion with the Performance Review Manager she also confirmed that where the LAA's in the partnership prepare reports they have a protocol in place to ensure that all parties do give feedback prior to meetings to ensure the information to be reported upon is being accurately communicated / reported.</p> | | |
| 10 | When the LAA output reports are returned to the Force they are put onto the MIG for reference/ information which is accessible to all in the Force. | Yes | <p>We confirmed that the data produced by the Research and Information Team at the County Council / Force is also put onto the Force MIG.</p> <p>We confirmed data is produced on dashboards for each of the districts in the County and that Crime data covering the period to September 2009 has been provided. The data for the Ant-Social Behaviour Dashboard is also now available.</p> <p>(We were advised the Dashboard documents have received national recognition for the design.)</p> | | |

| | CONTROLS (ACTUAL AND/OR MISSING) | ADEQUATE DESIGN(YES/NO) | TEST RESULT / IMPLICATIONS | RECOMMENDATION | CATEGORISATION |
|----|--|-------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|
| 11 | The Police Authority receives regular updates against Performance Indicators in place. | Yes | <p>Through review of the minutes of the Police Authority meetings for 5 May 2009 we confirmed that they received an annual performance report for the period April 2008 / March 2009.</p> <p>We confirmed progress against performance indicators in place for 2009/10 have been reported to the Police Authority meetings of 30 June (progress to 31 May 2009) and 3 November (progress to September 2009).</p> | | |