

## **HMIC's Programme for Regular Force Inspections**

### **Response from the Office of the Durham Police and Crime Commissioner**

#### **Q1. What do you think of the proposed approach?**

The approach must recognise that locally elected PCCs have a legitimate reason for agreeing different approaches with their chief constables. Elected PCCs set the strategic direction in their force area and hold chief constables to account. Inspections must recognise there is not one-size-fits all and different approaches are legitimate.

#### **Q2. Are there any other aspects of police work you would like to see covered by PEEL inspections? If so, what are these?**

Delivery of PCC priorities.

#### **Q3. Do you agree with the proposal to use four categories for making judgements? If not, how could it be improved?**

Yes. But disagree strongly with HMI discretion to place forces that receive "Requires Improvement" under review (paragraph 38). This could lead to inconsistent outcomes from inspections resulting in Requires Improvement. All forces receiving Requires Improvement should have the opportunity to undertake that improvement without formal review, which should be reserved for Inadequate forces.

Forces must be given the opportunity to carry out factual accuracy checks prior to the final judgment being made.

#### **Q4. Do you agree with the proposed approach to those forces that receive a judgement of inadequate? How could it be improved?**

Much earlier engagement with the relevant PCC.

#### **Q5. Is there anything else that we should include in our recommendations to ensure that they lead to improvement?**

Recommendations should acknowledge the financial position of Forces, and the strategic direction set by the PCC.

#### **Q6. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to inspecting partnership and collaboration arrangements?**

No comments

#### **Q7. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to gathering evidence?**

Evidence gathering should create as small a burden on forces as possible, yet be sufficient to enable a fair judgment. HMIC should consult forces and PCCs on the "system that minimises the number of requests for data", referred to in paragraph 48.

#### **Q8. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to gathering information from victims?**

No comments.

**Q9. What else should we consider doing to make the PEEL assessments as fair as they can be?**

Forces should be able to comment in advance of report finalisation and publication and must be given the opportunity to provide context behind statistics.

**Q10. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to reporting to the public?**

There should not be a report summarising deficiencies across all forces unless it also summarises strengths across all forces. To do otherwise would mean HMIC is presenting an unjustifiably unbalanced view to the public.

Thanks you for the opportunity to comment.

**Alan Reiss**

Chief of Staff

Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, Durham

Completed on behalf of Ron Hogg, PCC

12<sup>th</sup> September 2014