

**TILLEY AWARD 2002**

**PROBLEM SOLVING MANAGEMENT ON**  
**THE D1 OCU**

**WEST MIDLANDS POLICE**

**PREPARED BY:**

**RICHARD TIMMIS**  
**POLICE SERGEANT**  
**DI OCU**  
**24<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2002**

## **PROBLEM SOLVING MANAGEMENT ON THE D1 OCU**

### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

This project is intended to show how the management team at Queens Road Police Station have embraced Problem Solving to support frontline policing since October 2000. The D1 Operational Command Unit has been recognised as a model of good practice in relation to problem solving and call management within West Midlands Police.

During 2000 the D1 management identified that the operational officer on the OCU was almost totally reactive and incident led. Officers frequently had little time to investigate incidents with little or no community involvement and unable to provide a good quality of service. There was little or no problem solving activity and a lack of intelligence for tasking/targeting of resources. A snapshot of incident logs for the year showed that out of a total 55,000 incident logs only 3% had been resolved at the station either in person or by telephone.

The decision was made to move to a POP approach for a number of reasons including an enhanced intelligence capability, increased abilities to deliver policing to local communities and giving officers the time to solve problems. In order to deliver this approach an incident management unit (IMU) was introduced. The unit had a clear statement of purpose and core business clearly defined. These included interpreting the Force graded response guidelines to ensure that the public received a professional telephone based service. Reducing demand on control room staff by ensuring that only immediate or urgent deployments were retained by them and contributing to the intelligence process by examining crime, community safety and quality of life issues to initiate the problem solving process. The IMU had an immediate and dramatic impact on deployment issues together with a substantial contribution to the intelligence process by the identification of policing problems.

Specific results to date include;

- ◆ Over 90% of all incident dealt with by the [MU are resolved without the initial deployment of a Sector Constable.
- ◆ Between 800-900hrs of resource time released each month, equal to a saving of five constables monthly (employable cost saving between £17,000-£21,000pm).
- ◆ The identification to date of over 107 policing problems for Problem Solving .88 Problems resolved to date.
- ◆ Integration of Special Constabulary to action slow track deployments (Sector List) and ongoing Beat problems.

---

1. SUMMARY	2
2. STRUCTURE OF WEST MIDLANDS POLICE	4
3. BACKGROUND OF INCIDENT MANAGEMENT UNIT	5
4. STAFF TRAINING	6
5. IMU WORKING PRACTICES	7
6. PROBLEM SOLVING	10
7. PERFORMANCE	14
8. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	16
9. CONCLUSION	16
10. <b>APPENDICES</b>	17
<b>(1) IMU Performance Evaluation sheet 1</b>	
<b>(2) IMU Performance Evaluation sheet 2</b>	
<b>(3) IMU Performance Evaluation sheet 3</b>	
<b>(4) Special Constable Deployment sheet 1</b>	
<b>(5) Special Constable Deployment sheet 2</b>	
<b>(6) Customer Satisfaction sheet 1</b>	
<b>(7) Customer Satisfaction sheet 2</b>	
<b>(8) Problem Solving sheet 1</b>	

## **Structure and Goals of West Midlands Police**

The West Midlands is divided into 21 operational command units, each headed by a chief superintendent who is personally accountable to the chief constable for all policing activity in the area. In turn, each OCU is divided into a number of different sectors, each responsible for their own area.

To enable the police and their local authority partners to fulfil their shared responsibility for community safety, **none** of the OCU boundaries cut across local authority lines.

The philosophy of policing in the West Midlands is very much focused **on** providing a local policing service, carried out by officers who are accountable to their community.

Through the establishment of sector policing officers have the opportunity to understand and resolve the fears, concerns and vulnerability of different sections of the community in a way we could not have previously contemplated.

The ambition is to provide, as far as possible, officers with the freedom, knowledge and resources to act as guardians of their own local communities.

The force have already demonstrated that, by working as a visible, locally-based service which is genuinely part of the community and responsive to its needs, it can make a difference.

Put simply, the ambition is that better community and race relations will lead to increased intelligence from the community which, in turn, will result in reductions in crime and anti-social behaviour, improving everybody's quality of life.

## **Background of MU**

During the early part of 2000 D1 OCU management identified that the OCU was unable to manage the demand from the public effectively. Problems were identified as follows;

- Incident Led
- ◆ Reactive to calls
- ◆ Little or no time to investigate
- No community involvement
- ◆ Lack of intelligence
- s Little or no problem solving activity

After exploring alternative systems for demand management, associated areas of intelligence, problem solving and tasking/targeting of resources, it was decided that an IMU (Incident Management Unit) would be introduced on the OCU.

In order for it to succeed a number of issues needed to be addressed

## **Staffing Levels**

It was identified that in order for the IMU to deal with all D1 routine response calls it would need to be adequately resourced. Experienced constables and support staff with a committed sergeant would be utilised in order to deal with the demand and provide a high quality telephone based service to the public.

The established strength was set at 1xSergeant, 13xConstables, 5xCivilian Staff.

All police officers (other than the sergeant) were on restricted duties due to health reasons.

These officers were in the main highly experienced constables with many years' service who were happy to be able to contribute directly towards problem solving on the OCU.

## **Clarity of Purpose**

Staff needed to be clear as to their role; the key priority was the provision of a quality service to the public without the need to use an operational officer. They would also identify policing problems for problem solving, which would be fed into the Community Safety Bureau for tasking, thus reducing the repeated demand on police resources.

The IMU would not be burdened with extra functions and responsibilities outside of this remit.

This was in direct contrast to the existing D1 help desk which performed a miscellany of tasks ranging from PNC checks, lost/found vehicle updating, admin duties, together with officers visiting or phoning the help desk requesting information that was available elsewhere.

## Intelligence

It was acknowledged that since late 1999, for a variety of reasons, the intelligence function within the D1 OCU had been virtually non-existent. The IMU therefore needed to work closely with the CSB, identifying policing problems to enable the production of problem solving packages for operational officers. This would be tied into a tasking and performance review cycle.

It was vitally important to reduce the burden of response policing through the IMU as a prerequisite to operational officer's ability to carry out intelligence driven problem-solving policing. There was no use in producing POP packages if officers had no opportunity to carry them out!

## **STAFF TRAINING**

An imaginative and team building approach was taken towards training of staff including;

- Away days to other forces to look at differing approaches to problem solving
- Training in customer service skills
- Training in effective use of the telephone
- Training in IMU working practice and policy
- Training in problem solving and identification of potential problems
- Training delivered personally by a member of the management team
- Staff were also given the required IT skills to fulfil their role including;
  - Oasis (command and control system)
  - Crimes (crime recording system)
  - PNC (police national computer)
  - E mail (internal communication system)
  - Intranet (internal briefing and information system)

Once training had been completed for all IMU staff, two members of the management team commenced a two-day training course in problem solving for all Sector officers which included working on real life case studies which had been identified by the IMU.

The training provided all OCU staff with a clear understanding of problem solving which directly related to the community they policed.

## IMU WORKING PRACTICES

The most important first step was to prepare a statement of purpose this enabled the staff to be clear as their role within problem solving.

### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

'The purpose of the Incident Management Unit is to help build safer communities on the D1 OCU. The IMU will provide high quality telephone resolution, thereby reducing the level of routine response incidents which require the attendance of sector officers. The IMU will contribute to the intelligence process by identifying crime, community safety, and quality of life issues which require the application of problem solving tactics.'

### Core Business of IMU

- To interpret the graded response guidelines ensuring that the public receives a professional telephone based service. This will give operational police officers more time to engage in pro-active intelligence led police work.
- Reduce demand on control room staff by ensuring that only calls requiring immediate or urgent deployment are retained by them.
- Contribute to the intelligence process by examining crime, community safety and quality issues to initiate the problem solving process.

### Telephone/Incident log policy

A clear telephone/incident log policy was put in place to deal with the vast majority of calls that were preventing sector officers from engaging in full problem solving. Explanatory notes are detailed at the end of each policy to explain any local terms.

Any telephone calls, which do NOT require immediate or early response deployment, will be actioned as follows: -

- Call suitable for telephone resolution?

Consider:

1. What value will be gained by the deployment of an officer?  
(Will we lose evidence if we do not deploy an officer?)
2. Can we deal with the needs of the caller without a Sector deployment? - NO

Deploy sector officer

YES

If suitable create incident log (station resolution)

1

Close log and deploy special constables or attach to Sector list only if appropriate\*  
(\*See section on Sector List)

Suitable for problem solving? (Submit scanning form)

Provide customer with log or crime reference no

Complete customer satisfaction indicator (is the customer satisfied with the call?)

### Plucking

Staff were tasked to actively scan the incidents being dealt with by control room staff in Order to 'pluck' incidents that could be dealt with by telephone or by problem solving.

### Sector List

The Sector List is a part of the force command and control system that allowed IMU staff to task Sector officers with slow track deployments i.e.; those incidents where an urgent response was not required but the incident was unable to be dealt with by telephone or by special constables.

Sector Sergeants having responsibility for checking the list for each tour of duty.

The list was only used to inform Sector Sergeants of relevant incidents where action was required (take statement etc). It was not used for information purposes.

A time scale for contact was always agreed with the customer before incidents were added to the list.

### Special Constables

The Special Constabulary have an important role to play with regard to building safer communities on the D1 OCU. By working with the D1 IMU the Special Constabulary were able to action incidents that would otherwise be dealt with by sector officers. They could also target crime and disorder hotspots and contribute to the problem solving process.

### Tour of Duty

Special Constables worked three tours of duty per week and were able to action up to 100 incidents per month that would otherwise have been dealt with by sector officers.

### Briefing

Officers reported to the IMU where they were issued with work folders by the IMU staff. They were encouraged to ask experienced IMU staff for advice on any incident that they were deployed to deal with.

### Problem Solving

IMU staff were instructed to consider problem solving in relation to each telephone call or incident log they dealt with. In particular the features of the location, victim and offender(s).

#### Location

Staff were encouraged to use all West Midlands Police computer databases to give an indication of a potential problem. They were told to be mindful however that a problem might not be confined to one address or road.

#### Victim

Effective listening and questioning skills could determine repeat victimisation, which could also indicate a potential problem:

#### Offender

IMU staff were ideally placed to receive information on repeat offenders from the public. Once a problem had been identified the IMU scanning form would be completed and submitted.

### Customer Satisfaction

At the conclusion of every telephone call staff asked the customer if they were satisfied with the outcome of the call. An indicator was then placed on the command and control log.

### Voicemail

Voicemail was the preferred method of communication when receiving calls from the public who wish to contact an officer. The system was also used to ensure that during busy periods no calls were ignored. Staff would then return the customers call as soon as they became free.

### Staff Feedback

In order to improve the service to the public it was vital that all staff are able to highlight procedures or issues which impinged on our effectiveness. This was a two way process in which incident logs and the ability to identify problems was monitored to ensure standards were maintained and improved upon.

## PROBLEM SOLVING

The SARA model was utilised in the following manner:

### SCANNING

(IMU identify problem)

IMU staff deal with the majority of routine calls to the OCU and are therefore in the best position to scan for problems. Having identified a problem a scanning form would be submitted to the IMU supervisor who would ensure the problem was suitable for problem solving. The form and basic information would then be forwarded to the OCU Community Safety Bureau.

4'

### ANALYSIS

(CSB research the problem)

Having received the initial package the CSB then research and build the it according to the needs of the problem (see explanatory notes). Various experts within the CSB such as vulnerable person's officer, crime reduction officer, young persons officer would be called in to offer their expertise to the intended recipient of the package.

### RESPONSE

(Beat manager problem solves)

The researched package is taken to the weekly OCU tasking meeting where it is delivered by the CSB Inspector to the local beat manager for action with a further report date. Sergeants are encouraged to report back to the meeting for advice and encouragement from all levels of management at the meeting in the case of difficult or long-term problems.

T

The Beat manager utilises whatever resources are necessary to overcome the problem using other agencies wherever possible. The problem is referred back to the tasking meeting until finally resolved to the satisfaction of all parties.

## AS SESMENT

(CSB assess results)

The completed 'POP' package is returned to the CSB Inspector who then highlights any items of good practice to other OCU staff for future reference. The package is finally sent to the IIMU supervisor who ensures a BI monthly review to ensure there is no reoccurrence of the problem. The SARA cycle is repeated when problems

## Practical Considerations

With the benefit of 18 months problem solving experience it has become clear that there are a number of factors that were crucial to the success of problem solving on the OCU.

- Staff enjoy scanning for problems which can result in to many packages for sector officers if not carefully managed.
- The IMU supervisor must ensure that only suitable problems are forwarded to the CSB.
- The CSB Inspector plays a crucial role and is instrumental in driving the process with robust further report dates, which are rigorously enforced.
- Beat managers must feel able to bring their problem back to the meeting for advice from all parties in cases of difficulty.
- It is important to return the completed package to the originating IMU officer so they are aware of the final outcome of the package they initiated.

There have been 107 'POP' packages submitted to the CSB in total and of those a total of 88 have been resolved to date. The resolved packages are broken down into the following categories:

Total Number	Nature of problem.
32	Anti social behaviour by youths
13	Neighbour disputes ( Inc allegations of noise, harassment etc)
9	Vehicle crime ( Inc abandoned stolen vehicles)
5	Vulnerable person(mental health problems)
4	Theft/deception
4	Vulnerable person(Elderly)
4	Bilkings(make off without payment)
3	Drug use/dealing
3	Domestic Assault/Disputes
2	Stone throwing at moving vehicles
2	Repeat Burglary
1	Off road motorcycling
1	Vulnerable person(missing)
1	Vulnerable person(physical disability)
1	Premises used as a brothel
1	Nuisance telephone calls
1	Disorder(other than youths)
1	Disorder (licensed premises)

### Case Studies

The vast majority of problems identified were as a result of multiple calls to the police requesting action. These ranged from false calls from persons with mental health problems (up to 30 calls per week) to constant vehicle thefts on troublesome car parks. Prior to the adoption of problem solving the police response had been one of a `sticking plaster approach' and not separating the problem from the incident. Problem solving brought ownership and the willingness to resolve issues. All resolved problems have resulted in a complete cessation of calls to the police from that location or a good reduction of calls. Whilst it is not the purpose of this project to concentrate on one particular incident of problem solving a number of case studies are details to provide the reader with an overview of resolved problems on the D1 OCU.

### Case Study 1

It was identified that youths were throwing objects from a vantagepoint overlooking the A38 (M) onto vehicles passing at speed below them. Every such incident was a potential fatal Road Traffic Collision. The crime reduction officer was tasked with producing a site survey and making recommendations to the city transportation department as follows;

1. Removal of loose/broken fixtures, concrete, brickwork etc.
2. Removal of graffiti and regular removal of rubbish
3. Fitting and regular maintenance of light fittings (in anti vandal casings)
4. Trimming back of hedge and tree growth to maximise surveillance
5. Removal of bench seating to prevent youths congregating
6. Introduction of warning signage concerning CCTV monitoring (deterrent message)
7. Protection of 3 feet rails with close mesh wire

By working together with the transportation department a number of these measures were implemented with other as longer term objectives when funding became available incidents of a similar nature have all but ceased as a result of the action taken.

### Case Study 2

It was identified that vehicles left overnight at the Holliday Inn car park were being broken into overnight and property stolen. Research showed that the vehicles were predominantly used by company reps that were leaving valuable lap top computers etc on show in the vehicles. It also became apparent that whilst the hotel employed a security guard, he did not leave the premises at night. Other problems included overgrown bushes giving a restricted view, substandard CCTV system and poor lighting.

The following measures were suggested to the hotel and implemented.

1. Cutting back of bushes on car park
2. Improved lighting of car park
3. Upgrading of CCTV system
4. Security officer to wear fluorescent coat and conduct high visibility patrols of the car park throughout the night.
5. Welcome to customers at reception to include asking if they have locked their vehicle and removed valuables.
6. Message repeated on internal Television system within the hotel.

These measures again reduced crime on the car park significantly.

### Case Study 3

An elderly lady with mental health problems living alone in Erdington was identified as making numerous calls to the police for a deployment. The calls were of a serious nature (persons breaking in etc) but all found to be false on arrival.

Calls were being received up to 30 times a week. The vulnerable persons officer quickly intervened and made contact with relatives and social services. By working together with all the parties involved the lady was taken to hospital to receive treatment for her illness.

All calls from the premises then stopped.

#### Case Study 4

The Roebuck licensed premises in Erdington was identified as a disorder hotspot with fights occurring both in and outside the premises.

A meeting was held between the licensee, beat manager and licensing Inspector and the following actions agreed.

1. Installation of CCTV cameras
2. Positive action to be taken by staff when dealing with acts of violence and disorder
3. Premises to join the local Pub watch scheme
4. Regular visits to premises by sector officers

A significant reduction in calls occurred after the changes.

#### Case Study 5

Students at the University of Central England in Perry Barr were leaving bags unattended whilst on campus which were then having the contents stolen. Also property was being stolen from unattended classrooms. By working with both the student union and campus security the following action plan was implemented.

1. Student union to encourage students to secure their property by raising awareness of the problem with leaflets, newsletters etc.
2. All staff and students to report strangers on campus to security.
3. Improved security system to be introduced, classrooms locked when not in use, unattended bags to be removed by security for later collection.

A significant reduction in thefts occurred after the changes.

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

The initial performance indicators were set as follows;

#### Response Management

Aim - To resolve 85% of routine incident logs dealt with by the IMU without a deployment of a sector officer.

Measure - % of IMU logs resolved without a deployment as above

#### Problem Solving

Aim - To achieve 95% acceptance rate on POP packages sent to the CSB

Measure - % of total accepted as correctly identified problems by the CSB

#### Satisfaction indicators

Aim - To achieve 85% satisfaction ratings from users of the service

Measure •- % of customers who state they are either satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of service received.

## Performance Evaluation

Appendice 1 details performance from October 2000 until July 2001.

Appendice 2 & 3 provides the information from July 2001 until Feb 2002.

Reading from left to right the performance table is explained as follows:

Column 1 details the week.

Column 2 details total command and control logs graded according to force policy.

Column 3 (IMLT Performance) details total logs dealt with by the IMU excluding urgent incidents that would be beyond the remit of the IMU. The % column shows that figure as a percentage of the total.

POP packages shows the percentage of packages accepted by the CSB (PI)

Column. 4 (IMU impact on deployment) shows the number of logs where a deployment saving has been made as a percentage of the total figures in the IMU performance column.(PI)

The total resource time released column shows how many hours of resource time have been released for problem solving with a nominal time of 1 hour given for each saved deployment. Police Constables per week shows how **many** officers have been saved per week and the final figure shown as the cost saving achieved.

Appendice 4 details performance of the special constables between November 2000 and July 2001.

Appendice 5 provides the information from July 2001 until Feb 2002.

Reading from left to right the performance table is explained as follows:

Column 1 details the week.

Column 2 lists the number of deployments

Column 3 lists the total resource time released, constables saved per week and cost saving made.

Appendice 6 details customer satisfaction performance between March 2001 and June 2001.

Appendice 7 provides the information from July 2001 until Feb 2002.

Appendice 8 details cost saving as a result of problem solving for a snapshot period between June 2001 and February 2002.

## **ANALYSIS OF RESULTS**

### **Response Management**

This target has been achieved with staff consistently resolving more than 93% of logs they dealt with without deployment of a Sector Officer (target 85%).

### **Problem Solving**

This target achieved with 100% of POP packages accepted a suitable by the Community Safety Bureau (target 95%).

### **Customer Satisfaction**

This target not achieved to date (82%) but performance is showing a steady improvement (target 85%).

## **CONCLUSION**

The working practices introduced by the Management Team in October 2000 have ensured that all staff on OCU are involved in Problem Solving. One of the first obstacles to be overcome was being able to free up some time for Sector Officers to engage in problem solving. There can be no doubt that this has objective has been met. The IMU have consistently saved between 800-900 deployment hours per month at an employable cost saving of between £16-21,000 per month.

This free time has been used by the Sector Officers to engage in problem solving which has been evidenced. What has been particularly encouraging is that officers have tackled quality of life issues and in particular the vulnerable members of our community. Other agencies have been encouraged to play their part and a robust approach has been taken against profit making companies who invest little into crime reduction but expect the police to attend every time they are victims of crime.

The SARA cycle employed on the OCU has ensured that all levels of management and staff work as a team to resolve problems with staff encouraged to ask for advice when ever they are faced with a difficult or long term problem.

The policies set out in this project are constantly evolving with the advent of improved call handling systems and the recording of crime via the Internet. The D1 OCU have a problem solving process in place that meets those demands both now and in the future.

## APPENDICES

- (1) **IMU Performance Evaluation sheet 1**
- (2) **IMU Performance Evaluation sheet 2**
- (3) **IMU Performance Evaluation sheet 3**
- (4) **Special Constable Deployment sheet 1**
- (5) **Special Constable Deployment sheet 2**
- (6) **Customer Satisfaction sheet 1**
- (7) **Customer Satisfaction sheet 2**
- (8) **Problem Solving sheet 1**

D1 IMU  
Performance Evaluation

		I. 1 KN-:iJehJT LOG TOTALS					1Mt1 P>=RP3fZ IA+(C)1		II. U 151751 ON DEPLOYMENT						
		Immediate	Early	Routine	Station	Deterred	Total	Total IMU logs		POP packages	Total IMU logs		Total resource time	Police Constables	E Saving
		1	2	3	4	5	Logs	% of total Excl 1,2,3(misc)	accepted by CSB	non response saving la	hour per incident	released (hours)	per week	Per Week #	
Benchmark PSO performance (Aug 2000)		558	977	3107	485	5132	883	43.40%	45%	85%	NIA	819	92.50%	5.1	£10627
Week No	W1B														
1	10/10/00	125	180	575	242	3	1122	178	38.60%	100%	160	90%	160 hrs	4	£2,084
2	16/10/00	102	191	554	326	2	1175	266	48.00%	100%	246	92%	2465rs	6.1	£3,178
3	23/10/00	150	185	529	270	2	1137	204	40.00%	100%	192	94%	192hrs	4.8	£2,500
4	30/10/00	135	203	520	282	0	1140	235	47.00%	100%	221	94%	221 hrs	5.5	£2,865
TqTP+L		512	759	2178	1120	7	4574	883	43.40%	100%	819	92.50%	819hrs	5.1	£10627
5	06/11/00	157	202	626	314	2	1301	243	42.40%	100%	232	95.40%	232hrs	5.8	£3,021
6	13/11/00	150	200	507	282	0	1139	217	43.80%	100%	207	95.30%	207hrs	5.1	£2,657
7	20/11/00	132	189	491	308	0	1120	252	50.70%	100%	240	95.23%	240hrs	6	£3,126
8	27/11/00	118	177	468	301	0	1064	227	44.68%	100%	215	94.71%	215hrs	5.3	£2,761
70TAU i		557	768	2092	1205		4624	939	45.39%	100%	894	95.18%	894hrs	5.5	£11,555
9	04/12100	116	152	453	297	0	1018	214	44.21%	100%	201	93.92%	201hrs	5	£2,605
10	11/12100	133	191	513	253	0	1090	190	41.12%	100%	173	91.05%	173hrs	4.3	£2,081
11	18/12/00	122	210	521	232	0	1085	173	40.13%	100%	164	94.79%	164hrs	4.1	£2,136
12	25/12/00	110	174	371	191	2	848	130	36.01%	100%	120	92.30%	120hrs	3	£1,563
TOTAL		481	727	1558	973	2	4041	707	36%	100%	658	93.01%	658hrs	4.1	£8,385
13	01/01101	130	196	512	267	0	1105	208	42.27%	100%	191	91.82%	191hrs	4.7	£2,487
14	08/01/01	88	187	520	286	1	1082	238	48.27%	100%	225	94.93%	225hrs	5.6	£2,917
15	15/01/01	114	194	514	307	1	1131	218	36.03%	100%	205	94.03%	205hrs	5.1	£2,670
16	22/01/01	115	207	499	329	2	1153	247	46.42%	100%	231	93.52%	231hrs	5.7	£2,969
101AL		447	784	2045	1189	4	4471	911	43.24%	100%	852	93.47%	852hrs	5.3	£11,043
17	29/01/01	118	201	543	287	0	1149	237	46.19%	100%	225	94.93%	225hrs	5.6	£2,917
18	05/02/01	127	188	520	303	2	1142	229	43.28%	100%	214	93.44%	214hrs	5.3	£2,761
19	12/02/01	120	191	527	330	2	1171	243	44.10%	100%	224	92.18%	224hrs	5.6	£2,917
20	19/02/01	111	183	456	278	1	1029	201	44.17%	100%	188	93.53%	188hrs	4.7	£2,487
TOTAL		476	763	2046	1198		4494	911	44.43%	100%	851	93.52%	851hrs	5.3	£11,482
21	26/02101	102	179	455	302	0	1039	196	39.83%	100%	184	93.87%	184hrs	4.6	£2,396
22	05/03101	129	199	523	334	2	1187	233	38.25%	100%	218	93.56%	218hrs	5.4	£2,824
23	12/03/01	132	179	442	289	3	1045	208	44.63%	100%	193	92.78%	193hrs	4.8	£2,500
24	19/03/01	117	210	483	270	0	1080	195	42.66%	100%	181	92.62%	181hrs	4.5	£2,353
T&fAL			757	1903	1195	5	4351	632	43.4%	100%	776	93.25%	776hrs	4.8	£10,073
25	26/03101	128	215	494	256	0	1093	202	45.08%	100%	190	94.05%	190hrs	4.7	£2,448
26	02/04/01	110	193	517	285	2	1107	213	41.84%	100%	201	94.36%	201hrs	5	£2,605
27	09/04/01	108	182	535	247	2	1074	144	28.85%	100%	134	93.05%	134hrs	3.3	£1,719
28	16/04/01	117	206	485	299	1	1111	183	36.67%	100%	172	93.98%	172hrs	4.3	£2,081
TOTAL		463	795	2081	1057		4885	742	30.14%	100%	697	93.86%	697hrs	4.3	£8,853
29	23/04101	147	208	556	277	3	1191	156	27.65%	100%	141	90.38%	141hrs	3.5	£1,823
30	30/04/01	150	223	531	321	0	1226	221	38.43%	100%	210	95.02%	210hrs	5.2	£2,709
31	07/05/01	146	220	522	316	1	1206	211	39.07%	100%	200	94.78%	200hrs	5	£2,605
32	14/05101	148	212	509	351	1	1222	209	37.93%	100%	195	93.30%	195hrs	4.8	£2,500
LCSTOTAL		591	803	2118	1255	5	4845	737	35.77%	100%	746	91.37%	746hrs	4.8	£9,637
33	21/05/01	148	235	589	323	1	1296	205	35.96%	100%	190	92.68%	190hrs	4.7	£2,448
34	28/05/01	163	208	554	275	0	1200	184	34.39%	100%	174	94.56%	174hrs	4.3	£2,081
35	04/06/01	135	212	541	368	0	1256	232	33.14%	100%	220	94.82%	220hrs	5.5	£2,865
36	11/06/01	139	219	516	289	0	1163	161	31.75%	100%	150	93.16%	150hrs	3.7	£1,927
TOTAL		585	874	2200	1255	3	4915	782	33.81%	100%	734	93.80%	734hrs	4.5	£9,321
37	18/06/01	138	239	526	273	0	1178	180	38.37%	100%	160	88.88%	160hrs	4	£2,084
38	25/06/01	145	252	563	324	0	1284	224	40.14%	100%	215	95.98%	215hrs	5.3	£2,761
39	02/07/01	145	209	560	320	1	1236	209	39.65%	100%	198	94.73%	198hrs	4.9	£2,552
40	09/07/01	133	194	545	287	1	1160	164	31.54%	100%	155	94.51%	155hrs	3.8	£1,979
TOTAL		561	694	2194	1204	2	4858	777	37.42%	100%	728	93.52%	728hrs	4.5	£9,376

# = Employable cost per Constable = £521 per week.  
@ = Non response savings are logs where a deployment has been saved.



	IMU Total IMU logs. Non response saving @	IMPACT ON DEPLOYMENT Total resource time released (hours per incident)	PC's per month Hours divided by 160	£ Saving per month #
	<b>Logs .</b>	1.00	Hours divided by 160	£3,662.0
Jun-01	<b>848</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>5.30</b>	<b>£19,410.72</b>
Jul	<b>740</b>	<b>740</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>£16,938.60</b>
Aug	<b>702</b>	<b>702</b>	<b>4.39</b>	<b>£16,068.78</b>
<b>Sep</b>	757	757	<b>4.73</b>	<b>£17,327.73</b>
Oct	<b>940</b>	<b>940</b>	<b>5.88</b>	<b>£21,516.60</b>
<b>Nov</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>923</b>	5.77	<b>£21,127.47</b>
Dec	<b>753</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>£17,236.17</b>
<b>Jan-02</b>	<b>873</b>	<b>873</b>	<b>5.46</b>	<b>£19,982.97</b>
Feb	<b>829</b>	<b>829</b>	<b>5.18</b>	<b>£18,975.81</b>
Mar				
Apr				
May				
Jun				
Jul				
Aug				
Sep				
Oct				
Nov				
Dec				
<b>Jan-03</b>				
<b>Feb</b>				
Mar				

= Non response savings are logs where a deployment has been saved. (This is a maximum figure, past research indicates possible 5 to 10 % reduction based on logs which could or could not have been deployable)

# = Employable cost per constable set in cell H4 £ per month (4week) (to adjust change entry) NB this will affect all cells on this & other pages.

D1

Special Constable Deployment

week no	WIB	Special Constable Deployments		Special Constable Impact on Secondary Deployment		
		From Sector List and POP Packages	Sector Sgts	Total resource time released (hours)	Police Constables Per week	£ saving per week #
		Mon,Wed,Fri evenings	1 hour per incident	Hours divided by 40	PC rate	
1	13/11/00	11	11	0.27	£104	
2	20/11/00	23	23	0.57	£296	
3	27/11/00	11	11	0.27	£104	
4	04/12/00	17	17	0.42	£218	
<b>Total</b>		<b>62</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>£797 e</b>	
5	11/12/00	30	30	0.75	£390	
6	18/12/00	15	15	0.37	£192	
7	25/12/00	6	6	0.15	£78	
8	01/01/01	18	18	<b>0.45</b>	<b>£234</b>	
<b>Total</b>		<b>69</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>£94</b>	
9	envoi	13	13	0.32	£169	
10	15/rovo1	18	18	0.45	£234	
11	22/01/01	21	21	0.52	£270	
12	29/01/01	29	29	0.72	£377	
<b>Total</b>		<b>81</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>£1050</b>	
13	05/02/01	20	20	0.50	£260	
14	12/02/01	20	20	0.50	£260	
15	19/02/01	10	10	0.25	£130	
16	26/02/01	7	7	0.17	£88	
<b>Total</b>		<b>57</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>1.42</b>		
17	05/03/01	25	25	0.62	£324	
18	12/03/01	15	15	0.37	£192	
19	19/03/01	25	25	0.62	£324	
20	26/03/01	14	14	0.35	£182	
<b>Total</b>		<b>79</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>£1,021</b>	
21	02/04/01	32	32	0.80	£416	
22	09/04/01	23	23	0.57	£296	
23	16/04/01	25	25	0.62	£324	
24	23/04/01	18	18	0.45	£234	
<b>Total</b>		<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>£1270</b>	
25	30/04/01	24	24	0.60	£312	
26	07/05/01	19	19	0.47	£244	
27	14/05/01	21	21	0.52	£270	
28	21/05/01	28	28	0.70	£364	
<b>Tagil</b>		<b>132</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>£190</b>	
29	28/05/01	9	9	0.22	£114	
30	04/06/01	27	27	0.67	£349	
31	11/06/01	37	37	0.92	£479	
32	18/06/01	33	33	0.82	£427	
<b>Total</b>		<b>106</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>2.63r</b>	<b>£1369</b>	
34	25/06/01	32	32	0.80	£416	
30	02/07/01	24	24	0.60	£312	
31	09/07/01	18	18	0.45	£234	

Employable cost per constable £521 per week

	Special Constable Deslo ments	Special Constable Impact on Seconda Deslo ment		
4	From Sector list I Sector Sgts & POP Packages	Total resource time released (hours per incident)	PC's Saved per month (hours divided by 160)	£ Savings per month#
		1.00		£3,662.40
Jun-01	0	0	0.00	£0.00
Jul	106	106	0.66	£2,426.34
Aug	50	50	0.31	£1,144.50
Sep	48	48	0.30	£1,098.72
Oct	63	63	0.39	£1,442.07
Nov	48	48	0.30	£1,098.72
Dec	38	38	0.24	£869.82
Jan-02	52	52	0.33	£1,190.28
Feb	62	62	0.39	£1,419.18
Mar				
Apr				
May				
Jun				
Jul				
Aug				
Sep				
Oct				
Nov				
Dec				
Jan-03				
Feb				
Mar				

**D1****Customer****Satisfaction Indicator**

		IMU Total logs	Satisfied % of total	Dissatisfied	Other*
week no	W/B				
18	12/03/01	208	142(68%)	5	61
19	19/03/01	195	149(76%)	1	45
20	26/03/01	202	153(75%)	2	47
21	02/04/01	213	161(75%)	1	51
22	09/04/01	144	99. (68%)	0	45
23	16/04/01	183	133(72%)	0	50
24	23/04/01	156	115(73%)	0	41
25	30/04/01	221	172(77%)	0	49
26	07/05/01	211	156(73%)	0	55
27	14/05/01	209	161(77%)	1	47
28	21/05/01	205	145(70%)	0	60
29	28/05/01	184	133(72%)	0	51
30	04/06/01	191	134(70%)	0	57

\* Includes refused, neither and errors

Month	MU Logs	Satisfied Total logs	Satisfied %	Dissatisfied Total logs	Dissatisfied %	Other logs*	Other logs* %	Target % satisfied
Jun-01	848	778	<b>91.75</b>	2	<b>0.24</b>	68	<b>8.02</b>	85
Jul	<b>740</b>	662	<b>89.46</b>	0	<b>0.00</b>	78	<b>10.54</b>	85
Aug	702	640	<b>91.17</b>	0	<b>0.00</b>	62	<b>8.83</b>	85
<b>Sep</b>	757	583	<b>77.01</b>	1	<b>0.13</b>	173	<b>22.85</b>	85
Oct	940	786	<b>83.62</b>	5	<b>0.53</b>	149	<b>15.85</b>	85
Nov	923	827	<b>89.60</b>	4	<b>0.43</b>	92	<b>9.97</b>	85
Dec	753	640	<b>84.99</b>	2	<b>0.27</b>	111	<b>14.74</b>	85
Jan-02	873	785	<b>89.92</b>	2	<b>0.23</b>	86	<b>9.85</b>	85
<b>Feb</b>	829	728	<b>87.82</b>	3	<b>0.36</b>	98	<b>11.82</b>	85
<b>Mar</b>								
Apr								
May								
Jun								
Jul								
Aug								
Sep								
Oct								
<b>Nov</b>								
Dec								
Jan-03								
Feb								
Mar								

Includes refused, neither & errors

	POP packages to CSB	Ret No	No of deployments( calls in relation to packages (previous 3 months)	Packages accepted by CSB. Target 95%	Packages returned from C8B following Tasking	Ref No	Partnership approaches	Reductions in deployments/calls to same location (3 months post return)	PC Cost Savings (V1-1r) <b>£22.89</b>
<b>Jun-01</b>	6	79-84	44	100%	6	79-84	4	32	<b>£732.48</b>
<b>Jul</b>	2	85,86	4	100%		85	1	4	<b>£91.55</b>
<b>Aug</b>	1	86	n/a	100%	0	n/a	0	0	<b>£0.00</b>
<b>Sep</b>	3	89,90,91	36	100%	3	89-91	2	23	<b>£526.47</b>
<b>Oct</b>	3	92,93,94	20	100%	3	92-94	2	15	<b>£343.35</b>
<b>Nov.</b>	2	95,96	n/a	100%	0	n/a	0	0	<b>£0.00</b>
<b>Dec</b>	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	<b>£0.00</b>
<b>Jan-02</b>	5	97-102	n/a	100%	0	n/a	0	0	<b>£0.00</b>
<b>Feb</b>	1	103	n/a	100%	0	n/a	0	0	<b>£0.00</b>
Mar									
Apr									
May									
Jun									
Jul									
Aug									
Sep									
Oct									
Nov									
Dec									
<b>Jan-03</b>									
<b>Feb</b>									
Mar									