

Appendix D

Good Practice Guide

1.1 This guide is intended to be a check list to assist police managers at all levels to improve the integrity of their organisation.

THE EFFECTS OF BEHAVIOUR ON PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

2.1 Are there action plans to eliminate activity such as arrogance, abuse of office, bullying and harassment?

2.2 Do all staff realise the importance of displaying simple good manners and treating all people with dignity and respect?

2.3 Is there a culture whereby instances of bad behaviour are challenged at once and reported specifically in staff appraisals?

PERCEPTIONS OF THE PUBLIC

3.1 Is there a positive programme to ensure all staff understand the varied social needs and expectations of different sectors of society?

3.2 Has every effort been made to maximise high visibility policing?

3.3 Are incivility complaints analysed to see what lessons should be learnt?

3.4 Are there clear guidelines to officers regarding stop and search on the street?

3.5 If so, are they clearly understood and actually followed by patrol officers?

3.6 Is an imagination and commitment to help young people reflected more widely in officers' day-to-day contact with them?

3.7 Is every effort made to raise the status of community beat officers?

3.8 Do requests to use community beat officers for other work, thereby removing them from their beat, have to be approved by their senior officer?

3.9 Have the recommendations on community policing contained in the recent HMIC thematic inspection report *Winning the Race (Revisited) - Policing Plural Communities* been implemented?

3.10 Have all staff undergone training in community and race relations?

3.11 Have links been developed with gay and lesbian groups?

3.12 Are victims of crime regularly updated about the progress of their case?

3.13 Are there formal close links with local victim support volunteers and are they welcome in police stations?

3.14 Is there an open and professional relationship with the media?

INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF OFFENDERS

4.1 Has action been taken to ensure there is not an unhealthy performance culture around probationer training, whereby they are put under pressure to soft target ‘the public’ in order to ‘gain their spurs’?

4.2 Have all unethical crime recording practices been eradicated?

4.3 Are high volume crimes being unnecessarily pursued at the expense of proper investigation of more serious crime?

4.4 Are senior detectives assisting local crime managers and their divisional commanders by monitoring the quality of crime recording and investigation?

4.5 Is there a system for the chief officer team to be advised by the head of the CID of any inconsistencies or bad practice in crime recording and investigation, and particularly major crime investigation?

4.6 Are all crimes in all locations, reported by a member of the public, properly recorded and reflected in the overall crime figures?

4.7 Is the standard applied for crimes detected upon the authorisation of a senior police officer only attributed to a particular perpetrator whose involvement is provable by evidence which, if given in court, would be likely to result in a conviction, commonly including at least an unprompted admission containing accurate features of the crime that only the perpetrator would have known?

4.8 Whilst embracing the concept of best value, is the ‘service’ side of policing, for example child protection and community and schools liaison work, still afforded a high priority?

4.9 Are chief officers continuing to expose areas within the criminal justice system which investigating officers and victims feel should be improved?

4.10 Are chief officers doing all they can to ensure their staff are aware of the leadership being given, and the steps being taken to support them in their work?

4.11 Are those officers who recruit and handle informants reassured they will be fully supported and valued in their difficult work?

4.12 Is an adequate risk assessment carried out to ensure major criminals are not recruiting themselves as informants to obtain an ‘insurance policy’ for when they are arrested?

- 4.13** Is regard given to the experience of the handler in cases where major criminals are informants to ensure they do not find themselves 'out of their depth'?
- 4.14** Do the same methods of authorisation and auditing as would be applied to a cash payment also apply to any benefits received by an informant?
- 4.15** Is there clarity about when a person giving information comes within the definition of being an 'informant' and therefore should be registered?
- 4.16** Is there a 'confidential source' system in place?
- 4.17** If so, is this carefully controlled to ensure it is not used as a 'backdoor' method of avoiding stringent control systems?
- 4.18** Are informant controllers restricted to no more than 25 active informants?
- 4.19** Is there a system for ensuring every informant has been personally seen by the controller and his or her identity verified, as well as a first hand assessment by the controller of the informant's value?
- 4.20** Is the value/activity of each informant regularly reviewed to keep the number of unproductive informants to a minimum?
- 4.21** Are controllers and handlers supported by an IT system such as PIMS?
- 4.22** Is there a streamlined system to expedite payments and are there ways of paying an informant other than by using cash?
- 4.23** Is there a system for ensuring the informant actually signed the receipt for payment, such as a space for an impression of a rolled forefinger to be obtained at the time of payment?
- 4.24** Is National Police Training devising, as a matter of urgency, courses for informant handlers and controllers based upon the new manual of guidance?
- 4.25** Is there a system for the use of overseers, or officers independent of an investigation or department to which the informant relates, randomly to inspect the integrity of the use of informants?
- 4.26** Has the introduction of a dedicated source unit to handle informants been considered?
- 4.27** Is there a tenure policy whereby an informant can only be handled by the same individual for a maximum period?
- 4.28** Is there enough representation at the highest levels of the Police Service of officers who are experienced in major crime investigation?

4.29 Has full use been made of training and succession planning to ensure there is at all times a pool of senior investigators (SIOs) who are of proven integrity and well trained and experienced in major crime investigation?

4.30 Are crime scene managers encouraged to challenge decisions by SIOs which could lead to a lack of integrity, and through the scientific support manager have they, in exceptional circumstances, a direct operational reporting line to a chief officer?

4.31 Have the new codes of practice and accompanying manuals of guidance on covert policing techniques been adopted?

4.32 Is there a mechanism to become aware of the assessment of judges, magistrates and crown prosecutors about the general level of integrity of the officers and the quality of evidence they give?

4.33 Do supervisory officers occasionally monitor the quality and integrity of the evidence given by their officers in court?

PERSONNEL AND TRAINING

5.1 Have ways to improve initial recruitment vetting and refereeing procedures been examined?

5.2 Does integrity feature as a major theme in the training of tutor constables?

5.3 Does the subject of integrity stand in its own right within training and is it discussed and taught, particularly at certain key stages such as new sergeant, CID foundation, and custody officer training?

5.4 Is there a system of continuous professional development to allow much more regular intervention and support for officers, particularly those with 15 to 30 years' service?

5.5 Is the value of trainers recognised as agents of change?

5.6 Is there a tenure policy for trainers to ensure they are regularly exposed to operational policing?

5.7 Is the traditional checking of previous convictions at the recruiting stage extended to any occasion when the applicant was proceeded against or even investigated?

5.8 Is there a system of financial and lifestyle vetting of an applicant, together with their spouse or partner?

5.9 Has consideration been given to the reintroduction of home visits and drugs testing at initial application?

5.10 Is there a proper check on the veracity of referees and educational qualifications, including production of the actual certificates?

- 5.11** Has an extra layer of vetting been considered similar to the Kent model for all staff in high risk posts?
- 5.12** Do the risk factors apply equally to civilian support staff and special constables, and is guidance training and wider support available to them?
- 5.13** Are police officers and support staff trained together?
- 5.14** Has a structured objective annual staff appraisal, supported by agreed job profiles and core competencies, been developed?
- 5.15** Can supervisors be confident that in practising firm management they will be supported by senior colleagues further up the command line?
- 5.16** Is there a regular turnover of officers in high risk posts, such as drug squad, crime squad, etc?
- 5.17** Is there a fair and transparent selection procedure for these posts?
- 5.18** Do supervisors understand, and are they confident in handling, a grievance?
- 5.19** Does the chief officer, personally and regularly, dip sample the confidence his or her service deliverers have in the grievance procedure?

THE INTEGRITY OF INFORMATION

- 6.1** Is there a *presumption* the security of information held within the force is under attack?
- 6.2** Is the chief officer moving the force towards a greater acceptance of a 'need to know' culture?
- 6.3** Is there a 'clear desk' policy, and if so, have officers been provided with convenient secure storage?
- 6.4** Can a screen print on the force intelligence system be obtained without it being recorded in the audit trail?
- 6.5** Is there automatic timeout locking on all workstations?
- 6.6** Are integrity checks and data auditing carried out on a regular basis, and if so have enough staff been provided for this function?
- 6.7** Is maximum use made of technology to protect information?
- 6.8** Is the Police Information Technology Organisation regularly updating forces about which state of the art systems are available for the protection of information?

6.9 Has a chief officer been given the role of Force Director of Intelligence?

6.10 Is there an awareness of who else has access to intelligence databases, for example private maintenance companies?

6.11 Has a culture been created whereby the unauthorised leakage of information to the press is considered to be corrupt practice and immediately challenged?

GIFTS, GRATUITIES AND DISCOUNTS

7.1 Are staff aware exactly what is acceptable in terms of gifts, gratuities and discounts?

7.2 Does the force audit carefully what group discounts are currently being offered?

7.3 If group discounts are offered, has it been explained to staff the difference between such schemes and private, less transparent, personal arrangements?

7.4 Is the force aware of any nightclubs that arrange 'emergency services only' nights?

7.5 If staff are attending such events, has any effect on integrity or the potential for compromising local operational officers been considered?

7.6 Does the force have any arrangements with public transport organisations which allow their staff free travel?

7.7 If so, have the implications for public confidence and staff integrity been taken into account?

7.8 Has the ACPO published guidelines in respect of gifts and gratuities?

THE ADMINISTRATION OF FINANCE

8.1 Have individuals been instructed on what their responsibilities are and the role they perform in checking documents such as overtime and expenses claim forms?

8.2 Does the finance department have good systems to guard against deception, fraud and theft?

8.3 Are the regulations concerning claims being interpreted in the same way by all staff?

8.4 Is the Police Service together with the Home Office undertaking a review of the regulations concerning expenses and allowances?

8.5 Are support staff responsible for processing claims encouraged to challenge those with which they are not comfortable?

8.6 Are they provided with specimen signature lists of those supervisors and managers who can authorise expense claims?

8.7 If the force makes use of sponsorship, has consideration been given to any impact on public perception and the integrity of their staff?

MONITORING AND MAINTAINING INTEGRITY

9.1 Is there a professional standards committee, chaired by a chief officer, with members drawn from a wide range of disciplines?

9.2 Do welfare officers and psychologists have a forum within which they can contribute to the maintenance of integrity?

9.3 Are complaint and civil actions data effectively used as a management tool?

9.4 Is the complaints and discipline department fully used to maintain integrity and high standards?

9.5 Is there a system, such as a complaints and discipline newsletter, by which staff can be made aware of common causes of complaint and advised how they can be avoided?

9.6 Is it normal practice to publish in Force Weekly Orders the fact that an officer has been dismissed or disciplined and to detail the brief circumstances of the case?

9.7 Does the force have any form of confidential reporting line?

9.8 Are internal witnesses who report wrongdoing by colleagues fully supported, and if so are staff aware of the support mechanisms?

9.9 Is there a genuine desire by the chief officers to find out what is really going on in their force?

9.10 Does a productive relationship exist between senior management and the staff associations?

9.11 Is there a proactive team within the force for the investigation of corruption and/or the maintenance of integrity?

9.12 If so, does the proactive team have the chief officer's full and committed support?

9.13 Is there, within the force, a central repository for suspicions about corrupt officers or those who may lack integrity?

9.14 Has action been taken to ensure an air of complacency does not prevail, in terms of the potential for corruption to flourish?

9.15 If integrity testing or proactive work to maintain integrity is employed, is it doing so sensitively and carefully to ensure morale amongst honest staff is not lowered?

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

10.1 Is the Police Service taking steps to develop a more active leadership style, perhaps best described as ‘intrusive supervision’, at all levels?

10.2 Do chief officers ensure any statements by them about ‘firm leadership’ are translated into support for their middle managers?

10.3 Is there an over-reliance on officers ‘acting up’?

10.4 Are acting supervisors formally selected and given some form of training, including the recognition of failings in integrity and what to do about it?

10.5 Have selection criteria for promotion been re-examined to ensure greater emphasis is given to the ability to demonstrate robust leadership and the motivation to challenge unprofessional behaviour?

10.6 Does the chief officer have checking mechanisms to ensure the force ethical vision is delivered throughout the organisation?

10.7 Are ethical vision statements regularly updated and actively re-enforced?

10.8 Has the Home Office re-examined the wording of the Declaration of Attestation as set out in Schedule 4 of the Police Act 1996?

10.9 Do chief officers ensure they are visible and accessible, such as through regular visits to the workplace?

10.10 Has the introduction of a minimum period for a posting for senior officers been considered?

10.11 Does the chief officer team recognise the importance of clearly setting the standards and being seen to practice what they preach?

THE SUPPORT OF POLICE AUTHORITIES AND HMIC

11.1 Are police authorities provided with the means and information to become aware of the state of health of their force, including the ability to view all complaints files?

11.2 Is there a professional and mutually respectful partnership between the police authority and the chief constable?

11.3 Do Her Majesty’s Inspectors increasingly monitor integrity and the systems for maintaining it?

11.4 Have forces ensured their staff are continually aware that, if they consider a grievance or complaint is not being progressed correctly, they can contact their regional HMI direct?

References

Audit Commission Police Paper No 12, (1993) *Helping with Enquiries : Tackling Crime Effectively* London: HMSO

Feldberg, M (1985) 'Gratuities, Corruption and the Democratic Ethos of Policing: the Case of the Free Cup of Coffee' in F A Elliston and M Feldberg (eds) *Moral Issues in Policework* (Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld).

HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, (1997) *Policing with Intelligence* London: Home Office

HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, (1998) *Thematic Inspection Report on Child Protection* London: Home Office

HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, (1999) *Winning The Race-Revisited, Policing Plural Communities* London: Home Office

Johnston, L (1992) *The Rebirth of Private Policing* London: Routledge.

Jones, T and Newburn, T (1998) *Private Security and Public Policing*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kleinig, J (1996) *The Ethics of Policing*, Cambridge University Press

Newburn, T (1999) *Understanding and Preventing Police Corruption: Lessons from the Literature*. Police Research Series. (London: Home Office)

Nolan, Lord (1995) *First Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life*. London: HMSO

Sherman, LW (1985) *Becoming Bent: Moral Careers of Corrupt Policemen*, In F.A. Elliston and M Feldberg (eds) *Moral Issues in Police Work*, Towota, New Jersey: Rowan and Allanheld