

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary



Inspection of Surrey Police

Professional Standards

JANUARY 2006

ISBN 1-84473-836-1

CONTENTS

A – INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

1. Introduction
2. Inspection scope
3. Methodology
4. Baseline grading

B – FORCE REPORT

1. Force Overview and Context
2. Findings
 - **Intelligence** - *what a force knows about the health of professional standards*
 - **Prevention** - *how the force tries to improve and prevent the abuse of standards*
 - **Enforcement** - *its effectiveness in dealing with emerging problems*
 - **Capacity and Capability** – *having the resources and skills to address reactive and proactive challenges (including timely and proportionate response to lapses in professional standards)*

C – GLOSSARY

INSPECTION OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS 2005

A - INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

1. Introduction

'Professional standards' within the policing context has evolved significantly in recent years, following the HMIC thematic 'Police Integrity' (1999), the establishment of an ACPO Presidential Taskforce to tackle corruption and the introduction of the ACPO Professional Standards Committee. Since 2000, virtually every force in England and Wales has significantly expanded the activities of pre-existing Complaints and Discipline Departments to include an element addressing anti-corruption, including covert investigation. These larger units are generically known as Professional Standards Departments (PSDs).

The issue of complaints holds a unique importance for HMIC in that legislation¹ creates a responsibility on Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMIs) to 'keep themselves informed' as to the handling of complaints in forces. Traditionally this has involved inspection of individual forces on a rolling programme. The advent of HMIC's annual Baseline Assessment (from 2003/04), the establishment of the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) in 2004, and a series of public inquiries have changed the professional standards landscape significantly. In view of this, HMIC decided to carry out a simultaneous programme of inspection of professional standards in all 43 English and Welsh forces to provide a comprehensive picture of current performance and identify any issues of national importance.

2. Inspection scope

While this national programme of inspection of 'Professional Standards' has focused primarily on the operation of the PSDs, and their sub-sections, it has also examined issues of professional standards in the wider policing context, and therefore touched on other departments and areas of responsibility, for example Human Resources (HR). The core elements identified nationally for examination were:

Professional Standards Department

- The umbrella department within which all 'professional standards' activities are delivered, including the investigation of complaints and misconduct and proactive anti-corruption work.

Complaints and misconduct unit

- Responsible for reactive investigations into public complaints as well as internal conduct matters.

Proactive unit

- Responsible for the intelligence-led investigation of vulnerability to or allegations of corruption.

Intelligence cell

¹ Section 15(1) of the Police Reform Act 2002

- Responsible for:
 - Overall intelligence management
 - Analysis
 - Field Intelligence
 - Financial Investigation
 - Managing risks and grading threats

Handling of civil claims, security management and personnel vetting

- Individuals or units responsible for identifying risks to the integrity of the police service manifested within civil actions, civil claims, employment tribunals, breaches of security and infiltration of the service by inappropriate personnel.

Handling 'Direction and Control' Complaints

- Processes for handling complaints relating to:
 - operational policing policies (where there is no issue of conduct)
 - organisational decisions
 - general policing standards in the force
 - operational management decisions (where there is no issue of conduct)

Impact of unsatisfactory performance and grievance

- Relevant personnel within HR and operational departments, to establish that processes exist to identify any conduct issues or organisational lessons.

NB: The above list is not exhaustive nor does every force have each of these units or responsibilities as separate functions. The inspection sought to examine as many of the identified activities as are relevant to each force.

3. Methodology

Since 2003/04, HMIC's core methodology for assessing force performance has been Baseline Assessment (BA), which consists of a self-assessment process supported by visits to forces for validation and quality assurance. BA assesses performance annually across 27² areas of policing via a framework of questions for each area. The mainstream BA process for 2004/05 was completed during spring 2005 and the results published in October 2005.

Professional Standards is one of the BA frameworks and would normally have been included in the mainstream BA activity. With the full programme of professional standards inspections scheduled for October and November 2005, however, the assessment of this framework was deferred to await their outcome.

The programme of inspections has been designed to:

- Provide a full inspection of professional standards in all England & Wales³ forces;
- Gather evidence for Baseline Assessment reports and grading of professional standards in all forces; and
- Identify key issues, trends and good practice that may have implications for professional standards on a national basis.

The standard format for each inspection has included:

² Number of frameworks in the 2004/05 assessment

³ Also including British Transport Police and Ministry of Defence Police

- The completion of self assessment questionnaires by all forces;
- Examination of documents;
- Visits to forces with group and individual interviews;
- Consultation with key stakeholders; and
- Final reports with grade.

4. Baseline Assessment grading

HMIC applies a qualitative grading to the inspection of Professional Standards. These grades are:

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

In allocating individual force grades, HMIC assesses all the available evidence and identifies how well the force matches an agreed set of Specific Grading Criteria. To ensure fairness and transparency in the grading process, HMIC worked with key partners in the APA, IPCC, the Home Office and ACPO to develop and agree these Specific Grading Criteria for Professional Standards.

The criteria set out expectations for a “Good” force. Grades of Fair, Good and Excellent all represent acceptable performance levels but indicate the degree to which the force has met the grading criteria. An Excellent grade indicates ‘benchmark’ performance including significant implementation of good practice.

The full grading criteria are set out in HMIC’s website at:
www.inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk.

The key elements appear under four headings, namely:

- **Intelligence** - *what a force knows about the health of professional standards*
- **Prevention** - *how the force tries to improve and prevent the abuse of standards*
- **Enforcement** - *its effectiveness in dealing with emerging problems*
- **Capacity and Capability** – *having the resources and skills to address reactive and proactive challenges (including timely and proportionate response to lapses in professional standards)*

The remainder of this report is set out under these headings, for ease of reference to the evidence presented.

B – FORCE REPORT

1. Force Overview and Context

Surrey Police serves a resident population of 1,080,644 living in 442,265 homes and covers some 647 square miles. The Force prides itself on having one of the lowest overall crime rates in England and Wales. The Chief Constable holds the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) portfolio lead for workforce modernisation, and the National Reassurance Project team is based at Force headquarters. The county lies to the south of London and is a mixture of urban and rural areas that provide widely differing contexts for policing services. Broadly, the north and west of the county have a high density of urban and commercial areas, with the south and east being more rural. Territorial policing is delivered by four basic command units (BCUs), divided into eleven districts, with BCU headquarters at Staines (North Surrey), Woking (North-West Surrey), Guildford (West Surrey) and Caterham (East Surrey). The Force headquarters, Mount Browne, is just to the south of Guildford and houses amongst other things the centralised Professional Standards Department.

In recent years the force has experienced a very high level of turnover of staff and some unique recruiting challenges. Given its small size, this significant staff churn has brought with it issues including a loss of corporate experience and the need to train and supervise a new and relatively inexperienced workforce. The Force has also experienced some serious disciplinary cases, which attracted adverse publicity during 2004/05. The Chief Constable has, however, seized the opportunity proactively to address these and other lower-level disciplinary issues by setting out the Surrey Police Standard. He did this through interactive roadshows led by himself and members of his command team, which have proved an impactful and, hopefully, a positive watershed in the history of Surrey Police.

Under the workforce modernisation programme and through the mixed economy of policing, Surrey Police remains at the forefront of civilianisation, with the aim of making best use of resources. This programme has resulted in significant growth of non-sworn staff who now number almost as many as sworn police officers and provide a challenge in terms of discipline and complaints processes.

Professional Standards

The DCC holds portfolio responsibility for Professional Standards (PS), the Professional Standards Department (PSD) is led by a Detective Superintendent, Head of Department (HoD), with a Detective Chief Inspector Complaints & Misconduct (operations) and a Detective Chief Inspector Internal Investigation Unit (anti corruption / intelligence).

The department consists of 35 staff members (other than the head of department) split 28.6 % complaints, 28.6 % anti-corruption, 14.3 % vetting, 14.3% administration of complaints, 2.3% HR advisor and 11.4% legal services.

The complaints team consists of a blend of experienced police officers three of whom are investigating officers (IOs-3xDIs) and two assistant investigating officers (AIO-2xDSs) with four police staff AIOs and five administrative staff. The team reports to Chief Inspector C&M. The anti corruption team consists of seven police officers

(1xDI, 2xDS, 4xDC) with good proactive and covert criminal investigative skills. The department has its own analyst.

The anti-corruption team reports to DI PSD Intelligence. Force vetting sits within PSD (5) 3 x vetting officers, 1 x administration and a vacancy for a vetting manager. HR advisor x 1; Legal services 4 (3 x force solicitors, 1 x administration)
Data protection and information security are not part of PSD.

The Force has responded positively to departmental resource challenges both in terms of physical structures and in human resources. Considerable investment has been made in recent years in relation to both these issues and the department has also benefited from a period of stable leadership. The HoD and his senior management team have with the support of their Chief Officer Group (COG) brought the department into the mainstream of policing in Surrey and introduced smarter working practices which reflect NIM principles and workforce modernisation.

2. Findings

Intelligence - *what a force knows about the health of professional standards*

Strengths

- The Chief Officer Group (COG) meets weekly to review the business of the Force and to set strategic direction. The second part of the meeting is used to consider the ethical health of the force and to commission appropriate activity. For example, since April 2005, a review of the consultancy and procurement arrangements led by the DCC and Director of Finance has been undertaken to ensure the balance between innovation and speed and reputation and integrity.
- The National Intelligence Model (NIM) has been fully adopted within the department and the strategic and tactical assessments drive operational activity. Two-weekly meetings are held where all 'live' investigations are reviewed and a daily tasking and co-ordinating group (TCG) meeting reviews all incoming reports of complaints, misconduct and grievances for risk assessment and direction on investigation paths. These daily meetings are minuted and are chaired by the PSD head and involve DCI Operations and DCI Proactive, Force Solicitor, HR Advisor and Office Administrator. The force was able to share with the inspection team a number of successful and ongoing operations that arose from this process.
- The Force Strategic Assessment has been cited as a good practice document and there has been strong national interest with many forces having used the template for their own use. Proactive operations are assessed and prioritised according to the control strategy. The NIM is now fully embedded, driving activity within the department. NIM principles are also being applied to other elements within PSD including civil actions and complaints & misconduct.
- Surrey has conducted a risk assessment of integrity and vulnerability to corruption. Initially completed in late 2004, to the national model, it has been repeated since the April 2005 inspection programme. The Strategic Assessment, Intelligence Requirement and Control Strategy have been produced and forwarded to NCIS (see also AFIs).
- A range of PSD performance data including local resolutions (LR) data is included in the monthly Surrey Police Electronic Computerised System (SPECs) process and is broken down to division and department level. Identified trends and rises in complaints are reviewed with clear actions being tasked from this performance monitoring process. The inclusion of this information at this forum has resulted in increased local accountability and has, in particular, improved local resolutions.

- Following critical incidents there is active involvement of Surrey Police Authority (SPA) and Independent Advisory Groups (IAG) on all Gold Groups. These GOLD groups have also been used during high profile PSD investigations. Members from the SPA also regularly attend the SPECS process where performance against targets, including PSD, is assessed and risks identified.
- The analyst dedicated to anti-corruption/intelligence attends the fortnightly TCG meetings. This key individual assists NIM activity through a well managed I2 database, a secure and standalone system. All incoming intelligence is sifted against the force control strategy with NIM-based tasking and co-ordinating being applied.

AFIs

- The risk management group chaired by the DCC is a regular forum where organisational risks and opportunities for organisational learning are considered and where necessary entered onto the Force risk register. Consideration could be given to including the PSD legal advisor on this group. Her input would assist by providing informed oversight and early assessment of litigious risks to the organisation.
- There is a need to review and formalise the role of analysts currently working in support of PSD. The analysts sit within the Performance Management Unit and are tasked either directly or through the SPECS process. There would be business benefits in an analyst operating within PSD, dedicated to this specialised area of work. Getting behind the data and pro-actively looking at other organisational issues that affect trends in complaints and mis-conduct would enable better understanding and inform tactical responses.
- Surrey has completed a risk assessment of integrity and vulnerability to corruption in compliance with ACPO guidelines. The current processes have left some gaps in consultation. One notable gap is around the recognised threat of information leakage from the organisation where the force security manager was not engaged in the process. Consideration should be given to inclusion of all interested parties in future assessments.
- The Force should implement a method of gauging external and internal customer satisfaction around all areas of performance within PSD. Staff interviewed believed surveys around customer satisfaction had the potential to generate further organisational complaints if not handled sensitively.

Recommendation 1

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the Force introduces a method of gauging customer satisfaction around all aspects of PSD work both internal and external. This recommendation should be implemented within six months following consultation with relevant staff support groups, external agencies and the IAG.

- Surrey Police currently makes good use of agencies such as language line when dealing with non-English speaking persons and has utilised the services of its IAG on occasions. There is scope, however, to increase accessibility to the organisation through media such as the Force web-site and leaflets which could be made available in a variety of languages. Other forces in the region have demonstrated a wide range of information in many languages.

Prevention - *how the force tries to improve and prevent the abuse of standards*

Strengths

- The Chief Constable and his command team have clearly demonstrated active leadership during several recent high profile criminal cases involving serving members of staff. The DCC cited the main strength of the Force being its clear leadership and proactivity in relation to the Surrey Police Standards, an initiative which was personally led by the Chief Constable. This has been developed through the Leadership Forum consisting of the top 100 senior managers within the Force.
- There is a comprehensive policy on the use of police IT, telephony, operational equipment, uniform and identification passes. It has been widely circulated and on appointment each member of staff is given a personal copy and asked to sign against each entry as listed. This policy not only informs individuals of their responsibilities and restrictions but also provides an auditable record in case of subsequent breach.
- The Force has invested in a confidential reporting line with an external provider, which is now well established with an increased uptake in staff being reported. There is scope, however, for improved monitoring and reporting of usage rates to interested parties such as the SPA.
- At the conclusion of an investigation the IO completes a proforma identifying potential organisational learning which is attached to the file. The detail within this form is forwarded to the Force Improvement Inspectorate (FII) for progression (see also AFIs).
- The PSD has a good relationship with the Central Authorities Bureau who authorise all covert surveillance authority applications. This independence is valued and the integrity of the systems and people in place are trusted. The department also has access to the Personnel Information Management System (PIMS). The Office of the Surveillance Commissioner has reviewed these systems and structures and commented favourably on them.
- A group known as Reactive and Diverse Association Representatives (RADAR) has recently been launched within Surrey. The group consists of members from all support groups and staff associations. First impressions indicate this will be an impactful and influencing group addressing and progressing race, diversity and employment issues. Benefits may be gained from frequent engagement by

the PSD with this group in terms of active consultation, third party reporting and promoting trust and confidence.

AFIs

- Between 40-50% of all work referred to the anti-corruption department stems from the misuse of IT systems. There is a need to balance user operability and ease of access with the ever-pressing need for controlled access to systems. Recent experience has indicated vulnerability in this regard and there are a number of systems in use where it is impossible to either audit those who have accessed information or where there are no effective levels of security access. Work is in hand to address these security gaps but this remains work in progress.

Recommendation 2

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the Force in consultation with the security manager undertakes a review of the threat exposed in their own strategic assessment in terms of information leakage and identifies a robust and long term viable solution to accurately monitor the use of vulnerable IT systems. This review should be carried out immediately.

- Surrey Women's Officers Association (SWOA) have reported continuing concerns around sexual discriminatory behaviour in the workplace amounting to misconduct. Whilst attempts to validate these concerns have proved inconclusive there are indicators that this remains a problem and there is a sincere determination from the COG to identify and tackle inappropriate attitudes and behaviours at all levels.
- There is evidence of a high level of input into training from the PSD across most levels of the organisation but there is no direct training input to intakes of police community support or special constables (SCs) regarding professional standards. Several SCs have recently been referred to PSD and this may be an area of training worthy of review.
- The Force does not proactively identify areas where potential complaints in pre-planned major operations may be forthcoming. Examples of where this has happened are available but they are limited and depend on personalities. There is scope to formalise these arrangements.
- The Performance Management Unit has recently introduced a comprehensive diversity scorecard. Still in its early stages of development there is recognition of the scope for increased proactivity in the monitoring of disproportionality particularly around race and gender discrimination in a range of customer contacts, including complaints.
- The organisational learning spreadsheet owned by FII contains a number of entries from the PSD. However many have not been allocated 'owners' and many of the actions appear not to have been progressed.

Recommendation 3

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the Force prioritises the entries on the organisational learning database with clear lines of accountability. Early adoption of such learning across the organisation could potentially reduce complaints and improve efficiency and effectiveness. This recommendation is to the head of FII and should be implemented within 3 months.

- It is recognised at all levels within the organisation, including PSD, that greater marketing and publication of case results, lessons learnt and sanctions should be made available within the organisation.

Recommendation 4

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the force develop a communications and marketing strategy for PSD to highlight areas of organisational learning including sanctions. Information should, where appropriate, be shared with support groups such as RADAR, SWOA and IAG to raise awareness of what constitutes unacceptable behaviour and how it is being positively addressed within the organisation.

Enforcement - *its effectiveness in dealing with emerging problems*

Strengths

- There are frequent proactive meetings between the DCC, department head and IPCC Commissioner. The IPCC have reported that the Force are open to feedback and willing to learn and operates in a spirit of co-operation with external agencies. There have been significant benefits from this open relationship in dealing with recent high profile cases.
- Surrey Police Authority (SPA) maintains an active oversight of complaints including trends and data relating to specific incidents. They report a good relationship with the DCC, department head and IPCC Commissioner. SPA has adopted the APA good practice guide in complaints and receives a quarterly report on emerging issues. This scrutiny role by the Professional Standards Panel, who have regular and unfettered access to files, has permitted greater focus on emerging issues such as control and restraint complaints and improved communications with complainants in general.
- Early assessments of all complaints by the Head of Complaints and Misconduct ensures investigations are proportionate, timely and focused. An investigating officer (IO) on allocation of each complaint completes a comprehensive investigation plan. Weekly, all 'live' cases are reviewed and investigation plans updated in light of additional intelligence. Investigations are monitored and tracked for their timeliness on a spreadsheet with prioritisation given to investigations nearing the 120-day target. Streamlined versions of these

spreadsheets are shared with BCU commanders, on a weekly basis, who are then able to update staff subject of investigation of the progress.

- On completion of the investigation and before a hearing process is commenced, in the cases of all gross misconduct there is a review by a group consisting of the DCI Operations, the Investigating Officer (IO), HR advisor and Force Solicitor. This group evaluates the evidence and recommends whether a case has been made out. The process gives a clear corporate approach to management and sanction (see also AFIs).
- Following a significant and complex disciplinary inquiry Surrey Police engaged the services of the Metropolitan Police Service's internal consultancy group to debrief all those involved in the process. This process ensured strict confidentiality for individuals, allowed them to discuss the emotional issues and then took them forward into problem solving and the identification of learning outcomes. This third party confidential service has been widely acclaimed and is being considered for future debriefs, possibly as a permanent fixture.
- Each IO will on the conclusion of an investigation complete an MG5 form, which covers five predetermined headings: background, circumstances, investigation, conclusion and recommendations. All MG5s are personally reviewed by the Head of Complaints and a copy of the MG5 is sent to the complainant as part of the final outcome/result. The adoption of this method of finalisation has been well received, resulting in fewer appeals against investigations.
- An example of proactive organisational learning stemmed from a recommendation from within the anti-corruption department. As a result internal structural changes were immediately made within the Dedicated Source Unit (DSU). Whilst this change came mid-term in an investigation, its urgency was recognised and deemed necessary to protect Force assets.
- The inclusion of complaints and discipline data in the SPECS meeting, where accountability is assured, has reinforced the ownership of professional standards by BCU Commanders. This is making a positive impact on complaints handling generally and has improved the rate of local resolutions, currently running at about 50% of all complaints received.

AFIs

- All staff associations reported a good relationship with the PSD and cited regular updates on persons suspended. However, meetings between them and the Head of PSD are on an ad-hoc basis, are informal and are not minuted. One method to resolve this might be to offer staff associations a seat at the two weekly TCG where part of the meeting is open and the second part reserved for confidential and covert matters.

Recommendation 5

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the PSD Head should hold regular and minuted meetings with the staff associations, with an agreed agenda thereby formalising this process and promoting an open flow of communication where possible. This could be achieved by including staff associations in bi-weekly TCG meetings where they might be present during non-confidential or non-sensitive discussions. This recommendation should be addressed within three months.

- Local Discipline Registers (LDR) have recently been introduced supported by a policy that clearly sets out the rationale behind their introduction. The LDR only applies to sworn staff but the Force is considering extending this to encompass all employees. This initiative has the potential to be a useful means of formalising the ad-hoc arrangements which were in place to handle low level discipline and increase organisational memory. At the time of inspection, however, no formal training had been delivered and the registers had not been issued to other specialist departments. This initiative, which is in its early stages, would be enhanced by effective communications and marketing to the workforce.
- HMIC commends the Force for being one of the first to introduce Safecall, an external independent, confidential reporting line for Surrey Police employees in June 2005. To date there has been a lack of effective monitoring to identify take-up of the facility and any early outcomes. In fact, since its inception there have been 10 calls all of which the anti-corruption department has handled. Whilst the Force is pleased with this initial response it was reported that at least half of these calls refer to internal management issues which should have been resolved locally. There may be an opportunity to market this facility more effectively and ensure staff understand it is not a replacement for robust local management.
- There is an appetite within the PSD to develop the process mentioned in strengths in relation to gross misconduct to include all misconduct investigations, which are currently left to BCU/dept to resolve. If implemented this process would develop a corporate approach to the management of discipline and misconduct across the entire organisation. There might also be scope for greater involvement by staff associations to ensure transparency and engagement.
- Some minor tensions were evident between the PSD and the HR department, which have resulted in some breakdowns in communication. Attempts are being made to resolve this problem by regular scheduled meetings between the Director of HR and the Head of PSD. There are also potential gaps between the HR department and the Force Solicitor who specialises in management of grievance and civil litigation, but who is based within the PSD.
- Some delays are apparent in the submission of level 2 grievances to PSD. The blockage appears to be within the HR department, which is the route by which they come to the PSD. This is adversely affecting organisational ability to

progress some cases and may be leaving the organisation open to vulnerability around timeliness issues in relation to employment law.

Recommendation 6

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends that the Force should identify and eliminate the communication gaps between PSD and HR department.

- JOPI Annex A has been superseded by the disclosure manual which makes clear that JOPI applies equally to police and support staff. This has been the position for some time (April 2005) but the Force has been slow to action it. The current policy places the onus on the employee to record any relevant material in a sealed envelope on the file when it comes to the full file stage of the process. There is no process to check on whether this has been done or whether the employee has disclosed all he/she needs to.

Recommendation 7

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the Force should identify the training/awareness implications for all staff regarding the disclosure manual, which should be progressed as soon as possible. The Force should also consider adopting an IT based solution found in other forces that highlights staff to whom this applies.

- Concerns remain with Unison around the apparent disparity between punishments on findings of guilt between sworn and unsworn staff. These issues are largely historic in nature and the chief officer team has recently interceded to ensure fairness in terms of sanctions. At the time of inspection, however, it was reported that several requests for data around outcomes and sanctions had been made but had not been supplied. There is an opportunity to engender increased trust in processes and sanctions by affording staff associations increased access to such data. Material made available in a sanitised format would promote greater trust and transparency in the current misconduct procedure generally and perhaps prevent further incidents by enhancing organisational learning.

Capacity and Capability – *(Having the resources and skills available to address the reactive and proactive challenge and providing a timely and proportionate response to lapses in professional standards)*

Strengths

- The DCC has weekly meetings with the head of PSD to review all elements of professional standards. He also chairs the quarterly Force Diversity Board programme and the bi-monthly Force Platinum Group which reviews the identified and emerging risks from all Force level Gold groups. He and the Chief Constable have a recent and credible background in professional standards and anti-corruption and have made it an organisational priority that professional standards and integrity are key themes throughout the organisation. The DCC has recently hosted a regional professional standards event with department heads and regional analysts.

- Several of the most recent policies implemented by PSD have been submitted through the Diversity Directorate for oversight and advice in line with CRE recommendations. Examples were given where support with investigations in the form of IAG or internal support group members had been sought and provided, helping with the final outcome and increasing community confidence.
- Following the recommendations from the CRE the department has conducted bespoke training for PSD staff in respect of race and diversity. The Force is scoping the training of other forces in relation to the Race Relations (Amendment) Act, an area of training which still needs to be delivered within Surrey.

AFIs

- The Force Security Manager is currently head of a very small department with a wide range of responsibilities. It is recognised there is scope for greater resilience within the department with clear lines of communication/accountability between itself and PSD. The department has, over the years, been moved between portfolio owners and currently sits apart from PSD with direct line accountability to the DCC. This has resulted in some gaps emerging with some key staff within PSD being unaware of the role and function of the department. Consideration should be given to improving the structures and processes which link the functions of PSD and security to afford greater levels of support which in turn might assist tasking and co-ordination of activity.
- The Force has reacted positively to national guidance in a bid to ensure effective oversight and monitoring of direction and control (D&C) complaints. At the time of assessment the SPA maintained oversight of all D&C complaints; recorded onto their own access database prior to allocation to BCUs for resolution. D&C complaints were recorded by staff in PSD together with any updates from BCUs but there was a perception within the department that the process and organisational learning outcomes were owned by the Police Authority. HMIC welcomes the PA oversight and acknowledges the process is still evolving but believes the ownership should firmly rest within the operational policing environment.

Recommendation 8

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the Force should review its policy in relation to the recording, monitoring and organisational learning opportunities from direction and control complaints and whilst maintaining Police Authority engagement should ensure that these processes remain robust and effective but with police oversight and monitoring.

- In 2004 the Head of PSD arranged training for staff involved with discipline panels. This was not widely attended and further training is planned. To complement this it has been suggested that beneficial training would be in the form of a staged tribunal enabling a degree of role-playing and open discussion.

Other forces have progressed this style of training either individually or on a regional basis and an interim alternative might be for newly promoted superintendents to shadow existing panel members during hearings as part of their development.

- The Force has addressed previous shortcomings in relation to training and skills for proactive staff. In common with others inspected, however, there are no training courses for new staff to the professional standards department. At the time of assessment some had yet to complete the PEACE interview skills training programme and none were scheduled to complete the PIP accreditation scheme. Whilst most believed that the image and professionalisation of the department over the last few years had improved training, is an area which should receive continuous management emphasis and support.
- There is disparity between the timeliness targets in cases involving police officers and police staff. Currently the time allowed to process gross misconduct matters is 15 days, which puts unnecessary pressure on all parties concerned. ACAS guidelines suggest no fixed period but that investigations should be completed in a 'reasonable' time. There is broad agreement that the 15-day target should be extended and the Force should ensure that where possible there is parity between police officer and police staff discipline processes as recommended by the Morris enquiry.
- Before the Force can be said to be fully NIM compliant there should be improved segregation between the proactive officers and the intelligence cell. Whilst the integrity of all staff concerned is not in question, the current shared accommodation, in a modernised police house on the headquarters site is not appropriate demarcation in pure NIM terms.
- The Force solicitors work within the PSD 'secure corridor' environment and with the exception of the solicitor who specialises in HR, employment law and gross misconduct matters could be sited outwith the department. Staff associations see the sterile corridor syndrome as being a barrier to communication and there may be scope for the provision of some form of reception waiting area, out of public view.
- There are few formal support arrangements within the organisation for the first point of contact or support officers involved with staff under suspension. There is little information or guidance on the appropriate level of contact with a member of staff who has been suspended. A policy regarding contacting and 'managing/supporting' employees should be agreed.

Recommendation 9

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary recommends the Force should consult with support groups and staff associations to formulate recommendations for appropriate levels of contact with suspended staff and complainants, which should be published. Recognised support mechanisms for first contact officers and also the victim or reporting persons should be established.

- The Force has identified a need to apply the lessons learned following tragic experiences elsewhere where lives have been lost involving staff who are either under suspension or were at significant risk for other reasons. A networked group should be established including representatives from staff associations, PSD, welfare, HR and COG to identify, monitor and support the welfare needs of staff deemed at risk to themselves or to others.

¹¹ Section 15(1) of the Police Reform Act 2002

¹² Number of frameworks in the 2004/05 assessment

¹³ Also including British Transport Police

Glossary

ACAS	advisory conciliation and arbitration service
ACC	assistant chief constable
ACCAG	ACPO Counter-Corruption Advisory Group
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
ACPO PSC	ACPO Professional Standards Committee
AIO	assisting investigating officer
APA	Association of Police Authorities
BA	baseline assessment
BCU	basic command unit
BME	black and minority ethnic
Centurion	electronic database
CHIS	covert human intelligence source
CID	criminal investigation department
COG	chief officer group
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
CRE	Commission for Racial Equality
DCI	detective chief inspector
DCC	deputy chief constable
DI	detective inspector
DS	detective sergeant
DSU	dedicated source unit
ESU	ethical standards unit
FII	force improvement inspectorate
FTE	full-time equivalent
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspector
HMIC	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
HoD	head of department
HQ	headquarters
HR	human resources
I2	analytical software
IAG	independent advisory group – a body advising a force or BCU on race and diversity issues
IiP	Investors in People
IO	investigating officer
IPCC	Independent Police Complaints Commission
JOPI	Joint operational procedure instructions
LDR	local discipline register
LR	Local resolution
MG5	national form used to out the case summary in a prosecution file
MMR	Monthly management review
MSF	most similar forces – a way of grouping forces to which each police force can be compared that has similar social and demographic characteristics
NCDG	National Complaints and Discipline Group
NCIS	National Criminal Intelligence Service
NIM	National Intelligence Model

PA	police authority
PCSO	police community support officer
PDR	performance development review
PEACE	investigative interviewing training (prepare and plan, engage, account, challenge and explain)
PIMS	personnel information management system
PIP	professionalising investigative programme
PNC	Police National Computer
PPAF	Police Performance Assessment Framework
PS	professional standards
PSD	professional standards department
RADAR	reactive and diverse association representatives
RDS	Research, Development and Statistics
RES	race equality scheme
RIPA	Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act, 2000
QA	quality assurance
SGC	specific grading criteria
SLA	service level agreement
SPA	Surrey Police Authority
SPI(s)	statutory performance indicators (SPIs) are used to monitor key aspects of police performance and form a critical component of performance assessments. SPIs are set each year following consultation with partners in line with powers under the Local Government Act 1999. SPIs are also known as 'best value performance indicators'
SPECS	Surrey Police electronic computerised system
SPOC	single point of contact
TCG	tasking and co-ordination group
UPP	unsatisfactory performance procedure