



**HMIC Inspection Report**

**Derbyshire Constabulary**

**October 2007**



*Derbyshire Constabulary – HMIC Inspection Report*

*October 2007*

**ISBN: 978-1-84726-451-0**

**CROWN COPYRIGHT**

**FIRST PUBLISHED 2007**

## **Contents**

### **Introduction to HMIC Inspections**

Programmed frameworks  
Risk-based frameworks  
The grading process  
Developing practice  
Future HMIC inspection activity

### **Force Overview and Context**

Geographical description of force area  
Demographic profile of force area  
Strategic priorities  
Force developments since 2006

## **Findings**

### **National summary of judgements**

### **Force summary of judgements**

### **Neighbourhood Policing**

### **Performance Management**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Overview**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Domestic Violence**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Public Protection**

### **Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons**

## **Appendix: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations**

## Introduction to HMIC Inspections

For a century and a half, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) has been charged with examining and improving the efficiency of the police service in England and Wales, with the first HM Inspectors (HMIs) being appointed under the provisions of the County and Borough Police Act 1856. In 1962, the Royal Commission on the Police formally acknowledged HMIC's contribution to policing.

HMIs are appointed by the Crown on the recommendation of the Home Secretary and report to HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary, who is the Home Secretary's principal professional policing adviser and is independent both of the Home Office and of the police service. HMIC's principal statutory duties are set out in the Police Act 1996. For more information, please visit HMIC's website at <http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/>.

In 2006, HMIC conducted a broad assessment of all 43 Home Office police forces in England and Wales, examining 23 areas of activity. This baseline assessment had followed a similar process in 2005 and has thus created a rich evidence base of strengths and weaknesses across the country. However, it is now necessary for HMIC to focus its inspection effort on those areas of policing that are not data-rich and where qualitative assessment is the only feasible way of judging both current performance and the prospects for improvement. This, together with the critical factor that HMIC should concentrate its scrutiny on high-risk areas of policing – in terms of risk both to the public and to the service's reputation – pointed inexorably to a focus on what are known collectively as 'protective services'. In addition, there is a need to apply professional judgement to some key aspects of leadership and governance, where some quantitative measures exist but a more rounded assessment is appropriate.

Having reached this view internally, HMIC then consulted key stakeholders, including the Home Office, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and the Association of Police Authorities (APA). A consensus emerged that HMIC could add greater value by undertaking fewer but more probing inspections. Stakeholders concurred with the emphasis on protective services but requested that Neighbourhood Policing remain a priority for inspection until there is evidence that it has been embedded in everyday police work.

HMIC uses a rigorous and transparent methodology to conduct its inspections and reach conclusions and judgements. All evidence will be gathered, verified and then assessed against an agreed set of national standards, in the form of specific grading criteria (SGC). However, the main purpose of inspection is not to make judgements but to drive improvements in policing. Both professional and lay readers are urged, therefore, to focus not on the headline grades but on the opportunities for improvement identified within the text of this report.

### Programmed frameworks

This report contains assessments of the first three key areas of policing to be inspected under HMIC's new programme of work:

1. Neighbourhood Policing;
2. performance management; and
3. protecting vulnerable people.

Neighbourhood Policing has been inspected not only because it is a key government priority but also, and more importantly, because it addresses a fundamental need for a style of policing that is rooted in and responds to local concerns. The police service must, of course, offer protection from high-level threats such as terrorism and organised criminality, but it

also has a key role in tackling the unacceptable behaviour of the minority of people who threaten the quality of life of law-abiding citizens.

Performance management is an activity largely hidden from public view, although members of the public are directly affected by poor performance on the part of their local force. This inspection has focused on the need for forces to maximise the opportunities for performance improvement. It also posed questions as to whether forces have an accurate picture of how they are doing and the capability to respond to changing priorities. This area was selected for inspection because it is a key factor in delivering good performance across the board.

Protecting vulnerable people covers four related areas – child abuse, domestic violence, public protection and missing persons – that address the critically important role of the police in protecting the public from potentially serious harm. In the 2006 baseline assessment this was the worst performing area and raised the most serious concerns for HMIC and others. As a result, this area was prioritised for scrutiny in 2007.

### **Risk-based frameworks**

In addition to its programmed inspection work, HMIC continues to monitor performance across a range of policing activity, notably those areas listed in the table below.

<b>HMIC risk-based frameworks</b>
Fairness and equality in service delivery
Volume crime reduction
Volume crime investigation
Improving forensic performance
Criminal justice processes
Reducing anti-social behaviour
Contact management
Training, development and organisational learning

While these activities will not be subject to routine inspection, evidence of a significant decline in performance would prompt consideration of inspection. For 150 years, HMIC has maintained an ongoing relationship with every force. This allows it to identify and support forces when specific issues of concern arise. On a more formal basis, HMIC participates in the Home Office Police Performance Steering Group and Joint Performance Review Group, which have a role in monitoring and supporting police performance in crime reduction, crime investigation and public confidence.

HMIC conducts inspections of basic command units (BCUs), also on a risk-assessed basis, using the Going Local 3 methodology. Combining these various strands of inspection evidence allows HMIC to form a comprehensive picture of both individual force performance and the wider national picture.

## The grading process

Grades awarded by HMIC are a reflection of the performance delivered by the force over the assessment period April 2006 to July 2007. One of four grades can be awarded, according to performance assessed against the SGC (for the full list of SGC, see <http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/methodologies/baseline-introduction/ba-methodology-06/?version=1>).

### *Excellent*

This grade describes the highest level of performance in service delivery and achieving full compliance with codes of practice or national guidance. It is expected that few forces will achieve this very high standard for a given activity. To achieve Excellent, forces are expected to meet **all** of the criteria set out in the Fair SGC and the vast majority of those set out in Good. In addition, two other factors will attract consideration of an Excellent grade:

- The force should be recognised, or be able to act, as a 'beacon' to others, and be accepted within the service as a source of leading-edge practice. Evidence that other forces have successfully imported practices would demonstrate this.
- HMIC is committed to supporting innovation and we would expect Excellent forces to have introduced and evaluated new ways of delivering or improving performance.

### *Good*

Good is defined in the Collins English Dictionary as 'of a high quality or level' and denotes performance above the minimum standard. To reach this level, forces have to meet in full the criteria set out in Fair and most of the criteria set out in Good.

### *Fair*

Fair is the delivery of an acceptable level of service, which meets national threshold standards where these exist. To achieve a Fair grading, forces must meet all of the significant criteria set out in the Fair SGC. HMIC would expect that, across most activities, the largest number of grades will be awarded at this level.

### *Poor*

A Poor grade represents an unacceptably low level of service (except in relation to Neighbourhood Policing see page 9). To attract this very critical grade, a force will have fallen well short of a significant number of criteria set out in the SGC for Fair. In some cases, failure to achieve a single critical criterion may alone warrant a Poor grade. Such dominant criteria will always be flagged in the SGC but may also reflect a degree of professional judgement on the level of risk being carried by the force.

## Developing practice

In addition to assessing force performance, one of HMIC's key roles is to identify and share good practice across the police service. Much good practice is identified as HMIC conducts its assessments and is reflected as a strength in the body of the report. In addition, each force is given the opportunity to submit examples of its good practice. HMIC has selected three or more of these examples to publish in this report. The key criteria for each example are that the work has been evaluated by the force and the good practice is easily transferable to other forces (each force has provided a contact name and telephone number or email address, should further information be required). HMIC has not conducted any independent evaluation of the examples of good practice provided.

## Future HMIC inspection activity

Although HMIC will continue to maintain a watching brief on all performance areas, its future inspection activity (see provisional timescales below) will be determined by a risk assessment process. Protective services will be at the core of inspection programmes, tailored to capacity, capability and the likelihood of exposure to threats from organised criminality, terrorism and so on. Until its full implementation in April 2008, Neighbourhood Policing will also demand attention. Conversely, those areas (such as volume crime) where performance is captured by statutory performance indicators (SPIs), iQuanta and other objective evidence will receive scrutiny only where performance is deteriorating, as described above.

The Government has announced that, in real terms, there will be little or no growth in police authority/force budgets over the next three years. Forces will therefore have to maintain, and in some areas improve, performance without additional central support or funding. This in itself creates a risk to police delivery and HMIC has therefore included a strategic resource management assessment for all forces in its future inspection programme.

<b>Planned Inspection areas</b>
Serious and organised crime
Major crime
Neighbourhood Policing
Strategic resource management
Customer service and accessibility
Critical incident management
Professional standards
Public order
Civil contingencies
Information management
Strategic roads policing
Leadership

## Force Overview and Context

### Geographical description of force area

The county of Derbyshire covers an area of over 1,000 square miles. It has a mixture of urban and rural areas, including former mining communities in the north east, the industrial city of Derby in the south, and the vast moorlands and countryside of the Peak District in the north west.

### Demographic profile of force area

Derbyshire has a total population of 987,000, with 422,000 households. The black and minority ethnic (BME) proportion of the population is lower than the national average at just under 5%. Almost 80% of the BME population lives in the city of Derby. Derbyshire also has a higher proportion of senior citizens than both the regional and national averages. Derby City is a unitary authority and there are a further eight borough and district councils within the administrative county. Nine crime and disorder reduction partnerships (CDRPs) correspond to the nine local government areas within Derbyshire.

The total strength of the force, including part-time and seconded officers, is 2,125 police officers, 176 police community support officers (PCSOs), 1,369 police staff, and 420 special constables. The command team is based at the force headquarters (HQ) at Butterley Hall on the outskirts of Ripley. The chief officer team is headed by the Chief Constable, David Coleman (who retires in September 2007); Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) Alan Goodwin holds the portfolios for corporate development, information services, legal services and professional standards. Assistant Chief Constable (ACC) Dee Collins holds the portfolios for human resources, call handling, the Special Constabulary, learning and development and criminal justice. ACC Peter Goodman leads on operations, including divisional/territorial policing, specialist crime, specialist operations, community safety, intelligence, scientific support, level 2 crime and roads policing. Terry Neaves is the Director of Finance and Administration. The Derbyshire Police Authority (PA) consists of 17 members: seven councillors from Derbyshire County Council, two councillors from Derby City Council, three magistrates and five independent members. The chair of the PA is Janet Birkin.

Policing is delivered via an operations division, a crime support department and four territorial divisions or BCUs covering the areas of Alfreton, Buxton, Chesterfield and Derby. Each BCU is led by a chief superintendent and is subdivided into a number of geographically based sections. An inspector heads each section, providing local accountability. The force philosophy is based on a clear commitment to community-based, problem-solving policing, as set out in the Chief Constable's vision statement. The force is committed to placing at least one neighbourhood beat officer on every beat.

### Strategic priorities

The force has agreed five strategic priorities to deliver the national policing priorities and four additional corporate priorities. The national policing priorities are:

- Priority 1 – Reduce overall crime
- Priority 2 – Enable people to feel safer in communities
- Priority 3 – Bring more offences to justice
- Priority 4 – Strengthen public protection



- Priority 5 – Protect the country from terrorism and extremism.

For 2007/08, the force's corporate priorities are to:

- manage resources effectively, with full regard to the opportunities presented by collaborative working;
- take every opportunity to connect with communities in providing a citizen-focused policing service;
- improve the quality of investigations and ensure that people are kept informed of progress; and
- redirect resources to front-line service delivery, with particular emphasis on improving the front-line policing measure.

Work on regional collaboration continues, with Derbyshire staff contributing to the work of the regional collaboration planning team and units. Regional collaboration should bring opportunities for efficiency and performance improvements across many operational policing and supporting activities in the East Midlands region, and the savings released will help to maintain front-line services.

### **Force developments since 2006**

The force has developed an action plan to address the areas for improvement identified in the 2006 baseline assessment. This action plan is subject to quarterly updating of developments and is monitored by the Chief Constable and the PA prior to discussion with HMIC.

## Findings

### National summary of judgements

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
<b>Neighbourhood Policing</b>				
Neighbourhood Policing	6	14	21	2
<b>Performance management</b>				
Performance management	6	29	8	0
<b>Protecting vulnerable people</b>				
Child abuse	3	17	21	2
Domestic violence	1	13	27	2
Public protection	2	16	23	2
Missing persons	1	21	21	0

### Force summary of judgements

<b>Neighbourhood Policing</b>	<b>Grade</b>
Neighbourhood Policing	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Performance management</b>	<b>Grade</b>
Performance management	<b>Fair</b>
<b>Protecting vulnerable people</b>	<b>Grade</b>
Child abuse	<b>Good</b>
Domestic violence	<b>Fair</b>
Public protection	<b>Fair</b>
Missing persons	<b>Good</b>

## Neighbourhood Policing

GRADE	POOR
-------	------

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6	14	21	2

### National contextual factors

The national Neighbourhood Policing programme was launched by ACPO in April 2005 to support the Government's vision of a policing service which is both accessible and responsive to the needs of local people. It was anticipated that, by April 2007, every area across England and Wales would have a Neighbourhood Policing presence appropriate to local needs, with all Neighbourhood Policing teams in place by April 2008. For local communities this means:

- increased numbers of PCSOs patrolling their streets, addressing anti-social behaviour and building relationships with local people;
- access both to information about policing in their local area and to a point of contact in their Neighbourhood Policing team; and
- having the opportunity to tell the police about the issues that are causing them concern and helping to shape the response to those issues (Home Office, May 2006).

By focusing on the key areas of resources, familiarity/accessibility, problem identification and joint problem-solving, this inspection has identified the extent to which the national Neighbourhood Policing programme is being implemented. It has also examined forces' capability and commitment to sustain implementation beyond April 2008.

### Contextual factors

Derbyshire had an established philosophy of community beat officers working across the county prior to the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing. These officers were supported by special constables, rangers and wardens from partner agencies, together with PCSOs on their introduction into the force. Safer Neighbourhoods is seen as building on and enhancing the role of these teams in the communities they serve.

The latest British Crime Survey revealed that, nationally, over 70% of people feel that crime is rising although it is in fact decreasing; consequently, the force concluded that success in reducing crime had been largely invisible to the public of Derbyshire, who remain worried about what is happening on the streets. It sought to close this 'reassurance gap' through a visible and targeted presence that addresses neighbourhood priorities. Consultation across the county confirms that the public want to see an increase in street patrols and a more visible presence of officers who are familiar with local needs and local issues.

Derbyshire Constabulary has defined what constitutes a neighbourhood by consulting with partner agencies at the external Neighbourhood Policing board, which is chaired by the ACC (operations). The force has significant financial pressures which affect the level of

resources available for Neighbourhood Policing. This means that there is a tension between meeting the demands of calls for assistance from the public and providing problem-solving Neighbourhood Policing activity. HMIC recognises that much good work is taking place at the local level across the county, and a commitment to partnership work is evident. The grade of Poor reflects the assessment that some key elements of the agreed national programme are not yet embedded in Derbyshire, particularly in respect of community engagement.

## Strengths

- The force has a reward and recognition scheme which includes all members of Safer Neighbourhoods teams (SNTs). The awards are presented at commendation ceremonies and often feature in the local media, for example the *Derbyshire Times*, a recent example being publicity for an award presented to a community group for their contribution to tackling anti-social behaviour.
- The force has provided analytical capability on each BCU to support the SNTs. These staff will provide assistance in completing neighbourhood profiles to the new corporate standard, and will work with partners and partner data to inform the National Intelligence Model (NIM) process.
- The ACC (operations) chairs an internal Neighbourhood Policing delivery group, with PA and chief officer team involvement. He also chairs the external delivery board, which, thanks to effective partner participation, has enabled partners to define and then agree what is meant by the term 'neighbourhood'.
- Members of the community can currently access information on how to contact their SNT via the force internet, simply by using their post codes.
- A Safer Neighbourhoods week in August, focused around major public events, publicised SNTs. It included a Safer Neighbourhoods day in the centre of Derby to promote community engagement with the force and partner agencies.
- The force has produced a detailed project plan that contains requirements for coverage of all Safer Neighbourhoods, and plans for joint problem solving with partners, all for completion by the April 2008 deadline.
- The Safer Derbyshire research and information (SDRI) team comprises six partnership analysts who are building an intelligence-led assessment, updated every six months, to support long-term planning by the force and partner agencies. The SDRI team is preparing area profiles of the 103 identified neighbourhoods across the county; it produces an assessment at district level to highlight where activity is needed. In the future, work assessments will drill down to an area profile or Safer Neighbourhoods level. Members of the community will then be able to make searches on current performance and trends.
- The 23 newly appointed Safer Neighbourhoods sergeants, aligned with the nine CDRPs, will help shape the police response to the needs identified in the SDRI assessments, and will enable timely action to address local concerns.
- Inspection fieldwork included asking members of the public about interactions between the police and the community; it was evident that most of these residents and business people had been contacted by, or were aware of, local PCSOs. The majority spoke positively about the increased police presence.

- There is evidence of positive working relations between SNTs and partners, specifically with district councils. This is demonstrated by joint tasking meetings that tackle anti-social behaviour and work at the tactical level with community action network rangers to identify actions and deliver improvements for neighbourhoods.
- West Indian, Kurdish and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community leaders are not only aware of SNTs but report regular contact with them and can name individual officers. The inspection found evidence of positive engagement by SNTs with vulnerable victims, which has increased the confidence of victims to report crime.
- Information-sharing protocols are in place with partners to ensure the flow of appropriate information, building on former, more informal agreements. The force has also developed a NIM-compliant implementation action plan, which includes the capture and management of community intelligence and is linked to the implementation of the National Briefing Model. This work is facilitated by the director of intelligence, who sits on the Neighbourhood Policing board, and the force's principal analyst.
- The intelligence department and the Neighbourhood Policing project team are working with partners to establish joint strategic assessments and joint strategic tasking and co-ordination. Under the aegis of Operation Keystone, which is guiding the effective implementation of NIM processes in Neighbourhood Policing, a review is under way on how community intelligence is linked to tactical tasking and co-ordination and informs strategic assessments and tasking.
- The network of 23 Safer Neighbourhoods sergeants, 175 police constables, 176 PCSOs and an increasing number of special constables provides a visible and reassuring presence on the streets of Derbyshire.
- All SNT members operate from appropriate accommodation and are supplied with the equipment they need to fulfil their role. In some areas, the accommodation is shared with partner agencies to facilitate joint problem solving.
- All SNT staff have relevant Neighbourhood Policing objectives in their annual performance development reviews.
- Community impact assessments are used to identify community concerns and tensions. The force routinely uses its independent advisory group (IAG) and specific community agencies to ensure that these assessments accurately reflect concerns, and that any action taken by the police is informed appropriately.
- The force's BCUs have all completed self-assessments for Neighbourhood Policing implementation, which generated improvement action plans for each BCU. The HQ-based project team then collates and monitors progress against these action plans.
- The force has achieved 100% roll-out of SNTs and has recruited its full complement of PCSOs to SNTs, supported by the target number of special constables attached to SNTs.
- As part of the inspection process, a telephone survey of 100 randomly selected residents was carried out, asking six questions about their experience and views on how Neighbourhood Policing is being delivered. The answers to four questions did not deviate statistically from the national average results, but two were more positive

than the average: 'local police speak to local people about problems in their area' and 'the police make efforts to find out what people think'.

- To prevent future anti-social behaviour in Derbyshire, the force is working with partners to develop a youth strategy, aimed at keeping young people safe, promoting their positive input and ensuring early and helpful interventions. Through proactive engagement by SNTs, many young people are working with the police and partners to reduce nuisance and anti-social behaviour. The force supports schools by providing an input on citizenship for all young people in Derbyshire aged between 11 and 16. This ensures that joined-up messages about crime and its consequences are understood by those attending these sessions.
- As a method of identifying issues and priorities across the county, the force's Have Your Say programme is seen as a positive way to inform the police and other partner agencies of citizens' concerns. Efforts are made to carry out these events in locations that will increase the participation of young people and hard-to-reach groups. Last year these events attracted some 1,038 participants to 18 venues across the county.

### **Work in progress**

- A Safer Neighbourhoods DVD has been produced to spread the messages about how communities can better engage with their SNTs. Four neighbourhood communication officers have also been appointed, one for each BCU, whose remit will be to work with partners and the media to promote and enhance the Safer Neighbourhoods agenda and promulgate successes.
- The force has carried out its own internal inspection on the impact of Safer Neighbourhoods policing, which made numerous recommendations for improvement. Action in response will include the development of key individual networks (KINs) of 100 individuals covering the 103 neighbourhoods. The information services department is already scoping its capability to deliver a KINs application. The national Neighbourhood Policing Programme Team has been approached and will visit the force in September 2007 to undertake a further assessment on the delivery of Safer Neighbourhoods on each BCU. This assessment should help the force to improve the sharing of good practice across BCUs, and to formulate a multi-agency action plan in respect of any 'areas for development' so that the Government deadline for embedding Neighbourhood Policing by April 2008 will definitely be met.
- Neighbourhood Policing has been rolled out across the whole force, but resourcing is variable between BCUs because some areas have secured matched funding for additional PCSOs while others have not. Local authorities already deploy community action network rangers, who are being integrated into the Safer Neighbourhoods approach.
- A corporate model exists for Safer Neighbourhoods profiles; all beat profiles have been completed to this corporate standard and are currently going through a quality assurance process. This model does not currently include local priorities, a rationale for their generation or the methodology that will be used to identify priorities at the Safer Neighbourhoods level.
- The training department has developed an eight-module training package (based on the Centrex model) designed to be delivered to Safer Neighbourhoods officers,

sergeants and PCSOs. This is in recognition of a lack of training to date for some of these staff, although PCSOs joining the force benefit from a two-week training course prior to their SNT deployment. This training will be reviewed to evaluate the improvement to service delivery.

- The force has recruited sergeant supervisors for SNTs to ensure appropriate tasking and allocation of work and to monitor investigative workloads. However, their effectiveness is hampered by the lack of a robustly managed abstraction policy, which can lead to resources being drawn away from neighbourhood duties.
- The force is developing an appropriate performance management regime, which will incorporate satisfaction and confidence measures, focusing on the determination of priorities for SNTs and how these priorities are assessed and delivered.
- In trying to engage hard-to-reach groups, the force uses various methods including assessing partner databases, using media to advertise events, and leaving postcards (available in different formats and languages) in libraries to stimulate interest in attending panel meetings. The force is exploring the use of MOSAIC demographic data (which classifies households in the UK) in order to better tailor styles of engagement to specific communities.
- There are examples of active participation by partners and the police in joint problem solving and tasking at the neighbourhood level. This includes the discussion of crime issues by geographic area, and specific subjects such as anti-social behaviour or vulnerability to crime. Actions were allocated to various partners and police staff in relation to the prevention and detection of crime and the reduction of anti-social behaviour. Problem solving was not part of a wider community engagement process and so there was no mechanism to feed back results directly to communities, for example through community engagement panels.

### **Areas for improvement**

- While there are examples of a variety of methods used in community consultation and engagement, these are predominantly information gathering in nature rather than genuine development of local priorities. This means that there is also no process to feed back results of SNT action, or to gain sign-off from communities of the outcomes.
- There are no problem-solving or engagement plans linked to local neighbourhood priorities as set out in the national programme for implementing Neighbourhood Policing.
- A contradiction exists in that 'local' priorities are currently identified at force level rather than by neighbourhoods. Some local consultative groups are in place but, where none exist, reliance is placed on the local knowledge of inspectors, sergeants, SNTs or IAG outreach workers, or simply on an analysis of incidents. There is no corporate process to involve the community in identifying local priorities at the Safer Neighbourhoods level, nor any overview by SNT management of local priorities.
- Problem solving does not routinely involve communities at the neighbourhood level; rather, this is conducted with partner agencies through the tasking and co-ordination process. As a result, the decision to sign off successful problem-solving outcomes does not reach communities at the neighbourhood level.

- The force employs a minimum staffing level for police teams responding to calls for assistance. When these teams are below the minimum staffing levels, neighbourhood officers are used to meet the minimum requirement. This practice detracts from the effectiveness of SNTs, as officers are diverted from neighbourhood duties.
- The force's abstraction policy for SNT staff sets a target of no more than 10% abstraction from neighbourhood duties, but evidence indicates that actual abstraction rates are significantly higher. In addition, while there is a paper-based process to record and monitor abstraction, currently there is no process to improve performance in reducing abstraction. There is also no agreed definition of what constitutes an abstraction and consequently no consistency in recording or monitoring abstraction occurrences.
- There is no evidence of succession planning for SNT staff, especially beat officers, and there are still beat officer posts unfilled.
- A training need exists for staff who may encounter lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender issues; staff seemed unaware of the agreed protocols for liaising with outreach workers to problem solve issues. Occasionally, officers have simply contacted people they know from these communities and, in effect, asked them to act as outreach workers in relation to particular incidents.



## *Developing Practice*

**INSPECTION AREA:** Neighbourhood Policing

**TITLE:** Glossop town centre – retailer radio link

**PROBLEM:**

Analysis of incidents reported by telephone or to beat officers on patrol identified a persistent problem of thefts from shops in the town centre. Clearly, the existing cascade communication scheme was not working.

**SOLUTION:**

Beat officers invited selected retailers to participate in a pilot scheme, using a hand-held radio system that linked them to each other and to the police. They use this system to report suspicious circumstances in the stores and, in an emergency, as an alternative to the telephone. Police officers use their own radios to communicate directly with stores. The retailers also meet to share information about problems they have in their stores.

**OUTCOME(S):**

Ten retailers initially joined the scheme, followed by a further 23. They formed a partnership and now meet on a regular basis to share information, between themselves and with other agencies, in order to cut crime, reduce the fear of crime and make the town a safer place to visit and shop. The scheme now also extends to cover several town centre pubs/clubs as well as the local secondary school. The school link provides a useful tool to inform shops in the town centre, and the police, of truants, who can then quickly be located to avoid the potential for incidents of disorder and nuisance.

**FORCE CONTACT:** PC 2333 Julian Gallagher, Town Centre SNT – 07765 287684 or 01298 762245

October 2007

**INSPECTION AREA:** Neighbourhood Policing

**TITLE:** Gamesley Lend-a-Cam project

**PROBLEM:**

The initiative was to target criminal damage and anti-social behaviour on the Gamesley estate in Glossop. Witnesses to crime and disorder had been reluctant to come forward and provide statements because of fear of reprisals.

**SOLUTION:**

With money from High Peak Community Housing, Derbyshire Constabulary and Gamesley-on-the-Go, six cameras were purchased. These were lent to residents (both council tenants and private occupiers) free of charge, initially on a monthly basis. The recipients were victims of criminal damage or other anti-social behaviour near their houses. The cameras were linked to their TVs/videos and the force provided the video tapes. Large A3 signs were erected around the address where a camera was sited, informing people that there was a camera in the vicinity.

The results have been very positive. Two people were taken to court for throwing fireworks after having been caught on camera. Further funding was secured and 12 new cameras have been purchased. These were designed specifically for this project, with the time and date recorded on the screen. The project is now being rolled out to other areas of Glossop.

**OUTCOME(S):**

- Reduced number of acts of anti-social behaviour and damage in the specific areas where the cameras were installed.
- Some young people were taken to court and prosecuted for anti-social behaviour-related offences.
- Residents benefited from greater peace of mind.

**FORCE CONTACT:** PC 1852 Paula Doyle, Gamesley Beat Officer – 01298 721002

October 2007

<b>INSPECTION AREA:</b> Neighbourhood Policing
<b>TITLE:</b> Bradwell community action group
<b>PROBLEM:</b>  In the spring/summer of 2006, there was a disproportionately high number of criminal damage offences and calls for service about anti-social behaviour by teenagers in the Bradwell area.
<b>SOLUTION:</b>  The police initiated a community group – the Bradwell community action group – which has raised over £15,000 to provide a youth shelter in the village. A youth drop-in centre will open in September 2007, initially for two nights a week. During the school summer holidays, activities have been organised to aid youth diversion work. These include trips to local football clubs, a three-day residential outdoor pursuits centre course, tennis, bowling and cricket training. Some activities have been provided every week throughout the school summer break.
<b>OUTCOME(S):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Offences have dropped dramatically – by over 50%.</li><li>▪ Calls for service have dropped dramatically – again, by over 50%.</li><li>▪ Adults in the village are now engaging with teenagers and barriers between them are decreasing.</li><li>▪ Teenagers now feel that they are valued members of the community who are listened to and respected.</li></ul>
<b>FORCE CONTACT:</b> PC 685 Doug Eyre – 0845 12133333

## Performance Management

GRADE

FAIR

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6	29	8	0

### National contextual factors

There is no single accepted model of performance management across the police service but any such model or framework must be fit for purpose. Ideally, forces should demonstrate that individuals at every level of the organisation understand their contribution to converting resources into agreed delivery, and know how they will be held to account. On a daily basis, first-line supervisors monitor, support and quality assure the performance of their teams. At the other end of the spectrum, chief officer-led performance meetings – often based loosely on the American Compstat model – are a vehicle for accountability and improvement. Robust leadership, a commitment to improvement and reliable, real-time information systems are all critical factors in effective performance management.

There is no mechanistic link between overall force performance and the grade awarded in this framework. The grade is based on the quality of the force's processes that enable it to identify and react to changes in performance.

### Contextual factors

As part of performance planning, the force brings together control strategy requirements with national and local priorities under the leadership of the DCC. This cycle includes the Chief Constable's seminar, which is an opportunity for senior staff and PA members to discuss the development of force objectives. The force also carried out a public consultation exercise to inform the target-setting process, with 278 responses received.

### Strengths

- The PA is actively involved in the performance process in Derbyshire, with clear lines of accountability through the audit and scrutiny committee. Monthly performance reports are presented at every full PA meeting, and are fully involved in the annual performance target-setting process. This helps to ensure that targets are challenging and link to issues identified by the community through consultation, as well as incorporating national policing priorities.
- The force engages in a programme of internal audit and inspection, which covers issues such as compliance with the Victims' Code and the National Standards for Incident Recording (NSIR). It has also completed a 'mystery shopping' initiative to gauge the level of service delivered across different areas of the force; the report findings are awaited.
- There was evidence of good use of review processes to evaluate the benefits of change; for example, the use of the National Strategy for Police Information Systems

duty management system in commissioning an evaluation of business benefits realisation, to demonstrate where performance improvements have been made.

- Team and officer management information (TOMI) data, available to managers and supervisors, identifies performance at team and individual officer level. This can then be used to analyse performance and make improvements where required.
- Staff are committed to the 'one truth' approach in using performance data (at both force and BCU level), which everyone agrees is timely, accurate and provided in a meaningful way to staff. This means that performance management fora are focused on problem solving and performance improvement and not distracted by debates on data accuracy. It also means that, where performance is positive, teams receive recognition from managers.
- Staff within Derbyshire have a clear understanding of the overall vision of the force, which includes commitment to locally based policing services that are accessible, reliable and provide a strong visible presence. Staff are also aware of the force priorities, particularly at the local level – for example they were clear about the targets for their particular BCU.
- The force carries out a number of consultation events that inform a variety of force plans and priorities:
  - **Have Your Say:** This is the largest single face-to-face public consultation event that the force and PA undertake jointly. One of the objectives of the consultation is to identify where force resources should be prioritised. To maximise accessibility to diverse communities, the times and locations of the events are targeted using support from the IAG and include work addresses, hospitals, universities, markets and sports centres. Some 18 locations were visited across the county and 1,038 members of the public participated.
  - **Your Opinion consultation:** Co-ordinated jointly by the force and the PA, this public consultation exercise specifically sought to identify public priorities, to feed directly into the target-setting process. The consultation took the form of an online questionnaire accessible from the force and PA websites, and 278 responses were received and analysed.
  - **Budget consultation:** In addition to the Your Opinion initiative, the force held five events in January 2007, including a specific event for the business community, to determine where the public would like to see the budget allocated. Over 400 people were consulted from across the county, in evening meetings held at well advertised and accessible locations.
- The force has effective project management processes overseen by the DCC, co-ordinating programmes of work across the force with chief officer leads in each area. These projects are linked to the delivery of outcomes identified within the local policing plan, and those accountable for each area of work are identified.
- The force uses NIM processes when identifying priorities and developing its control strategy. This process includes the identification of risk in respect of both level 1 and level 2 criminality to ensure that identified priorities match areas of greatest risk and concern. The PA and partners play an active part in this process by attending the meetings that identify the risks and being part of the risk-monitoring process.

- Activity analysis has been used to improve performance on the front-line policing measure – for example, PCSO visibility was analysed and improved as a result of changes to the tasks they are required to perform. Activity analysis has been embedded across the force; staff have been trained and BCU-based mentors promote its use.
- The operational commanders' meeting chaired by the ACC (operations) drives the delivery of operational policing performance, identifying blocks and barriers to performance and how these can be overcome. The discussion is based on the provision of BCU performance data, as well as comparative performance data, which enables benchmarking of performance levels.
- Survey data and information have been used to develop and adapt force processes to improve performance. An example is where follow-up actions from staff are required in response to dissatisfaction expressed by victims of burglary. This means that where actions have not been completed, such as follow-up contact by staff, then this is chased.
- Ring-backs by contact centres and enquiry desk staff are made to update victims on the status of investigations after they have made a statement. This initiative is viewed positively by the community as it demonstrates that the police care about individual situations and seek to improve public confidence in the reporting of crimes.

## **Work in progress**

- The operational commanders' monthly conference is due to expand and will become a bi-monthly meeting, with BCU and departmental performance meetings in between. This will strengthen the performance regime for support departments, as well as probing identified gaps in departmental performance, and will provide a more focused look at performance by concentrating on one area of business.
- A 'mystery shopper' exercise has been carried out to assess customer satisfaction; the report is due to be published and will be used to review and improve customer service processes.
- The force's diversity programme board has expanded its remit to include national quality of service standards, call-handling standards and the Victims' Code. New arrangements are now being developed to take this work forward. These are likely to include partners and PA members to ensure that feedback on strategies and plans can be incorporated into the force's decision-making process.
- A scrutiny of service delivery identified room for improvement in follow-up contact with victims of crime and providing the final results of investigations. Work was initiated to develop divisional champions, to ensure high standards of service and deliver a 'get it right first time' ethos to front-line staff.
- Dip sampling to assess quality of service and customer satisfaction is conducted differently across the force, reducing consistency in measurement and comparability of results. A new model has been identified and is being introduced.
- User satisfaction surveys are conducted by the corporate development department and any problems in the quality of service provided by individual staff members are

referred to BCU chief inspectors (operations). However, it is unclear whether this has led to any overall improvement in satisfaction ratings.

### **Areas for improvement**

- Limited performance information in respect of support services and protective services is available; the force has recognised this but has yet to develop a force-wide plan around the collection and use of performance data, in order to better understand and improve performance in these areas.
- Staff view the performance development review process as the main mechanism for identifying annual performance and setting objectives. However, not all staff are aware of individual performance requirements or how they personally contribute to force objectives.
- The force has made efforts to encourage the reporting of hate crime incidents, which are monitored through the performance framework. However, the third party reporting method is viewed as cumbersome and complicated, and as a result has not led to the increased level of reporting as hoped.
- The force produces a five-year strategic audit plan and an annual audit plan. While the force audit plan outlines a schedule of audit activity, this is not completed in full due to a lack of resources. The force should look again at this area of work and ensure that auditing requirements are adequately resourced so that the findings can be processed and action plans developed in a timely manner.

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Overview

### National contextual factors

The assessment framework for Protecting Vulnerable People was first developed in 2006 as part of HMIC's baseline assessment programme. It replaced two existing frameworks – Reducing/Investigating Hate Crime and Crimes against Vulnerable Victims – which focussed on hate crimes (predominantly racially motivated), domestic violence and child protection. Following consultation with practitioners and ACPO leads, a single framework was introduced with four components – domestic violence, the investigation and prevention of child abuse, the management of sex and dangerous offenders, and vulnerable missing persons. Although the four areas are discrete, they are also linked and share a common theme – they deal with vulnerable victims where there is a high risk that an incident can quickly become critical, and where a poor police response is both life-threatening and poses severe reputational risks for the force.

This year's inspection has been carried out using similar assessment standards as those in 2006. These highlight the importance of leadership and accountability; policy implementation; information management; staffing, workload and supervision; performance monitoring and management; training; the management of risk; and partnership working.

The work carried out by forces to protect the public, particularly those most vulnerable to risk of serious harm, is complex and challenging. No single agency, including the police, has the capacity to deliver the required response on its own. Success is therefore, dependent on effective multi-agency working and there are a number of established partnerships, involving a wide range of services and professionals, aimed at ensuring that an integrated approach is adopted to protecting those most vulnerable to risk of serious harm.

### Contextual factors overview

The Richard Inquiry, set up following the Soham murders, identified loopholes in police information management. The inquiry produced a series of recommendations, the implementation of which has been progressed by Derbyshire Constabulary. In order to comply with the Code of Practice on the Management of Police Information, the force has created a management of police information project board. It has achieved phase 1 compliance as appraised by peer review, and plans to achieve full compliance by 2010.

### Strengths

- A detective superintendent is dedicated to the public protection portfolio and leads a department with a robust structure and clear lines of accountability. The ACC is aware of the pressures in this area of work and as a result has instigated appropriate accountability mechanisms.
- Auditing activity is focused on compliance with NSIR and the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS). Auditors check that incidents are recorded and closed appropriately, thus ensuring that the force has an accurate profile of the nature and extent of those incidents and crimes that affect vulnerable people.
- A force public protection board has been established, chaired by the ACC (operations) and attended by HQ management and divisional representatives at



detective chief inspector (DCI) level. A member of the PA has also been appointed to this group.

### **Work in progress**

- The force has undertaken a substantial piece of work to identify the requirement for services to protect vulnerable people. This has generated proposals to restructure the public protection department and provide extra resources in areas of identified risk, such as domestic violence investigation. The force has also produced a number of action plans in this area of work to monitor progress; it has already committed some of the extra resources required to implement the plans.
- Policies for domestic violence work and child abuse investigation have been rewritten and await sign-off by ACPO; the revised missing from home policy is in draft form. These new policies should ensure that staff comply with the guidance produced by the National Centre for Policing Excellence (NCPE) and that the force can improve services for vulnerable victims and witnesses.

### **Areas for improvement**

- The protecting vulnerable people components are not currently reflected in the force strategic assessment, and therefore are not identified as force priorities in the NIM process.
- Protecting vulnerable people is not specifically included in force plans (although some elements, such as domestic violence, are mentioned), priorities or the strategic assessment, but is included as part of a generic violent crime category.

## *Developing Practice*

**INSPECTION AREA:** Protecting vulnerable people

**TITLE:** Bullying/hate crime report form for people with learning difficulties

**PROBLEM:**

Known cases of bullying and crime suffered by adults with learning difficulties were not reported to any agency.

**SOLUTION:**

Working in partnership with the hate crime co-ordinator for the community safety partnership and the hate crime working group (with agency representatives and adults with learning difficulties), a small group of people with learning difficulties designed a form for the initial reporting of bullying or crime. Post boxes were also designed and both forms and boxes were situated in daycare centres and adult learning venues.

The forms are collected by an employee of Advocacy (agency representative), who carries out the initial assessment and signposts further action if necessary. The users (people with learning difficulties) designed both forms and boxes. The forms were printed and funded by the police; the boxes were made and funded by the Wetherby Centre.

**OUTCOME(S):**

- An increase in the reporting of incidents.
- Increased reassurance among adults with learning difficulties.
- No matter what the issue, there is one known point where reports are dealt with or signposted.

**FORCE CONTACT:** PC Nev Coupe, Community Safety Team, St Mary's Wharf – 01332 613118

**Protecting Vulnerable People – Child Abuse**

GRADE

GOOD

**National grade distribution**

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
3	17	21	2

**National contextual factors**

The Children Act 2004 places a duty on the police to 'safeguard and promote the welfare of children'; safeguarding children, therefore, is a fundamental part of the duties of all police officers. All police forces, however, also have specialist units which, although they vary in structure, size and remit, normally take primary responsibility for investigating child abuse cases. Officers in these units work closely with other agencies, particularly Social Services, to ensure that co-ordinated action is taken to protect specific children who are suffering, or who are at risk of suffering, significant harm. The Children Act 2004 also requires each local authority to establish a Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB). This is the key statutory mechanism for agreeing how the relevant organisations in each local area will co-operate to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in that locality, and for ensuring the effectiveness of what they do.

Membership of LSCBs includes representatives of the relevant local authority and its Board partners, notably the police, probation, youth offending teams, strategic health authorities and primary care trusts, NHS Trusts and NHS Foundation Trusts, the Connexions service, Children and Family Courts Advisory and Support Service, Secure Training Centres and prisons.

**Contextual factors**

The child abuse investigation unit (CAIU) deals with all cases of familial abuse of people under the age of 18, and with offences and allegations involving professionals and people in positions of trust. There are strong links with the hi-tech crime unit in cases of internet abuse and senior investigating officers from the major crime unit have been identified for assignment to murder investigations. The divisional criminal investigation department deals with any sexual offences committed against children that fall outside the CAIU remit.

The specific comments in this section should be read in conjunction with those contained in the generic protecting vulnerable people section of this report.

**Strengths**

- Child abuse investigation is subject to clear lines of accountability and a documented organisational structure. Child abuse investigators are geographically based on divisions, with dedicated supervision by detective sergeants (DSs) and detective inspectors (DIs). Active management and involvement in investigations on a daily basis is demonstrated by the DCI and detective superintendent.

- The ACC (operations) is the named chief officer with responsibility for all public protection work.
- The central referral unit (CRU) receives all referrals and ensures that force policy is applied consistently. The DS undertakes all strategy discussions with social services, which are then documented on the child and adult referral enquiry (CARE) system.
- The CARE system records all child abuse and adult abuse referrals and provides a single nominal record for identified families and individuals, thereby capturing all incidents reported to the police.
- The CRU completes comprehensive packages for CAIU officers and researches all relevant force systems, as well as conducting IMPACT nominal index (INI) checks for all CAIU referrals.
- The force policy for child abuse investigation has been rewritten and signed off by chief officers, and is consistent with ACPO guidance. Joint agency child protection procedures have been published. The policy includes the completion of joint visits with social services and the investigation of infant sudden deaths.
- Force policy states that the remit of the CAIU includes all cases of familial child abuse of people under the age of 18 and allegations of abuse involving professionals and people in a position of trust. The remit has been extended to include the investigation of all sexual offences with child victims, thereby ensuring that a consistent quality of service is provided to all child victims irrespective of the relationship between perpetrator and victim.
- Child abuse investigators have an active operational involvement in all cases of child murder and manage all infant sudden death investigations.
- A high priority is attached to CAIU investigations and regular support is provided by the major crime unit and use of the HOLMES system. As a result, a significant number of specialist resources are made available at the crucial early stage of an investigation.
- CAIU DSs provide 24-hour, on-call coverage to ensure that a specialist response to any incidents involving children is available.
- A hi-tech crime unit, comprising dedicated detective officers, provides a significant commitment and a leading resource to support child abuse enquiries and expedite computer examinations.
- The force INI capability is contained in the CRU, and force policy requires that INI checks are made in respect of all CAIU referrals.
- A data-tracking tool has been developed which monitors each referral through to final disposal at court. Key milestones – including intelligence and compliance with the Victims' Code and NCRS – are all recorded to provide an audit trail of decision making and actions.
- Robust management scrutiny is exercised through the NIM process. In BCU daily tasking meetings, all significant CAIU investigations are discussed and actioned.

October 2007

- Joint home or scene visits are completed by police officers, paediatricians and police surgeons in respect of all unexplained infant sudden death investigations to ensure that the opportunities for evidence retrieval are maximised.
- Maximum staffing levels are maintained in the CAIU and chief officers have determined that no abstractions or vacancies will be carried by the unit, reflecting the importance attached to this particular sphere of work. DSs have not carried any operational workload since January 2007, concentrating instead on supervision and quality assurance.
- The rationale for staffing levels has been informed by research into crime incidence to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to investigate all sexual offences involving a child victim. The commitment to increase resources for protecting vulnerable people is evidenced by successful growth bids and the protecting vulnerable people action plan.
- Performance information on CAIU activity – including the number of referrals, the action taken in respect of each referral, individual officer caseloads and the number of case conferences attended – is collated on a monthly basis and submitted for review. The development of performance indicators and outcome measures is being progressed by the force.
- Analysis of CAIU data is being used to streamline investigations by identifying the factors that improve timeliness. For example, better management of joint visits with social services is expediting investigations and improving the quality of service to victims.
- Auditing activity has focused on NSIR and NCRS compliance, to ensure that all incidents are recorded appropriately. As a result, the force has developed an accurate profile of the nature and extent of incidents and crimes involving children and other vulnerable people which is used to inform strategic and operational decision making.
- Checks are made by the CAIU DSs of each officer's individual caseload on a weekly or fortnightly basis, to ensure that officers are managing cases appropriately and to provide support if required.
- There are effective links between staff working on child abuse investigations, domestic violence, multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) and missing persons; wherever possible, public protection staff are co-located with divisional intelligence teams. In addition, the two DIs are located in the same department at HQ to ensure that management arrangements are co-ordinated.
- A multi-agency sexual exploitation core group has been set up, targeting perpetrators associated with missing persons. Significant success has been achieved, both in identifying offences and offenders associated with the sexual exploitation of children, and in reducing the number of repeat missing persons reports associated with a small number of children as a result of abuse perpetrated against them.
- A dedicated county facility has been established in Chesterfield Hospital to provide medical examination facilities equivalent to those offered by sexual assault referral centres, with a forensically sterile and child-friendly environment for child victims.
- Up-to-date job descriptions exist for staff in the CAIU and reflect their remit.

- Welfare sessions are mandatory for all CAIU staff, with attendance monitored to ensure compliance. The quality of the provision has been improved by moving the service to a specialist provider.
- The CAIU requires DSs to be experienced detectives. All officers complete mandatory tier three offender and witness interviewing courses, to improve the quality of investigations.
- CAIU staff are accredited detectives and are required to complete the specialist child abuse investigator development programme. All staff are trained in Achieving Best Evidence and undertake multi-agency training that is monitored and recorded in officers' personnel records.
- Staff play an active role in the local safeguarding children boards (LSCBs) and the associated working subgroups. The appropriate DCI, DI or DS attends these boards.

### **Work in progress**

- Currently, all child sexual abuse examinations – and some solely related to physical abuse – in Derby City are conducted in consultation rooms at the Children's Hospital or in similar hospital facilities. The force, in consultation with partner agencies, recognises that these are not ideal environments for victims or their families, or for the potential gathering of evidence from examinations, given the increased sensitivity of DNA identification. Therefore, the examination suite situated in the child abuse unit at St Mary's Wharf in Derby is to be completely refurbished. The primary care trust has agreed to fund this project with a grant in excess of £24,000, and a multi-agency project team has been established.
- Through the CRU, the force is currently trialling a process whereby specialist child protection officers take on all child abuse referrals, whether familial or non-familial. The trial will help to determine workload and resource implications, but the objective remains to assign a consistent specialist lead investigator in all crimes of abuse against children.
- A policy on completion of joint visits, rather than single agency visits by social services, is being rolled out and evaluated to ensure that force resources can meet demand; strict guidelines aim to protect staff welfare and promote correct practice. It was not clear if the new policy has filtered down to social workers, as cases were identified where a joint visit should have occurred but did not.
- A heavy workload is associated with attending strategy meetings and case conferences, with a lot of unproductive time spent travelling. The force is examining IT solutions such as conference calls.
- The CAIU DI has not received any specialist training for the role, but is due to complete the National Centre for Applied Learning Technologies component of the specialist child abuse investigation course.

### **Areas for improvement**

- While a policy for initial joint visits is in place, very limited use is made of them, resulting in inappropriate single agency visits by social services acting in an investigative capacity. In some cases this has contributed to criminal investigations

being discontinued, or social services has refused to give access to records that detail initial disclosures.

- There is inconsistency around the recording of information, with sometimes no or limited documented evidence that a strategy discussion has taken place, or a lack of appropriate detail in the CARE record entries regarding decisions made.
- The DS within the CRU determines which cases should be investigated by the police; however, operational staff are unclear about the criteria for police involvement.
- The performance management information collected for child abuse investigations is limited to the number and type of incident, action taken, case conference attendance and individual workloads. The information could usefully include identification of outcomes, to inform service improvement.

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Domestic Violence

GRADE

FAIR

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1	13	27	2

### National contextual factors

There is no statutory or common law offence as such of 'domestic violence'; the term is generally used to cover a range of abusive behaviour, not all of which is criminal. The definition of domestic violence adopted by ACPO does, however, take account of the full range of abusive behaviour as well as the different circumstances in which it can occur:

*'any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse (psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional) between adults, aged 18 and over, who are or have been intimate partners or family members, regardless of gender or sexuality'.*

As with the investigation of child abuse, responding to and investigating domestic violence is the responsibility of all police officers. Again, however, forces have dedicated staff within this area of work, although their roles vary. In some forces staff undertake a support/liaison role, generally acting as a single point of contact for victims and signposting and liaising with other agencies and support services; in others, staff have responsibility for carrying out investigations.

Irrespective of who carries out the investigation in domestic violence cases, an integral part of every stage is the identification of risk factors, followed by more detailed risk assessment and management. In 2004, HMIC, together with HMCPSI, published a joint thematic inspection report on the investigation and prosecution of domestic violence. At that time, risk identification, assessment and management were in the early stages of development throughout the service. Since then, there has been considerable progress in developing formal risk identification and assessment processes and - in a number of forces - the implementation of multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARACs). Other improvements include the introduction of specialist domestic violence courts and the strengthening of joint working arrangements.

### Contextual factors

A force public protection board has been established, chaired by the ACC (operations) and attended by HQ management and divisional representatives at DCI level. A member of the PA has also been appointed to this group. Under this leadership, Derbyshire Constabulary has undertaken a substantial programme of work to identify the developing need for services to protect vulnerable people. One outcome is a proposal to restructure the public protection department and provide extra resources in areas of identified risk, such as domestic violence investigation; some extra resources have now been committed. The force has also generated a number of action plans in this area to ensure progress. A detective superintendent is dedicated to the public protection portfolio and leads a department with a robust internal structure and clear lines of accountability.



The force has developed its domestic violence systems in response to recommendations made after a review of a high-profile domestic violence-related murder and criticism from the Independent Police Complaints Commission. A force-wide initiative sought to learn lessons from that incident, which stemmed from a poor investigative response to reported incidents of violence and theft attributed to the victim's former partner. Customised training has been rolled out force-wide and sets clear expectations for the quality of investigation and standards of victim care.

The specific comments in this section should be read in conjunction with those contained in the generic protecting vulnerable people section of this report.

## Strengths

- The ACC (operations) is the ACPO portfolio holder for domestic violence; he took up post in April 2007 on transfer from West Midlands Police and has demonstrated a willingness and ability to take on this portfolio and implement the lessons from Operation Cosmos to strengthen the force's response across the board to domestic violence incidents.
- The force has established a domestic violence improvement plan group, chaired by the ACC (operations), which has actioned changes to the risk assessment process as well as monitoring referral completion rates and any risk assessment backlog. This has led to much improved senior management oversight. Performance objectives were launched in July 2007 to track and monitor performance improvements, in recognition of the previous paucity of data with which to make valid comparisons of performance across BCUs.
- The force has recognised the importance of taking positive action where offences have been committed and following this up with investigations of the highest quality. In response to this goal, each division has established a domestic violence review panel, which sits quarterly. Each panel comprises divisional officers – from practitioners to senior command level – and independent representatives from external agencies. The panels review and critically examine performance in the handling of a random sample of incidents. Identified problems are then used to improve the quality of service provided.
- The introduction of a specialist domestic violence court in Derby has speeded up the processing of cases and has improved links between the courts and specialist domestic violence officers (DVOs), facilitating a prompt risk assessment after a victim withdraws a complaint. Improved relationships with specialist prosecutors have contributed to an 80% success rate at court, and there is specialist training for all domestic violence court staff. (The specialist domestic violence court currently covers only the Derby area; a similar court in Chesterfield would provide cover for the rest of the county.)
- An important initiative has been the introduction of a system to capture all domestic violence incidents reported to the police, which are documented on the case-tracking system (known in Derbyshire as CARE, but very similar to the more recognisable Case Administration Tracking System). These CARE records are then viewed by trained specialist staff who risk assess each incident. The force can then put an appropriate response in place depending on the degree of risk of harm to the victim.
- Auditing activity in the protecting vulnerable people field is focused on compliance with NSIR and NCRS. Auditors ensure that incidents are recorded appropriately and

October 2007

closed appropriately, thus ensuring that the force has an accurate profile of the nature and extent of those incidents and crimes that affect vulnerable people.

- Derby City has a multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC) for the highest risk potential victims of homicide or serious harm arising from domestic violence. The MARAC process is a fortnightly multi-agency meeting that provides an effective community response to domestic violence, supporting the victim by identifying and reducing risk. It allows current risk information and a comprehensive assessment of a victim's needs to be shared, and links individuals directly to the appropriate services for each victim, child and perpetrator.
- Strong working relationships exist between partners – eg homeless victims were previously dealt with by generic homelessness officers – and there is now a greater emphasis on preventative work. If necessary, offenders rather than victims are rehoused to help prevent further victimisation. From 2007, waiting lists for housing have been easier to access for victims of domestic violence. Agencies also assist in accessing affordable legal advice.
- Local authority-employed independent domestic violence advisers (IDVAs) are the main partner link to the MARAC, conducting 'safe and well' checks with victims. IDVAs also encourage victims to access services, provide support with injunctions – eg attending meetings with solicitors – and provide referrals to the police where incidents are reported direct to IDVAs.
- A clear accountability framework is in place with evident ACC oversight exercised through the force-level public protection board; a dedicated detective superintendent for public protection is in post. Divisional domestic violence review panels provide quality assurance of first response and follow-up investigative work, while divisional DVOs provide victim support and care to high-risk victims and monitor them for six months. DVOs are required to contact high-risk victims weekly, visiting as necessary, and put appropriate security packages in place for every victim.
- Derbyshire does not have a specific reference to domestic violence in its strategic assessment but there is a clear commitment to domestic violence response and investigation in the local policing plan. Policies for domestic violence investigation have been rewritten and await sign-off by chief officers; these policies should ensure full compliance with ACPO/NCPE guidance and should improve services for vulnerable victims and witnesses.
- Call-handling and help desk staff have received training in recognising and taking appropriate action in respect of a domestic violence incident. All police officers who have joined the force since 1996 have received an input on domestic violence.
- The paper system for recording domestic violence incidents captured only 40% of cases and therefore only 40% of victims were risk assessed. The introduction of the electronic system (Form 621) ensures the recording of **all** domestic violence incidents – the command and control system cannot be closed unless the 621 reference number has been endorsed.
- When the force introduced a CRU for domestic violence in 2005, it became clear that officers were not completing referral forms for each domestic violence incident, as force policy required. To improve compliance and ensure that officers completed the appropriate referral form, the force introduced an electronic form (Form 621) with a unique reference number for each domestic violence incident. This unique reference

number means that the CRU can track the number of incidents against completed referral forms, and identify each case where forms have not been completed.

- This tracking increased the number of referrals significantly, and the additional workload created a significant backlog of referrals waiting to be risk assessed by specialist DVOs. This backlog has been managed (see below) and additional staff have been recruited to improve the timeliness of risk assessment following the initial response and risk identification.
- DVOs previously completed the SPECSS risk assessment (which is a list of potential risk factors pertaining to domestic violence incidents namely Separation, Pregnancy, Escalation, Cultural, Sexual assault and Stalking), which determines whether the risk of harm is low, medium or high; some officers had a backlog of over 100 domestic violence incidents awaiting risk assessment. The SPECSS risk assessment does not cover fully the elements of the MARAC risk assessment process; consequently, the force examined ways of integrating the requirements of the force and the needs of partner agencies. Outcomes from the two mechanisms do not always align, resulting in potential conflict – eg when MARAC identifies a case as high risk but the police risk assess the same case as low risk. A new risk assessment tool was introduced in February 2007, which is based on the West Midlands risk assessment. It is IT-based and automatically scores each case as standard, medium or high risk. This new approach produces results that are more consistent with those of the MARAC risk assessment process.
- Medium-risk domestic violence packages are sent to divisional officers to manage. The officer is expected to make contact with the victim, complete a checklist of interventions and complete monthly and six-monthly reviews. The force has recognised that previously there was no formal process of supervision and no requirement to complete the packages. Supervisors on the BCUs have been identified and briefed about their role and responsibility to manage these packages, to ensure that victims receive the appropriate level of service. The CRU has set up a tracking database to monitor whether packages are being managed in a timely manner.
- Any domestic violence incident at which children are present or normally resident in the household is automatically referred to the child abuse investigation referral desk, which is separate from the domestic violence referral unit.
- The staffing levels for specialist posts are adequate and indeed now offer some resilience provided that DVOs are not asked to take on ancillary tasks (this point is the subject of an 'area for improvement') and that the CRU is fully staffed, which it is at present, although it has experienced shortfalls in the past.
- Four additional administrative support posts have been established for divisional domestic violence units, to reduce the administrative burden on DVOs so that they can improve the quality of service to victims. These staff are currently being trained. If these staff are abstracted/unavailable, then the CRU will manage the workload to ensure that no backlog is allowed to build up.
- Specialist DVOs have up-to-date job descriptions that accurately reflect their role.
- Training sessions based on the lessons learnt from a high-profile domestic violence incident have been delivered by the detective superintendent (protecting vulnerable people) to all inspectors, who then cascade this training to their officers and reinforce the key issues.

- All new recruits receive domestic violence training during their induction. In 2006, specialist DVOs, call-handling staff and enquiry office staff received specialist modular training appropriate to their roles. A briefing has been delivered to all staff involved in the investigation process to outline the quality of investigation and the standard of victim care required when dealing with domestic violence incidents.

### **Work in progress**

- The introduction of the electronic system (CARE) and Form 621s generated significant follow-up demands on staff, which coincided with staffing problems, including the CRU supervisor leaving the post. As a result, a backlog of forms requiring input to the CARE system built up. This backlog, created between January and April 2007, has now been risk assessed, and additional staff have been posted to the CRU specifically to clear outstanding referrals.
- The force is considering establishing a domestic violence investigation unit, to operate in addition to the existing victim-focused DVOs. Such a unit would provide consistently high-quality investigation of domestic violence incidents across the force area.
- Supervision of DVOs has been limited, partly due to the need for the domestic violence detective superintendent to focus attention on the CRU and its backlog of work, although this commitment is reducing. The deployment of an additional acting detective sergeant in Derby has improved the depth of supervision and support to DVOs, and the post is awaiting the recruitment of a substantive post holder.
- There is ongoing education of partners and staff in the meaning and purpose of MARACs, file requirements for the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and inputs by victims of domestic violence. Training has been piloted in one division and will shortly be rolled out across the force.
- Training for members of the MARAC is still to be provided. This training is for all staff involved in the MARAC process, to ensure that the meetings are run as effectively as possible.

### **Areas for improvement**

- Every domestic violence incident should be marked with the code QDV and officers must submit a Form 621 before it can be closed on the command and control system. However, compliance with this QDV marking is not audited and therefore the force cannot be wholly confident that 100% compliance is being secured, or that all domestic violence incidents are correctly marked. The CRU does audit the referral forms and ensures that there is a linked incident marked on the command and control system. This audit has identified that there are more referral forms completed than incidents marked as domestic violence incidents.
- The force IT systems for domestic violence work do not interface, and staff cannot keep Guardian (the force intelligence system) open while they access other databases – eg command and control, Form 621s or the Police National Computer (PNC). The incompatibility of IT systems increases the time lags between receipt and inputting of information.
- The move to electronic referral created a sizeable backlog of domestic violence incidents awaiting risk assessment. Earlier in the year, the backlog had reached around 2,000. The force took a calculated decision to clear as much of this backlog

as was feasible but then to draw a line and focus attention on recent and new cases. As a consequence, some 1,500 referrals from response officers inputted on the CARE system between August 2006 and mid-January 2007 have not been risk assessed. All have received an initial investigative response and any repeat incidents will have been picked up, but the administrative task of clearing the assessment backlog will not be undertaken. The force accepts that this poses some vulnerability; it has now staffed the CRU to ensure that this type of backlog is not allowed to develop in future, and this is obviously a point that HMIC will track over the next year or so.

- DVOs are expected to make contact with high-risk victims within seven days, but current workloads prevent this from happening in every case.
- There is evidence to show that DVOs are being tasked with actions that sit outside their original remit, such as obtaining initial statements of complaint from victims. Consequently, some DVOs are not able to complete core tasks in a timely manner.
- Recently recruited DVOs have received no training for the role. Although there is an online learning pack (which takes three days to complete), no protected duty time is allocated to complete this pack, and officers are expected to complete this while carrying out their core work.
- DVOs are the main point of contact for the CPS, and are required to respond to CPS queries in respect of all domestic violence victims, not just the high-risk cases that they manage personally. This can be problematic; for example, when obtaining further statements or commenting on bail conditions, DVOs are not always aware of the relevant background information.
- DVOs used to receive counselling every six months but, because the provision is now located in Derby, some DVOs no longer attend.

GRADE

FAIR

## Protecting Vulnerable People – Public Protection

### National grade distribution

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
2	16	23	2

### National contextual factors

The Criminal Justice and Courts Services Act 2000 led to the formation of the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements, commonly known as MAPPA, requiring the police and probation services to work together as the Responsible Authority in each area of England and Wales to establish and review the arrangements for the assessment and management of sexual and violent offenders. Subsequent legislation brought the Prison Service into the Responsible Authority arrangements and also requires a range of social care agencies to co-operate with the Responsible Authority in the delivery of the assessment and management of risk in this area. These agencies include health, housing, education, social services, youth offending teams, Jobcentre Plus, and electronic monitoring services.

Under MAPPA, there are three categories of offender who are considered to pose a risk of serious harm:

Category 1 – Registered Sex Offenders (RSOs)

Category 2 – violent and other sex offenders

Category 3 – other offenders (with convictions that indicate they are capable of causing, and pose a risk of, serious harm).

To be managed under MAPPA, offenders must have received a conviction or caution. However, there are some people who have not been convicted or cautioned for any offence, and thus fall outside these categories, but whose behaviour nonetheless gives reasonable ground for believing a present likelihood of them committing an offence that will cause serious harm. These people are termed Potentially Dangerous Persons (PDPs).

Following risk assessment, risk management involves the use of strategies by various agencies to reduce the risk, at three levels:

- Level 1 offenders can be managed by one agency;
- Level 2 offenders require the active involvement of more than one agency;
- Level 3 offenders – the ‘critical few’ – are generally deemed to pose a high or very high risk and are managed by a multi-agency public protection panel (MAPPP).

In 2003, the Home Secretary issued MAPPA guidance to consolidate what has already been achieved since the introduction of the MAPPA in 2001 and to address a need for greater consistency in MAPPA practice. The guidance outlines four considerations that are key to the delivery of effective public protection.

- defensible decisions;
- rigorous risk assessment;
- the delivery of risk management plans which match the identified public protection need; and,
- the evaluation of performance to improve delivery.

## **Contextual factors**

The dangerous persons management unit (DPMU) deals with registered sex offenders (RSOs), violent and other sex offenders. The unit is part of crime support, as part of the wider public protection structure in the force. The specialist DPMU officers are located in the four BCUs across the force area and are either co-located with or closely aligned to the local intelligence unit. This ensures that the officers are well placed to link with the NIM processes of tasking and co-ordination.

The force has approved the provision of an additional supervisor (an increase of one post) to ensure robust management of dangerous persons by staff across the four operational divisions. The force has also recognised the heavier workloads on the Derby City BCU and has provided additional resources to bring workloads into line with those on the other BCUs. This should allow a more consistent level of service across the county. There are good working relationships between DPMU officers on a cross-border basis, both between divisions and with officers in neighbouring force areas.

The specific comments in this section should be read in conjunction with those contained in the generic protecting vulnerable people section of this report.

## **Strengths**

- RSOs are automatically archived on the Violent and Sex Offenders Register (ViSOR) following completion of their period of registration. However, where it is considered that they will still pose a high risk of serious harm to the public at the point when they would normally leave MAPPA, they are considered for inclusion under category 3, thereby providing for their continued management under MAPPA and on ViSOR.
- Level 3 multi-agency public protection panel (MAPPP) meetings are consistently attended by the HQ DCI, facilitating a consistent approach to the management of risk posed by those offenders discussed at this meeting.
- Level 3 MAPPP meetings are minuted by the MAPPA co-ordinator, who inputs all meeting minutes on ViSOR, thus enabling decisions and actions to be audited.
- Quarterly review meetings are held between police officers and probation staff to review all RSOs, including those managed at level 1. This meeting takes place outside the formal MAPPA structure but ensures that partners are fully aware of action relating to, and results of, the management of people in this category.
- Officers have received ViSOR and Risk Matrix 2000 training, and have attended the Lancashire management of sex offenders course, and the Child Exploitation and

Online Protection Centre (CEOP) understanding sex offenders course. There are plans for further CEOP courses to be delivered.

- The ACC (operations) is the named chief officer with responsibility for all public protection work.
- An effective central ViSOR team ensures high standards of data quality, researching and inputting generic antecedent information on ViSOR. There is comprehensive use of warning markers on ViSOR, which are mirrored on the PNC.
- A MAPPA administrator and ViSOR administrator were recruited last year; an additional DS for public protection, together with three police staff visiting officers, are to be recruited in order to achieve a caseload of around 60 offenders per staff member.
- ViSOR nominals are flagged on the force intelligence system so that officers are aware that they are dealing with sex or violent offenders and can contact the DPMU for advice on how to proceed.
- All offenders managed at divisional level are managed not by individuals but by DPMU officers jointly, ensuring equal knowledge of, and ViSOR access to, all nominals.
- There is clarity regarding the creation of ViSOR nominal records for offenders, with all RSOs and other categories of offender managed at level 3 MAPPP. Other offenders may also be included on ViSOR at the discretion of offender managers.
- Agency staff have been employed to put previously held paper records onto computer to ensure all information held on paper files is available on ViSOR.
- Welfare sessions are mandatory for all DPMU staff, with attendance monitored to ensure compliance. The quality of the provision has been improved by moving the service to a specialist provider.
- All DPMU officers have been subject to enhanced vetting at security check level.
- The MAPPA co-ordinator post is part of a package of multi-agency funding totalling £100,000 per annum, and a long-term commitment has been given to continue this funding provision through the strategic management board (SMB). The SMB meets on a quarterly basis, chaired by the ACC (operations) and attended by the DCI for public protection. The MAPPA co-ordinator also attends the SMB, preparing papers for the meeting and drafting strategy and policy advice for board members.
- The MAPPA co-ordinator meets with regional MAPPA co-ordinators on a quarterly basis to share good practice and provide mutual support; they also attend national MAPPA co-ordinator events.
- The role of lay advisers includes bi-annual sampling of random DPMU files. The force will extend this process to include questioning of DPMU officers. Lay advisers also attend the MAPPA level 3 and level 2 meetings, and speak to community groups about MAPPA to inform the force about areas where service provision can be improved.
- Potentially dangerous persons (PDPs) are identified through the divisional tasking and co-ordination meeting, and many of the PDPs are managed on a single agency basis through normal policing methods. PDPs are addressed in a multi-agency



meeting only if that meeting can add to the management of the offender. PDPs are brought into MAPPA if that would reduce the risk of harm.

- By structuring all public protection-related disciplines in one department, the force has promoted effective links between staff at all levels working in these disciplines.
- Job descriptions for all staff (including the MAPPA co-ordinator) working in the public protection department are up to date and reflect their roles.

### **Work in progress**

- The force is about to implement training to enhance the role of SNTs in enforcing licence conditions or prohibitive orders, and in gathering intelligence in respect of identified sex and dangerous offenders. The intelligence and information received from the SNTs will be monitored to establish the effectiveness of this initiative. However, there is a lack of clarity as to how this information will be produced, stored securely and subsequently used.
- The force audit team is currently completing a compliance audit of PNC records, ViSOR and manual files; the report will make recommendations for improvements in performance and quality of service provision.
- The force is currently revising its sex offender policy to secure compliance with the ACPO manual of guidance.
- Performance data is collected regarding the timeliness and completion of home visits.
- All risk management plans are now entered on ViSOR for all nominals, following any review undertaken. This is a structured way of ensuring compliance with the changes to the ViSOR system that have recently been introduced as part of a rolling implementation programme, which will continue over the next 12 months.

### **Areas for improvement**

- Home visits to RSOs are not completed in accordance with the set timescales laid down in force policy, and there is a training need regarding how visits should be recorded or documented by officers. There is no structure for the timing or scheduling of home visits in accordance with the likelihood of reconviction or risk of harm.
- Officers are completing home visits alone, and sometimes without colleagues or supervisors even being aware of their whereabouts, the offenders they are visiting or the estimated time of their return. Officers do not carry Airwave radios or personal protective equipment during visits.
- The existing ViSOR structure, with the two ViSOR administrators holding all identified roles, is not consistent with national guidance. Significant risks exist over the determination of offender manager and supervisor roles. The DS is a ViSOR user but cannot access supervisory functions, and is tasked by the central ViSOR administrators. DPMU officers are allocated as a group to all offenders on their division, and thus there is no identifiable offender manager with specific accountability for the management of a named offender.

- The level 2 MAPPA meetings are rarely instigated by police officers, even though the force is the lead agency, and there is a stronger probation lead. Attendance at level 2 meetings is restricted to DC or DS level, and there is a pressing need for greater divisional management attendance. DCIs are supposed to attend the MAPPA level 2 meetings but do not do so. Where there is a police-led MAPPA meeting, it is chaired and minuted by the DPMU DC.
- There is no strategic support to DPMU officers from the DI or DCI. There has been significant turnover in the DI post, with three DIs in the last year. Divisional DCIs in general pay little attention to public protection issues. There is a worrying lack of knowledge and awareness of public protection and MAPPA issues among DCIs and divisional management teams.
- DPMU officers maintain a local database detailing the date on which annual notification is due, and a second date six months later, which is used to schedule home visits. Offenders are told to telephone DPMU officers when their annual notification is due, and officers count this as a home visit. In fact, the legislation stipulates that offenders should notify in person at a prescribed police station. One reason for this is that powers to take photographs, fingerprints etc apply only at the time of notification at a station.
- There was evidence of inconsistent use of ViSOR, along with gaps in the inputting of data and updating of the system. The force should conduct an internal audit to identify and remedy any inconsistencies and assess the force's preparedness for the introduction of the ViSOR national standards.
- Evidence suggests that, while the force is proactive in securing sex offender prevention orders, there are problems with the effective enforcement and monitoring of the orders' conditions.

**Protecting Vulnerable People – Missing Persons**

GRADE

**GOOD****National grade distribution**

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1	21	21	0

**National contextual factors**

Each year, thousands of people are reported to police as missing. Many have done so voluntarily and are safe from harm, whether or not they return home. But a number are vulnerable, because of age or health concerns, and the police service has developed well-honed systems to respond swiftly and effectively to such cases. For obvious reasons, missing children arouse particular concern, and many forces deploy 'Child Rescue Alert' to engage the media in publicising such cases. Key good practice in this framework are early recognition of critical incident potential, effective supervision of enquiries, the use of NIM problem profiles and other intelligence techniques to analyse repeat locations (eg, children's homes), and the use of an IT-based investigation tracking system such as COMPACT.

**Contextual factors**

The force has set up a multi-agency forum in Derby to manage vulnerable missing persons enquiries and, in particular, those living in social care accommodation who are repeatedly reported to the police as missing. It is envisaged that this type of initiative will not only lead to a reduction in the numbers reported missing but also protect already vulnerable individuals from exposing themselves to risk of drug or sexual abuse.

The specific comments in this section should be read in conjunction with those contained in the generic protecting vulnerable people section of this report.

**Strengths**

- The force has set up a multi-agency forum in Derby to manage vulnerable missing persons enquiries and, in particular, those living in social care accommodation who are repeatedly reported missing to the police. (Individuals may be classed as vulnerable because, for example, they are young or have learning difficulties.) It is envisaged that this type of initiative will not only lead to a reduction in the numbers reported missing but also protect already vulnerable individuals exposing themselves to the risk of drug or sexual abuse. An evaluation report has been completed and submitted to the LSCB.
- Missing persons work is seen by front-line investigative staff and supervisors as having a high priority. This was evidenced by their knowledge of the appropriate procedures to locate missing persons as soon as possible, and the understanding of relevant force IT systems.
- Missing persons enquiries are recorded on the COMPACT system, which is used to manage all such investigations.

- A rapid response team, funded through partners, deploys a police officer and education welfare officer to Derby city centre to identify and detain missing persons and return truants. The force has used PCSOs for national truancy initiatives, and has also tasked them to trace vulnerable missing persons on neighbourhoods.
- A sexual exploitation core group has been established, and is successfully targeting perpetrators who associate with vulnerable missing persons.
- Performance data on missing persons enquiries has been analysed, identifying that 29 individuals were responsible for 24% of all missing persons reports. As a result, targeted partnership action against these individuals has resulted in specific successes and a reduction in reported absences by these individuals.
- 'Safe and well' interviews are completed on the return of all missing persons and documented on CARE. Further follow-up visits are completed by specialist officers as and when required.
- Effective partnership work is evident between police, education welfare and social care officers to tackle truancy and the sexual exploitation of children. There is also good information sharing between partners regarding children in care homes and to identify repeat missing persons or locations. Partners meet monthly to share information.
- The COMPACT database is used to register first-time missing persons and help with efforts to prevent them from becoming repeat missing persons through the Runaways project.
- The audit and inspection team identified a problem in the failure to record some missing persons cases on COMPACT; it trawled command and control and compared this with COMPACT records, requiring divisions to report on the differences. Each division can now see other divisions' reports and ensure that COMPACT is completed.
- Vulnerable missing persons are included in daily management meetings and the tasking and co-ordination process on BCUs. Any further work is allocated at the meeting and results updated at subsequent meetings, as appropriate.
- Force policy for missing persons investigation was rewritten last year and is consistent with ACPO guidance. All missing persons cases are now risk assessed as low, medium or high risk. This assessment cannot be lowered without an inspector authorising and evidencing the reasoning.
- The new force policy sets out requirements for risk assessment, supervisory responsibilities and review requirements, all of which are duplicated on the COMPACT system to ensure compliance.
- The audit and inspection department identifies cases where missing persons reports are not recorded on COMPACT and search command and control to compare these records. They then require divisions to report and action any differences they identify. The reports are viable across divisions for comparison of performance. This has led to divisions actively ensuring completion of COMPACT records.

## **Work in progress**

- The level of compliance for the completion of COMPACT records has increased from 40% to 70% and continues to increase each month.
- A process of dip sampling to test the quality of investigations into missing persons for submission on a monthly basis is being progressed by the missing from home user group.

## **Areas for improvement**

- There is no joint training with partners on missing persons enquiries, although there are significant links to partners in respect of the requirements to reduce the numbers of missing persons.
- The force would benefit from using specialist input in training for front-line officers on vulnerable missing persons enquiries; this would enhance awareness of attendant risk and of the likelihood of missing persons becoming victims of crime. Officers receive a remote training package in the use of COMPACT, but this could usefully be supplemented by specialist input.

## Appendix: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

### A

ACC	Assistant Chief Constable
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers

### B

BCU	Basic Command Unit
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic

### C

CAIU	Child Abuse Investigation Unit
CARE	Child and Adult Referral Enquiry
CDRP	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
CEOP	Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
CRU	Central Referral Unit

### D

DCC	Deputy Chief Constable
DCI	Detective Chief Inspector
DI	Detective Inspector
DPMU	Dangerous Persons Management Unit
DS	Detective Sergeant
DVO	Domestic Violence Officer

### H

HMIC	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
HOLMES	Home Office Large Major Enquiry System

HQ                      Headquarters

**I**

IAG                    Independent Advisory Group

IDVA                  Independent Domestic Violence Adviser

INI                     IMPACT Nominal Index

**K**

KIN                    Key Individual Network

**L**

LSCB                  Local Safeguarding Children Board

**M**

MAPPA                Multi-agency Public Protection Arrangements

MAPPP                Multi-agency Public Protection Panel

MARAC                Multi-agency Risk Assessment Conference

**N**

NCPE                  National Centre for Policing Excellence

NCRS                  National Crime Recording Standard

NIM                    National Intelligence Model

NSIR                    National Standards for Incident Recording

**P**

PA                      Police Authority

PCSO                  Police Community Support Officer

PDP                    Potentially Dangerous Person

PNC                    Police National Computer

**R**

RSO            Registered Sex Offender

**S**

SDRI            Safer Derbyshire Research and Information

SGC            Specific Grading Criteria

SMB            Strategic Management Board

SNT            Safer Neighbourhoods Team

**V**

ViSOR            Violent and Sex Offenders Register