



THE CHIEF CONSTABLE OF CLEVELAND

Performance and Capability Management

Internal audit report 13.23/24

FINAL

21 June 2024

This report is solely for the use of the persons to whom it is addressed. To the fullest extent permitted by law, RSM UK Risk Assurance Services LLP will accept no responsibility or liability in respect of this report to any other party.

THE POWER OF BEING UNDERSTOOD
AUDIT | TAX | CONSULTING



1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Why we completed this audit and background

We have conducted a review of Performance and Capability Management at the Force as part of the 2023/24 internal audit plan. As part of our review, we have considered how the Force manages its performance and capability management processes for officers, ensuring adherence to the College of Policing guidance.

The Force maintains a Values and Behaviour Framework, which reflects the College of Policing's Competency and Values Framework; the Framework is highlighted to all officers as part of their induction process. There is an Unsatisfactory Performance Procedure (UPP) for Police Officers (based on 2020 Regulations), outlining the processes to be followed in instances that officer performance does not meet required standards. Our review has focused on police officers only.

The Force has established a Professional Development Review (PDR) process and uses Headlight as their e-PDR system to record officer objectives and end of year performance ratings. The College of Policing outlines the central purpose of PDRs as being to facilitate regular, open and honest conversations between officers and line managers, allowing officers to develop self-awareness, aid with career development, identify talent, setting objectives and helping with promotions.

Conclusion

Through our review we have identified weaknesses in the overall control framework from officer understanding of the PDR process, through to the completion of the SMART objectives, mid-year and end of year reviews between officers and line management. We also identified there is currently no review of PDR outcomes between line management and the People Team to support fair and transparent performance, development and succession planning. There is also no clear link between the PDR process and capabilities management, as incidents of unsatisfactory performance are only escalated to the Employee Relations Team when critical issues are identified.

We acknowledge the performance excellence process is currently being further embedded to include a talent grid, and performance and potential calibration, between line managers, People and Development and leadership led talent boards. As a result of our review, we have agreed **eight medium** priority management actions.

Internal audit opinion:

Taking account of the issues identified, the Chief Constable of Cleveland can take **partial assurance** that the controls upon which the organisation relies to manage this area are suitably designed, consistently applied or effective.

Action is needed to strengthen the control framework to manage the identified area.



Key findings

We identified the following exceptions resulting in eight medium priority management actions being agreed:



The Learning and Development Team nor the HR Team currently hold records of pre-induction completion for new officers joining the Force. We attempted to acquire evidence to support the completion of pre-induction for 10 new officers by obtaining signed conditions of service and fitness declarations, which are collated at the pre-induction sessions. Four new starters were transferees, therefore not applicable. In the remaining six cases, fitness declarations were obtained for each sample and for only three samples, we obtained the conditions of service declaration.

Where pre-induction records and declarations are not retained on file, there is a risk that new officers may not have signed up and acknowledged the values and behaviours expected by Cleveland Police prior to starting at the Force. **(Medium)**



The Force utilises a Power BI dashboard to monitor completion of the PDR process. As part of our sample testing, we identified two instances where end of year reviews were signed off as completed and would be included in the compliance figures through the Power BI dashboard; however, they had not actually taken place, but would pull through into reporting metrics.

There is a risk if the information pulled through into the dashboard does not accurately reflect the performance data that incorrect compliance figures will be reported. **(Medium)**



We completed a walkthrough of the e-PDR system to test a sample of 20 officers to confirm they had at least one SMART objective recorded, a mid-year review undertaken, and an end of year review. Our sampling identified inconsistencies in compliance with the process.

- **SMART Objectives:** Our testing identified five exceptions. In two cases, no objectives were set and no mid-year review information had been documented. In two further cases, the officers had not yet accessed the e-PDR system for 2023/24, and in the final case, the objectives were documented in the incorrect section.
- **Mid-year reviews:** Our testing identified 11 exceptions and in all 11 cases, we could not find evidence of a mid-year review completed on the e-PDR system.
- **End of year review:** We considered the end of year review for the prior year (2022/23) and identified four exceptions. Three instances where the end of year review was marked as completed in the system, but one case was for a new starter in March 2023, therefore was not applicable, and the remaining two cases were marked as completed but without any record to confirm the meeting or discussion. In the final case, the end of year review was not marked as complete.

We have agreed **two medium priority** actions in relation to the findings above, one in relation to raising compliance at an appropriate Board and the second in relation to how the Force ensures the quality and completion of SMART objectives.

Where officers are not completing the PDR process effectively, there is a risk that performance is not effectively monitored, meaning underperformance or achievements are not known or acted upon, where applicable. **(Medium)**



As part of our sample testing of 20 officers, we queried whether there was any evidence of outcomes of the PDR process being communicated and discussed with the People Team to ensure that justification for performance is documented. It was noted this did not take place at the time of the audit.

However, we discussed this with the Organisational Development Manager and determined they had already made preparations to implement calibration meetings between line management and HR and a Talent Board, which will be introduced as of April 2024 and also supports succession planning. **(Medium)**



Unsatisfactory performance may be identified by an individual's line manager as part of their management responsibilities, by another manager or through formal complaints. Through discussions with the Employee Relations Manager, we noted that there are only minimal examples across the Force. We therefore considered five samples of UPP cases and from one of the cases reviewed, we could not confirm from the evidence received whether the case has been handled in line with procedure, and the action plan was not followed up. In another case, the officer was escalated to a stage three UPP; however, we note this had not yet happened and the case is ongoing.

Where the UPP is not consistently followed, there is a risk that underperformance may not be dealt with accordingly, leading to further performance issues. **(Medium)**



There is currently no defined link between the PDR process and capability management. The Employee Relations Manager explained that the individual shift supervisors would be responsible for communicating that they are not satisfied with the performance of an officer, and setting up a meeting with them. Instances are only raised to the Employee Relations Team when they reach critical point and before entering formal processes. The expectation is that officers will be put on informal development plans or progress checks that the Employee Relations Team are not informed about.

There is a risk that if there is not a clear link between the PDR process and the UPP that instances will not be identified in a timely manner and HR proceedings may not be followed as required at the informal stages. **(Medium)**



We reviewed the action and decision log in place for the Strategic Workforce Planning Board and determined there has been no annual review of the PDR process to ensure its current state is effective and supporting officers in their development.

Without a regular review of the PDR process, the Senior Leadership Team may not be able to determine whether the current process is effective. **(Medium)**

Our audit review identified that the following controls are suitably designed, consistently applied, and are operating effectively:



We obtained a copy of the Force's Unsatisfactory Performance Procedures (UPP) for Police Officers (based on 2020 Regulations). The UPP is available to officers on the Force's SharePoint, we walked through the system with the Organisational Development Manager and Organisational Development Co-ordinator to confirm this.



The Force ensure that line managers understand their roles in developing and motivating people through providing training and guidance documents. We evidenced the documents provided to Line Managers including the Leadership Prospectus which explains the four areas of focus of Leadership Development: inclusive leadership; personal leadership; organisational leadership and operational and work-based leadership, personal and professional development.



We obtained the terms of reference for Strategic Workforce Planning Board which was implemented in September 2023, and identified the following:

- Development and oversight of a long-term workforce plan supported by effective processes for recruitment, retention, progression and prioritisation to ensure the Force has the right people with the right skills in the right place at the right time at the right cost; and
- Review key performance metrics including, but not limited to, vacancies, attrition, sickness absence, limited duties, occupational health, misconduct, vetting, workforce representation, training and accreditation.



We obtained the updated governance structure in place which shows the current reporting mechanisms from local level to the strategic workforce planning Board and the IMPACT Board are directly reported through to the Executive Management Board for decision making.



We reviewed the Impact Board as they also meet on a monthly basis to discuss the current impacts the Force faces, we obtain three months of reports for August, September and October 2023 which shows the current key performance indicators for the PDR process:

- August 2023 Report: PDR data for 2023/24 shows that as at the end of August, 62.1% have a PDR with at least 1 objective.
- September 2023 Report: PDR data for 2023 24 shows that as at the end of September, 66.9% have a PDR with at least 1 objective.
- October 2023 Report: PDR data for 2023 24 shows that as at the end of October, 73% have a PDR with at least 1 objective whilst 22.4% have had a midyear review.

2. DETAILED FINDINGS AND ACTIONS

This report has been prepared by exception. Therefore, we have included in this section, only those areas of weakness in control or examples of lapses in control identified from our testing and not the outcome of all internal audit testing undertaken.

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management				
Control	Officers attend a pre-induction session prior to joining the Force, which covers the values and behaviours expected by Cleveland Police.	Assessment:		
		Design	✓	
		Compliance	x	
Findings / Implications	<p>We met with the Sergeant from the Learning and Development Team to understand the process for officer induction. Officers attend a pre-induction prior to joining the Force, in which a presentation is delivered outlining the values and behaviours expected by Cleveland Police. We obtained a copy of this presentation, and noted contents of the presentation include security advice, ethics and standards, and fitness. This is not the only induction officers get. Their induction starts on day one of the PC entry route programme.</p> <p>However, we were informed that records of attendance for pre-induction are not retained on file by the Learning and Development Team nor by the HR Team, and we understand this has been the case since Covid. The HR Team is responsible for issuing invites to the new officers to invite them to induction. For the sample, we therefore requested evidence of invites issued to determine the dates of pre-induction, and we obtained evidence of six invites outlining the pre-induction dates. Each date was prior to the officer's start date. In the remaining four cases, the new officers were transferees and therefore would not be required to attend pre-induction.</p> <p>In addition, as part of induction, officers are required to complete and sign various declarations, including conditions of service and fitness declarations. We requested copies for the six new starters (not including transferees) to support in evidencing induction completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • of the six new starters, we obtained all fitness check declarations, which were signed and completed. Although in two cases, the fitness check declarations were completed in October 2023, despite the new starters commencing employment on 25 September 2023; and • in three cases, we obtained the completed conditions of service declaration, although in one of these cases, the declaration was signed on 4 October 2023 despite the officer starting on 25 September 2023. In the remaining three cases, the conditions of service declarations were not on file. <p>Where records do not exist to support officer pre-induction attendance and declarations are not completed in a timely manner, there is a risk that officers are not informed of the values and behaviours expected of Cleveland Police prior to starting at the Force.</p> <p>Of the 10 new officers who joined the Force in the last 12 months, the six on the PC entry route attended the PCDA (Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship) programme, which covers the values and behaviours expected by Cleveland Police, as per the programme specification. There is no record of attendance, other than by exception report on Oracle detailing absence.</p>			
Management Action 1	A register of pre-induction whereby officers are required to sign in will be retained.	Responsible Owner:	Date:	Priority:
	Documentation, including declarations, will be signed in a timely manner, scanned and sent to the HR Team for storage.	Head of Learning and Development Recruitment Manager	31 July 2024	Medium

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

Control	Completion of the PDR process is monitored through a Power BI dashboard available to all officers and their line managers. The Power BI dashboard automatically pulls information showing whether SMART objectives have been set and whether mid-term and end of year reviews have been recorded.	Assessment:	
		Design	✓
		Compliance	×

Findings / Implications	<p>The Power BI Dashboard considered in this finding is not separated between officers and staff. This information is used to manage PDR completion for all officers and staff in the organisation and reported through the governance structure. Our testing for the review has focused on officers only, but we have referred to officers and staff below as we were unable to distinguish between them in our analysis based on reporting limitations.</p> <p>The Force utilises a Power BI dashboard to monitor completion of the PDR process. The dashboard can be filtered to show the percentage of officers and staff who have set at least one SMART objective, completed a mid-term review, completed an end of year performance review and the assigned end of year ratings. The dashboard is extracted monthly from the e-PDR system and can be broken down into areas such as function, team, or line manager. The Force can also use the information to compare the data between years, for example, creating pie charts showing the number of officers and staff who do not meet expectations, partially meet expectations, meet expectations, or exceed expectations. Bar charts are also used to present these ratings which are a combination of 'the what' rating and 'the how' rating. 'The what' is defined through objectives set and whether they were achieved, and 'the how' through the behaviours questionnaire, completed by both officers and their line manager.</p> <p>As of 8 January 2024, of the 2,098 total officers and staff, 77.4% had set at least one objective. Although the dashboard states this shows officers and staff having set a SMART objective, we noted during sample testing that officers do not in all instances complete the additional details, including ensuring the target meets the SMART criteria. In some instances, we noted the individual only included the generic Force-wide objectives, without detailing how they fit within their role.</p> <p>We also were provided with a screenshot showing the number of officers and staff who had completed a mid-year review; of the 2,098 officers and staff, only 32% have had a mid-year review documented. The findings from our sample testing also reflected low levels of completion for mid-term reviews, with the majority of officers and staff not receiving one (only 35% correctly documented as receiving a review from our sample of officers).</p> <p>The Organisational Development Co-ordinator explained that they monitor the completion of the PDR process using the Power BI dashboards discussed as part of evaluating another control. Each month the Organisational Development Co-ordinator sends out an email to Heads of Command and the Chief Officer Team providing them with the performance figures for that month compared to the prior month pulled from the Power BI dashboard and requests that they cascade the information and meet with their teams as required. Links to the dashboard are also provided to allow officers to access the data themselves.</p> <p>We have completed sample testing as part of evaluating another control and identified inconsistencies between the documented procedure and what is actually completed by officers using the e-PDR system. As part of our sample testing, we identified two instances where end of year reviews were signed off as completed and would be included in the compliance figures through the Power BI dashboard; however, had not actually taken place. There is a risk if the information pulled through into the dashboard does not accurately reflect the performance data that incorrect compliance figures will be reported.</p>
--------------------------------	---

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

Management Action 2	We will review the PDR system in place and consider how to improve the data integrity of PDR completion, ensuring that it is fit for purpose and allows mitigating controls to be implemented to identify the failures in the system.	Responsible Owner: Organisational Development Manager	Date: 30 September 2024	Priority: Medium
----------------------------	---	---	-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

Control	All officers have a mid-year and end of year performance review, and the records of these discussions are maintained in the e-PDR system, Headlight.	Assessment:	
		Design	✓
		Compliance	×

Findings / Implications Through discussions with the Organisational Development Co-ordinator, we confirmed that objectives are set by officers between April and June for the year, discussed during meetings between officers and their line manager, and reviewed during the mid-year review. We selected a random sample of 20 officers and walked through the e-PDR system. In 19 instances from the initial sample of 20, we confirmed that there was a PDR open for the current year (2023/24). In the remaining instance, there was no record of a review, and the Organisational Development Co-ordinator explained the individual is a Probationer Officer and currently exempt from the PDR process.

Objectives set 2023/24

From our sample of 20, in 15 instances, we confirmed that at least one objective had been documented under the 'objectives' tab in the PDR system. Of the remaining five officers, we noted:

- in one instance, the objectives were set to mirror the Force's priorities during the mid-term review, and this was included in the notes. The Organisational Development Co-ordinator, however, explained that officers should formally document objectives in the dedicated section;
- in two instances, the officer had not yet accessed the e-PDR system for 2023/24 and therefore had not documented their objectives in a timely manner; and
- in the remaining two instances, there were no objectives set and there was no mid-year review information to determine if any had been discussed.

During our walkthrough of the system, we noted that under objectives, officers are required to document 'additional details' covering the SMART objectives, such as the success measures and evidence that will support them. We noted in most instances, officers were not using these sections effectively and did not include sufficient detail regarding the SMART targets, success measures or what the achievement would be supported by. Whilst the percentage of officers that have at least one objective is reported through the Power BI dashboard, the completion of the additional details such as the SMART targets is not included in this.

We also noted that in some instances the officer had used the Force's values as their objectives, showing a clear link between the objectives and the College of Policing's Competency and Values Framework, as achievement of objectives is used to rate officers' performance. However, officers did not, in all instances, tailor the values to them and their role.

In some instances, the additional detail had been completed to document how the objective applied to the individual; however, this was not the case in all instances considered in our sample.

Objectives are monitored and discussed as part of mid-year and end of year reviews, and once achieved, marked as complete. As part of determining the officer's performance outcome grading for the year, the line manager considers whether they have not met, have met, or have exceeded their objectives and combines this with a rating of whether skills and behaviours were demonstrated.

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

Mid-year review 2023/24

From our sample of 20, we noted in seven instances where a mid-year review had been documented on the PDR, showing the date and what was discussed in the meeting. In a further instance, we noted during our walkthrough that a mid-year review had taken place; however, it had been recorded incorrectly under 'general meeting'.

In the remaining 12 instances, there was no evidence of a mid-year review on file, and we were therefore unable to determine whether objectives were discussed and reviewed during the year. If mid-year reviews are not held in a timely manner, there is a risk that objectives are not reviewed.

End of year review 2022/23

From our sample of 20, we confirmed in 16 instances that an end of year review had taken place for 2022/23. Of the remaining four instances:

- in one instance, the officer only started in the Force in March 2023, and therefore was not included in the prior year PDR cycle. We however noted that the end of year review was marked as complete on 5 May 2023, despite not being undertaken. This would be recorded in the Force's compliance and suggests that the figures reported may not be accurate. We have raised this action above;
- in one instance, the end of year review was marked as completed; however, the narrative stated that there was no meeting and final discussion, indicating that an end of year review had not actually taken place despite being recorded as complete on the system. Again, this suggests that figures reported are not accurate;
- in one instance, the officer had not completed the evidence of year review; and
- in the remaining instance, the end of year review was marked as completed but the officer did not receive a rating.

Behaviours Questionnaire

During our walkthrough, we also viewed the Behaviours Questionnaire. The Organisational Development Manager explained that the requirement is for officers and line managers to complete this prior to the end of year review. As the end of year is not due until March 2024, we have not considered compliance; however, noted during our walkthrough that the questionnaire maps to the Competency and Values Framework issued by the College of Policing.

Management Action 3	The results of this audit will be presented to an appropriate Board to ensure they have oversight of the findings and agree a way forward to ensure the wider Force are embedding the PDR process and to highlight the importance of why the PDR process should be completed.	Responsible Owner: Organisational Development Manager	Date: 30 September 2024	Priority: Medium
Management Action 4	The Force will consider the quality of SMART objectives within the e-PDR system and based on the findings escalate to the Strategic Workforce Planning Board.	Responsible Owner: Organisational Development Manager	Date: 31 January 2025	Priority: Medium

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

The Force will consider how to measure and monitor the SMART objectives.

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

Control	The Force has started a broader piece of work to identify individuals in the organisation with the potential to develop upwards or sideways and to take on additional responsibilities.	Assessment:	
	Partially missing control - The PDR process allow line management and officer to define their development, succession planning and contribution within the Performance Excellence system. However, there is no involvement or moderation completed with the People Team or to check PDR ratings.	Design	x
		Compliance	-

Findings / Implications As part of our sample testing of 20 officers, we queried whether there was any evidence of outcomes of the PDR process being communicated and discussed with the People Team to ensure that justification for performance is documented. It was noted this did not take place at the time of the audit. However, we discussed this with the Organisational Development Manager and determined they had already made preparations to implement calibration meetings between line management and HR and a Talent Board will be introduced as of March 2024 to support succession planning.

During our walkthroughs of the samples within the system, we noted errors in the ratings where the line manager had assigned an incorrect rating to the officer. Ratings are a combination of the officer’s score on how they completed their objectives ('the what') and the behaviours exhibited ('the how'). In some instances, we noted that the officer had been rated a two for both objectives and values and behaviours (meets objectives and demonstrates values and behaviours); however, the overall rating given was a five (exceeds expectations) rather than a four (meets expectations). We also noted an instance where the officer had been assigned a five rather than a six, as they had been identified as exceeding expectations in both their objectives (a three, combined to give six) and the behaviours exhibited. Both a rating of five and six however do fall within the 'exceeds expectations' rating. There is a risk that officers files may be incorrect and show either a rating that is too high or low and this may impact progression and pay rises. Development and succession planning is being implemented by the Force as of April 2024, and they have developed guides to assist line managers with identifying talent and discussing progression with members of their team. We note however this has not been implemented at the time of the audit and were therefore unable to evidence any discussions between line managers and the People Team documenting justification for development, succession planning and review.

Management Action 5	The Force will have a Force-wide roll out plan of performance and potential calibration ensuring consistency and fairness of performance and potential ratings.	Responsible Owner: Organisational Development Manager	Date: 30 September 2024	Priority: Medium
----------------------------	---	---	-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

Control	Missing control – there is currently no review of underperformance in end of year performance ratings in relation to performance improvement plans or the UPP process.	Assessment: Design × Compliance -			
Findings / Implications	<p>Through discussions with the Organisational Development Manager, Organisational Development Co-ordinator, and Employee Relations Manager, we noted that there is currently no defined link between the PDR process and UPP as part of end of year performance reviews. The Employee Relations Manager explained that the individual shift supervisors would be responsible for communicating that they are not satisfied with the performance of an officer as part of the end of year review, and then setting up a meeting with them.</p> <p>There is a risk that if there is not a clear link between the annual PDR process and the UPP that instances will not be identified in a timely manner and HR proceedings may not be followed as required at the informal stages.</p>				
Management Action 6	The Force will develop guidance outlining the process if an officer’s overall end of year rating falls below 4, with suggestions on how to support and resolve underperformance.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1142 662 1590 791">Responsible Owner: HR Policy Advisor</td> <td data-bbox="1590 662 1859 791">Date: 30 September 2024</td> <td data-bbox="1859 662 2013 791">Priority: Medium</td> </tr> </table>	Responsible Owner: HR Policy Advisor	Date: 30 September 2024	Priority: Medium
Responsible Owner: HR Policy Advisor	Date: 30 September 2024	Priority: Medium			

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

Control	<p>Instances resulting in the capability management process are completed in line with procedure.</p> <p>Actions identified from stage one and stage two capability meetings are recorded in an action plan and are discussed by the line manager with support and advice from the Employees Relations Team.</p>	Assessment: Design ✓ Compliance ×
Findings / Implications	<p>Officer's unsatisfactory performance may be identified by their line manager as part of management responsibilities, by another manager or through formal complaints. Managers are expected to deal with issues in light of their knowledge of the individual and their circumstances. Prior to using UPP, management are expected to take informal action, which should be recorded on the officer's PDR, documenting the nature of the issues, any advice given, and the steps taken to address the problem identified.</p> <p>Where performance does not improve following management action, the UPP process should be used; however, we note the procedures state that there is no single formula to determine the point at which a concern about performance should lead to formal procedures.</p> <p>There are three potential stages to UPP, each with different meeting compositions and outcomes. Officers should be notified as soon as reasonably practicable that their line manager considers their performance unsatisfactory and requires them to attend a UPP meeting. Key details are required in the notice including the procedures for determining the date and time, a summary of why their performance is considered to be unsatisfactory, the possible outcomes of the meeting, that a HR or officer may attend the meeting to advise the line manager, and the officer's rights. After a stage one or two meeting, the outcome is either that there is no case to answer, or a written improvement notice is issued. An improvement notice requires officers to improve performance and must state in what respect current performance is considered unsatisfactory, the improvement that is required, a 'specified period' in which improvement is expected, and the period the written improvement notice is valid.</p> <p>An action plan describing what actions are required and should identify reasons that may be the cause of unsatisfactory performance, describe steps required and the support available from the Force, specify the period in which actions should be followed up, and set dates for reviewing performance.</p> <p>Through discussions with the Employee Relations Manager, we noted that there are only minimal examples across the Force. As there were such small numbers of individuals in the capability process, we have considered five instances during our testing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in two instances, the case was not concluded under UPP. The officers were subject to Department of Standard and Ethics (DSE) investigations and left the Force, and either were suspended or went on sick and never returned to work for the UPP to be undertaken; • in one instance, the case was only recently referred to UPP and no meetings had yet been held; • in one instance, we were provided with evidence that a stage one meeting was held and a first written improvement notice issued the same day and an action plan developed and reviewed. Due to a lack of improvement, the matter was escalated to stage two and a stage two meeting took place, and final written improvement notice letter issued the month after. An action plan was created and reviewed monthly. The officer has subsequently moved roles, and we were provided with correspondence regarding an escalation to stage three in October 2023. The plan was closed in December 2023, with no further action; and 	

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

- in the remaining instance it was unclear from the evidence provided whether this was managed in line with procedure. It appears two separate stage one UPPs were held following two DSE reports, and it was unclear whether these had been held separately or whether the process had begun again following the outcome from the DSE reports. The officer was issued a first written improvement notice valid for 12 months and a three-month development, and this was successfully completed in April 2023.

Where the UPP is not fully followed, the Force risks UPP cases being dealt with incorrectly which could result in complaints or underperformance being unaddressed.

Action Plans

Actions are recorded in an action plan, describing what is required from the officer to help them both achieve and maintain the required improvement. Plans are formulated by the officer with their line manager. The action plan should identify the reasons that may give rise to the unsatisfactory performance, describe the steps required to improve performance and the support available from the Force, specify a period to follow up the actions, and set the dates for reviewing performance.

For the two instances in our sample of five where the UPP had been undertaken, we confirmed in one instance, action plans were created, however, performance did not significantly improve, and the officer was escalated to a stage two, and an additional action plan created and reviewed.

In the remaining instance, it was not clear from the evidence provided whether procedures were followed, and the action plan expired, it was unclear if performance had improved. There is a risk if action plans are not appropriately reviewed officers may not be supported during the UPP process and not given appropriate opportunity to achieve and maintain the required improvement.

There may also be a risk that instances of continued poor performance are not identified in a timely manner if action plans are not regularly reviewed.

Management Action 7	All live UPP cases will be reviewed against the defined policy and procedure to assess whether they are completed as required.	Responsible Owner: Senior HR Business Partner	Date: 31 December 2024	Priority: Medium
	Where identification of incorrect procedures being followed, officers will be provided training on the UPP process.			

Area: Performance Management and Capabilities Management

Control	<p>Monthly Power BI dashboards are presented to the Strategic Workforce Planning Board. An action and decision log of the Strategic Workforce Planning Board is in place to support discussions at the meetings.</p> <p>Monthly KPIs are reported to the IMPACT Board on compliance rates with the PDR process.</p>	Assessment: Design ✓ Compliance ×	
Findings / Implications	<p>We understood the Force has a compliance Power BI dashboard in place which tracks the performance indicators for the PDR process. To note, the dashboard includes data on both officers and staff. The two core areas are 'employees have at least one objective assigned' and the 'number of mid-year reviews completed to date' we have obtained print screens of each of these compliance reports to show the current point in time of the proposed completion rates.</p> <p>As of the week of the audit (8 January 2024), we confirmed the current compliance rates for setting at least one SMART objective is 77.4% of all officers and 32% of all officers have completed a mid-term review.</p> <p>We reviewed the action and decision log in place for the Strategic Workforce Planning Board and determined there has been no annual review of the PDR process to ensure its current state is effective and is supporting officers in their development. There is a risk without an annual review of the PDR process, the SLT cannot assure themselves that the current process in place is effective and supports the Force's demand and complies with the Competency and Values Framework outlined by the College of Policing which could further result in lower completion rates across the wider Force. Additionally, without a standard annual review, the Force cannot reflect on organisational lessons learnt and embed supported working practices to mitigate control risk.</p> <p>We reviewed the IMPACT Board as they also meet on a monthly basis to discuss the current impacts the Force faces, we obtained three months of reports for August, September and October 2023 which shows the current key performance indicators for the PDR process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 2023 Report: PDR data for 2023/24 shows that as at the end of August, 62.1% have a PDR with at least one objective. • September 2023 Report: PDR data for 2023/24 shows that as at the end of September, 66.9% have a PDR with at least one objective. • October 2023 Report: PDR data for 2023/24 shows that as at the end of October, 73% have a PDR with at least one objective whilst 22.4% have had a mid-year review. <p>A recent review of the development of the PDR process was undertaken to consider talent and succession planning and whether there was an appropriate framework in place to manage and support this function under the Performance Excellence framework.</p>		
Management Action 8	<p>The Strategic Workforce Planning Board will undertake an annual review of the PDR process to identify lessons learnt and to ensure the current process is effective and identify development areas.</p> <p>The Force will review the current process, system, and the integration of both to understand where there are opportunities to develop and identify any lessons to be learned.</p>	Responsible Owner: Organisational Development Manager	Date: 31 October 2024 Priority: Medium

APPENDIX A: CATEGORISATION OF FINDINGS

Categorisation of internal audit findings

Priority	Definition
Low	There is scope for enhancing control or improving efficiency and quality.
Medium	Timely management attention is necessary. This is an internal control risk management issue that could lead to: Financial losses which could affect the effective function of a department, loss of controls or process being audited or possible reputational damage, negative publicity in local or regional media.
High	Immediate management attention is necessary. This is a serious internal control or risk management issue that may lead to: Substantial losses, violation of corporate strategies, policies or values, reputational damage, negative publicity in national or international media or adverse regulatory impact, such as loss of operating licences or material fines.

The following table highlights the number and categories of management actions made as a result of this audit.

Area	Control design not effective*	Non Compliance with controls*	Agreed actions		
			Low	Medium	High
Performance and Capability Management	2 (11)	5** (11)	0	8	0
Total			0	8	0

* Shows the number of controls not adequately designed or not complied with. The number in brackets represents the total number of controls reviewed in this area.

** More than one management action raised against one control.

Debrief held 12 January 2024
Second debrief held 17 January 2024
Draft report issued 14 February 2024
Revised draft reports issued 10 May 2024, 4 June 2024, 7 June 2024
Responses received 21 June 2024
Final report issued 21 June 2024

Internal audit contacts Dan Harris, Head of Internal Audit
Phil Church, Associate Director
Hollie Adams, Assistant Manager

Client sponsor Director People and Development
Organisational Development Manager
Distribution Director People and Development
Organisational Development Manager

We are committed to delivering an excellent client experience every time we work with you. If you have any comments or suggestions on the quality of our service and would be happy to complete a short feedback questionnaire, please contact your RSM client manager or email admin.south.rm@rsmuk.com

rsmuk.com

The matters raised in this report are only those which came to our attention during the course of our review and are not necessarily a comprehensive statement of all the weaknesses that exist or all improvements that might be made. Actions for improvements should be assessed by you for their full impact. This report, or our work, should not be taken as a substitute for management's responsibilities for the application of sound commercial practices. We emphasise that the responsibility for a sound system of internal controls rests with management and our work should not be relied upon to identify all strengths and weaknesses that may exist. Neither should our work be relied upon to identify all circumstances of fraud and irregularity should there be any.

Our report is prepared solely for the confidential use of **The Chief Constable of Cleveland**, and solely for the purposes set out herein. This report should not therefore be regarded as suitable to be used or relied on by any other party wishing to acquire any rights from RSM UK Risk Assurance Services LLP for any purpose or in any context. Any third party which obtains access to this report or a copy and chooses to rely on it (or any part of it) will do so at its own risk. To the fullest extent permitted by law, RSM UK Risk Assurance Services LLP will accept no responsibility or liability in respect of this report to any other party and shall not be liable for any loss, damage or expense of whatsoever nature which is caused by any person's reliance on representations in this report.

This report is released to you on the basis that it shall not be copied, referred to or disclosed, in whole or in part (save as otherwise permitted by agreed written terms), without our prior written consent.

We have no responsibility to update this report for events and circumstances occurring after the date of this report.

RSM UK Risk Assurance Services LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales no. OC389499 at 6th floor, 25 Farringdon Street, London EC4A 4AB.