

**CUMBRIA POLICE AUTHORITY  
Policing Plan and Best Value Committee**

**23 November 2005**

**Agenda Item No 6.**

**BEST VALUE REVIEW OF USER SATISFACTION - FINAL REPORT AND ACTION PLAN**

**A report by the Chief Constable.**

**1. SUMMARY**

Attached are the User Satisfaction Best Value Review Report and Action Plan. Appendices are attached as a separate document, sent with this report.

The review focused on how the Constabulary could cost effectively meet the Quality of Service Commitment Standards for an acceptable proportion of user enquiries.

Analysis of the PPAF User Satisfaction measures shows that the Constabulary performs well in this area, being first in Most Similar Forces ranking and fourth in the national tables.

For racist incidents, Cumbria is 20 percentage points above the national average.

Against this background, the review has focused on least satisfied users and developed cost effective solutions, which are proportionate and which include recommendations on policy, processes, performance management and diversity.

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

- That the Policing Plan and Best Value Committee approve the final report and action plan.

**Michael Baxter  
Chief Constable**

## **DETAIL**

### **3. Drivers for Change**

The need for a Best Value review was first identified from the Constabulary's risk management assessment in 2004. The Constabulary identified that user requirements and the Constabulary's ability to meet them were not well understood.

Since that time, the government has introduced two initiatives – the Quality of Service Commitment Standards and the Victim and Witness Code of Practice, with which the Constabulary must comply by November 2006 and April 2006 respectively.

The Code of Practice is reflected in the national Quality of Service Commitment.

The review focused on how the Constabulary could cost effectively meet the Quality of Service Commitment Standards for an acceptable proportion of user enquiries.

### **4. Details**

See attached Report and Action Plan.

### **5. Financial Implications**

No growth recommended. Efficiencies of £380,548 non cashable and £7,155 cashable identified through process changes.

Opportunity cost of implementation is £10,305.

A detailed breakdown can be found in see Appendix 6 – Cost / Efficiency Balance Sheet.

### **6. People Implications**

Impact on police staff at Enquiry Counters regarding process changes and increased workload. At the same time, the approach minimises paperwork and frees up time for officers.

Some police officers will experience additional workload for feedback to victims and witnesses, although solutions minimise the bureaucracy surrounding this.

### **7. Consultation**

Consultation has been carried out according to the Best Value Policy and Strategy Handbook.

In particular, Detective Superintendent Specialist Support, OS and BCU Commanders have been consulted about the solutions and Action Plan.

Employee Relations has consulted with Enquiry Counter staff about additions to job descriptions.

# Best Value Reviews

*Final Report*

## **User Satisfaction**



**Cumbria Constabulary  
November 2005**

## Best Value Review of User Satisfaction

### CONTENTS

1. Summary of Recommendations	1
2. Background, Objectives and Methodology	2
3. Findings	5
4. Options for Change - Policy and Process	10
5. Options for Change – Performance Management	24
6. Options for Change - Diversity	25
7. Improvement Action Plan	28
Appendix 1: National Quality of Service Commitment Standards	36 - 60
Appendix 2: Terms of Reference	
Appendix 3: Summary of National Call Handling Standards	
Appendix 4: Recommendation Appraisal Table	
Appendix 5: Recommendation Benefit / Risk table	
Appendix 6: Cost / Efficiency Balance Sheet	
Appendix 7: HO/RT Process maps	

### GLOSSARY

QoSC	Quality of Service Commitment
VPS	Victim Personal Statement
OIC	Officer in Case
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
BCUs	Basic Command Units
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic
MSF	Most Similar Forces
HO/RT	Home Office Road Traffic form
IMS	Information Management Section
PSD	Professional Standards Department
HMIC	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
PPAF	Policing Performance Assessment Framework

## Best Value Review of User Satisfaction

### 1. Summary of Recommendations

#### **Recommendation 1**

The Constabulary should ensure that enquiry counter staff have timely access to the information necessary to respond to requests from members of the public.

#### **Recommendation 2**

Amend the Volume Crime Policy to include individual responsibilities for keeping victims informed, in compliance with National Quality of Service Commitment Standards.

#### **Recommendation 3**

Adopt a customer-focused approach to initial contact information. Provide information to victims and witnesses to comply with the National Quality of Service Commitment Standards, and support the Constabulary's corporate image.

#### **Recommendation 4**

Civilianise police duties at Enquiry Counters to provide a more efficient and customer-focused service to the public and reduce bureaucracy for police officers.

#### **Recommendation 5**

Reduce unnecessary bureaucracy in the Home Office Road Transport process for production of documents

#### **Recommendation 6**

Procedures should ensure the proper issue of Home Office Road Transport forms to members of the public, to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy later.

#### **Recommendation 7**

Include User Satisfaction performance measures in the Performance Development processes on a regular basis, in order to raise the profile of user satisfaction within the Constabulary and maintain performance.

#### **Recommendation 8**

In order to maintain current performance levels, include quality of victim / witness contact in the inspection regime, where performance and risk analysis indicates this action.

#### **Recommendation 9**

Consider using Activity Based Costing to monitor performance in user service activities.

#### **Recommendation 10**

That further research is carried out into the cause of satisfaction levels of black and minority ethnic (BME) users being lower than that of white respondents.

## Best Value Review of User Satisfaction

### 2. Background, Objectives and Methodology

#### 2.1 Background

The need for a Best Value Review was first identified from the Constabulary's risk management assessment in 2004. The Constabulary identified that user requirements and the Constabulary's ability to meet them were not well understood.

Since that time, the government has introduced two initiatives – The Quality of Service Commitment Standards and the Victim and Witness Code of Practice, with which the Constabulary must comply by November 2006 and April 2006 respectively.

The National Quality of Service Commitment sets out the standards and services the public can expect when they make contact with the police. There are six standards:

- i. Making it easy to contact us.
- ii. Providing a professional and high quality service.
- iii. Dealing with your initial enquiry.
- iv. Keeping you informed.
- v. Your voice counts.
- vi. Victims of crime.

Details of the standards can be found in Appendix 1.

During the course of the review, consultation on the draft Victim and Witness Code of Practice was completed and content confirmed. The Code specifies:

- i. which organisations are required to provide services (this includes the police service),
- ii. a list of services, on an organisation by organisation basis, which victims are entitled to receive and,
- iii. complaints procedures.

The Code of Practice is reflected in the national Quality of Service Commitment.

## 2.1 Aim and scope

The aim of this review was to identify the improvements needed to cost effectively meet the following national quality of service commitments, for an acceptable proportion of user enquiries, for:

- Dealing with initial contact
- Keeping users informed
- Support to victims of crime

Solutions will support continuing high levels of user satisfaction rates, exceeding 85%.

The review:

- i. Used information from public consultation to determine user requirements and areas of dissatisfaction.
- ii. Analysed user satisfaction data into actionable information to inform and add value to the improvement options.
- iii. Mapped and carried out a “customer walkthrough” of the relevant processes in order to develop options for improving them, to meet the national quality of service commitment and to maintain user satisfaction levels above 85%.
- iv. Developed options for the required performance monitoring arrangements to maintain and improve compliance and user satisfaction levels.

Detailed terms of reference for this review are included in Appendix 2.

The following aspects of user satisfaction are specifically excluded from the terms of reference for the review and are being dealt with as follows:

- i. The Citizen Focus Project is addressing the standards for ‘Making it easy to contact us’ and ‘Local standards of service’.
- ii. User complaints processes are being improved by the Professional Standards Department (‘Your voice counts’.)
- iii. The Consultation Working Group is developing separate action plans to improve public consultation (‘Your voice counts’.)

## 2.3 Methodology

The review was carried out in accordance with the Best Value Policy and Strategy Handbook. Key features of the methodology included:

- i. Research into practices in other forces.
- ii. Analysis of public consultation statistics.
- iii. Analysis of customer complaints.
- iv. Review of the Quality of Service Commitment Action Plan.
- v. Identification of key processes which influence satisfaction.
- vi. Process mapping.
- vii. Analysis of policy from the user perspective.
- viii. Customer walkthrough of relevant processes.
- ix. Consultation with police officers.
- x. Consultation with most dissatisfied victims.
- xi. Consultation with a high-level stakeholder group, including Lead Members, Chief Officers and Commanders.

Detailed information about the application of the four Cs can be found in the terms of reference (Appendix 2).

The review started in June 2005 and delivered options for stakeholders in August 2005.

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1 User requirements

The identification of user requirements is key to the review. This enables the current processes to be assessed in order to establish whether or not they satisfy these requirements, and to provide information to make the changes necessary to directly improve user satisfaction.

The user requirements for Cumbria have been identified as a result of analysing feedback from a range of sources - public consultation survey findings, victim surveys, an internal Chartermark assessment, a mystery shopping analysis, race and equality consultation, complaints received in the Constabulary, consultation using focus groups of least satisfied users, and benchmarking against user requirements identified by the Office for Criminal Justice Reform.

##### 3.1.1 Local user requirements identified through this approach

- i. Users require easy access to the police service regardless of whether they have a disability, come from a different ethnic minority or speak an alternative language to English. Contact with the police should be easy and straightforward, with minimal problems.
- ii. A crime or incident reference number should be provided as soon as possible, which would enable victims to contact police directly to discuss issues regarding their personal incident.
- iii. Following the incident and the crime being recorded, users require to be kept informed on a continuous basis regarding how the case is being progressed. Feedback is required on whether the case is being investigated, any findings and the eventual outcome.
- iv. Users require the right information to be provided to them at the right time throughout the crime recording, investigation and criminal justice process. This should include victim support and crime prevention advice.
- v. Processes need to be unambiguously explained to the user so that expectations are clearly outlined.
- vi. Users require issues and actions to be fully resolved prior to closure. This is largely linked to feedback and being kept informed (points iii, iv and v above). Users want to be fully aware of the current situation, any progress and final result - even if that result is an explanation of why there is no further investigation/action.
- vii. Users require an open, honest and humanistic approach to the services provided. Users do not want to fear the police, they want to trust the police

so that they can work together to prevent and tackle crime. In order to ensure this happens the police need to be polite, show compassion and treat people with integrity.

## **3.2 Current performance**

In April 2004 new measures were introduced to populate the Citizen Focus domain of Policing Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF).

The measures of user satisfaction reflect the effectiveness of operational and organisational systems and processes to meet the need and expectations of service users, as well as providing an assessment of the attitude and behaviours of the officers and staff providing the service.

### **3.2.1 PPAF Citizen Focus measures**

The PPAF Citizen Focus measures are key in assessing the impact of the introduction of the National Quality of Service Commitment Standards. The measures are categorised into three elements – user satisfaction, public confidence and fairness and equality.

#### **3.2.1.1 User satisfaction.**

The prescriptive Home Office surveys are sent to victims of domestic burglary, vehicle crime, violent crime and those involved in road traffic collisions. The survey asks questions about user satisfaction in the following areas:

- 1a** The ease of contacting someone who could assist you.
- 1b** The actions taken by police.
- 1c** How well you were kept informed of progress.
- 1d** The way you were treated by the police officers and staff who dealt with you.
- 1e** Taking the whole experience into account, the service provided by the police.

Results: PPAF Citizen Focus User Satisfaction (April 2004 to March 2005):

% Satisfied	1a Access	1b Actions	1c Follow up	1d Treatment	1e Whole experience
<b>Cumbria</b>	92.6%	90.3%	70.6%	92.7%	85.2%
<b>MSF Average</b>	88.14%	77.8%	62.3%	89%	80%
<b>MSF Ranking</b>	2 1 <sup>st</sup> Kent 93.2%	1	1	1	1
<b>National Average</b>	88.1%	76.9%	60.1%	88.3%	78.5%
<b>National Ranking</b>	5 1 <sup>st</sup> West Midlands 95.8%	1	2 1 <sup>st</sup> West Midlands 74.5%	3 1 <sup>st</sup> Hertfordshire 96%	4 1 <sup>st</sup> Merseyside 86.2%

Analysis of the figures shows that the Constabulary performs well in this area overall, being first in Most Similar Forces ranking and fourth in the national tables. (Latest relevant data used, April 2004 – March 2005.) The area of weakness is 1c – being kept informed of progress ('follow up').

## 3.2.1.2 Public confidence.

This indicator is based on the percentage of British Crime Survey respondents who 'think that the police in their area are doing a good or excellent job' (SPI 2a).

Data collected in the British Crime Survey from October 2004 is based on the percentage of people who agree that the police in their area:

- i. Can be relied on to be there when you need them.
- ii. Would treat you with respect if you had contact with them for any reason.
- iii. Treat everyone fairly, regardless of who they are.
- iv. Can be relied on to deal with minor crime.
- v. Understand the issues that affect this community.
- vi. Are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community.

Results: PPAF Citizen Focus Public Confidence (April 2004 to March 2005):

<b>Cumbria</b>	53.3%
<b>MSF Ranking</b>	3      1 <sup>st</sup> Suffolk 59.9%
<b>MSF Average</b>	50.4%
<b>National Ranking</b>	7      1 <sup>st</sup> Suffolk 59.9%
<b>National Average</b>	48.5%

### 3.2.1.3 Fairness and equality

As part of the fairness and equality monitoring, there are two performance indicators relevant to user satisfaction. These are:

- 3a** Satisfaction of victims of racist incidents with respect to the overall service provided.
- 3b** Comparison of satisfaction for white users from visible minority ethnic groups with respect to the overall service provided (data from 1e).

Results: PPAF Citizen Focus Fairness and Equality (April 2004 to March 2005):

% Satisfied	3a Racist incidents whole experience	3b White respondents whole experience	3b BME respondents whole experience
<b>Cumbria</b>	90.5%	86%	80.4%
<b>MSF Ranking</b>	1	1	3 <i>1<sup>st</sup> Norfolk 88%</i>
<b>MSF Average</b>	70.6%	79.8%	77%
<b>National Ranking</b>	1	2 <i>1<sup>st</sup> West Midlands 86.1%</i>	3 <i>1<sup>st</sup> Norfolk 88%</i>
<b>National Average</b>	71.1%	78%	71.2%

Cumbria's current target for 3b is that there should be no measurable difference between white and BME users. However, as the table above indicates, BME users are 5.6% less satisfied than white users.

### 3.2.2 Public consultation survey

The annual public consultation survey was conducted during June and July 2005. 7,006 surveys were distributed to members of the public. Of these, 3,004 were sent to Community Voice (panel of volunteer citizens), 1,602 to 'hard to reach groups' and 2,400 distributed as a random sample to the people of Cumbria. The response rate was 26.6% - or 1,840 surveys returned.

One of the major issues highlighted in the survey was the lower satisfaction levels after having police contact. Overall satisfaction levels with policing services are 82% and satisfaction levels remain high for first contact and subsequent action taken. The issue identified by the survey is that satisfaction levels fall significantly in relation to follow up actions taken by the police (50%).

This supports the facts presented in the PPAF User Satisfaction figures identified in Section 3.2.1.1 above, and the user requirements identified in 3.1.

### 3.3 Dealing with complaints

During research, the review found that complaints to the Constabulary arrive through a number of different channels across the organisation. There is no evidence of a corporate or coordinated response to dealing with complaints. This results in important user information not being fed back to the organisation to improve services, which is best practice. This is being addressed by Professional Standards Department (section 2.2. refers) and the review has passed on all relevant information to inform their decision-making.

### 3.4 Strategic options

During the review a number of strategic options were identified as potential solutions. Consideration was given to the following:

- i. One Stop Shop – defined as a central contact centre to include Call Handling, PNC Bureau, Dispatch, Crime Input and Help Desks.
- ii. Collaboration with local partners (fire service, council, utilities, NHS) amalgamated to provide one contact centre.
- iii. Police Paperwork Unit – defined as police staff who would create MG Files, update victims, make appointments and complete all paperwork for police officers.

However, these options were not carried forward because analysis showed that:

- i. Benchmarking research could find no evidence that user satisfaction would improve after implementation of any of the above.
- ii. Shifting the responsibility for effective contact with users from police officers to police staff would remove accountability and potentially undermine police officers' role. This would also require considerable growth.
- iii. The options are high risk and high cost options in the current political climate.
- iv. Options will be overtaken by decisions resulting from the Home Office O'Connor 'Force Structure Report' (Closing the Gap2).
- v. They are not proportionate or cost effective solutions.

The review focused on improving policy, process, performance and diversity.

## 4. Options for Change – Policy and Process

The review has focused on improving policy, process, performance management and diversity.

### 4.1 Compliance with the Quality of Service Commitment

The national quality of service commitment sets out the standards and services the public can expect when they make contact with the police. The commitment applies to all members of the public who have reason to call on the services of the police, referred to as “users”. Compliance with the standards is to be achieved by November 2005. It is important to note that external scrutiny of compliance with the quality of service commitment will be via existing PPAF measures of user satisfaction and the annual Baseline Assessment.

The Victims and Witness Code of Practice is reflected in the national quality of service commitment standards, with some standards being in both requirements. The review is represented on the relevant Cumbria Criminal Justice Board project board responsible for implementing the Code, to ensure that work and effort are coordinated. The Code is statutory in April 2006.

Benchmarking against the standards in the key areas was undertaken to evaluate compliance, the results of which are described in the following sections:

- 4.1.1 Dealing with your initial enquiry.
- 4.1.2 Keeping you informed.
- 4.1.3 Supporting victims of crime

#### 4.1.1 Dealing with your initial enquiry

<b>Standard for dealing with your initial enquiry</b>
<p>Ensure that we properly understand what you are telling us.</p> <p>Explain how we are going to deal with your enquiry.</p> <p>Wherever possible, provide you with a reference number.</p> <p>Where your enquiry requires specialist knowledge or expertise, transfer you to the appropriate named person or department for your enquiry.</p> <p>Where the appropriate person is not on duty and we cannot connect you, tell you of the delay and give you the opportunity to leave a message. You will be made aware of the likely length of time it will be before someone will respond to your message.</p> <p>If your enquiry is not an emergency but does require a police officer or other member of staff to visit you, arrange a suitable time with you. If something changes and we cannot keep to the arrangement we have made, we will inform you at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>If your enquiry is about something that the police cannot deal with, tell you if there is another organisation that can help you and, if so, how to get in touch with them.</p>

### 3.2.1.2 Policy

Crime Reporting and Recording is the relevant policy for this standard and it includes the key elements of:

- providing a crime reference number, which is the responsibility of the BCU Crime Help Desk and,
- the action to be taken by a member of staff receiving a report of a crime.

### 3.2.1.3 Call handling

Analysis of National Call Handling Standards (NCHS)<sup>1</sup> identified explicit links to the QoS found in Sections 8 and 9 - Customer Satisfaction Standards and Quality Monitoring respectively. These sections cover the standard in its entirety. In addition, Section 12 and Appendix B deal with relevant processes to be applied, which are detailed and mapped. Work is ongoing to implement these standards.

### 4.1.1.2 Police officers

User consultation (focus group and survey) and PPAF indicator for 'Actions taken' identified that officer contact was not a problem. The review has therefore not analysed this area further.

Officer focus groups highlighted the problem of an arranged appointment coinciding with being dispatched to an immediate response. In the majority of cases, officers will request the Communications Centre to contact the user to rearrange, although this is left to the officer's discretion. The group provided anecdotal evidence that some officers will regularly miss appointments causing dissatisfaction with users. Providing users with information and access to a complaints procedure, by making reference in the initial letter, would help to reduce this problem over time.

### 4.1.1.3 Enquiry Counter staff

Consultation with enquiry counter staff highlighted that they do not have easy access to information which tells users about other organisations that could help them.

This situation has arisen because enquiry counter personnel no longer have access to the source command and control system, which holds the relevant information. Nor do they have access to the knowledge database that call handlers use, which has a complete list of other agency information sources. This neither complies with the standard above, nor does it present a professional image for the Constabulary.

<sup>11</sup>\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> A full summary of NCHS can be found at Appendix 3.

**Recommendation 1**

The Constabulary should ensure that enquiry counter staff have timely access to the information necessary to respond to requests from members of the public.

SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
Compliance with National Quality of Service Commitment in the following areas: - Providing high quality service - Dealing with your initial enquiry	Opportunity Cost – Time to implement 2 days Communications Centre Chief Inspector <b>£499.36</b>

**4.1.1.4 BCU Crime Help Desks**

Crime Help Desks, in each BCU, ensure that a crime reference number is provided to users via a letter sent to victims. However, the review established that practices vary across the BCUs and there is no standard set of information, or letter, which is sent. Recommendation 3 sets out the change in practices which are required.

**4.1.2 Keeping you informed**

The standards 'Keeping you informed' and 'Supporting victims of crime' are closely related, as they both involve information and explanation for users. The same solutions have been identified to improve compliance with both standards. As a result, the recommendations covering both are reported in section 4.1.4, page17, after all the evidence has been presented.

Standard for keeping you informed
<p>Provide you with the details necessary for you to be able to talk to someone about your enquiry. In most cases this will be a reference number and the name and contact details of the person dealing with your enquiry.</p> <p>Update you at a mutually convenient time and in an agreed way.</p> <p>Take into account any concerns you may have about confidentiality.</p> <p>If we have not already been in touch with you, contact you monthly. [ NB: Commitment in the draft Victims Code is for notification on a monthly basis.]</p> <p>To let you know whether we are still actively investigating your case and when we will review that decision. If we are not investigating, we will explain the reasons for that decision.</p>

**4.1.2.1 Policy**

There are four policies relevant to this standard:

Hate Incident Policy – The policy is sufficiently victim-focused, covering impact on the victim, victim surveys, written complaints, enquiry office staff, the role of the reporting officer, reporting procedure and the role of the investigating officer.

The advice leaflet for officers dealing with Hate Crime includes specific information on keeping victims updated. Data from the PPAF fairness and equality measure (3b) for racist incidents shows that Cumbria performs well with 90.5% satisfaction – ranked first in Most Similar Force (MSF) group and nationally.

Crime Reporting and Recording Policy – Analysis of the policy evidenced that it is victim-focused and it promotes victim-orientated crime recording. The policy includes sending out a crime reference number and informing the victim at the point of detection.

Domestic Violence Policy – Analysis of the policy identified updating victims as an integral part of the policy and includes keeping the victim informed of bail and bail conditions, where relevant.

Volume Crime Policy – The policy covers arrangements for burglary, violent crime and vehicle crime. The aims and purpose of the policy are mainly internally focused, concentrating on investigation and detection. The policy includes a comprehensive suspect and investigation management plan, but there is minimum reference to the victim. This is despite the overall aim that takes into account victim needs and wishes.

There are very clear criteria that state whether a crime is deemed solvable. This will determine whether an investigation proceeds or whether the crime is filed as undetected. In the policy, there is no mention of explaining this to the victim. Best practice and evidence from public focus groups (Section 3.1) show that, if an explanation of the reasons why the crime is not investigated is provided, the victim is likely to be more satisfied with the service they receive. Recommendation 2 refers to policy change required.

#### 4.1.2.2 Police officers

The PPAF user satisfaction measures evidence that keeping victims informed of progress ('follow up') is the area of greatest weakness. This has also been identified as one of the key requirements to satisfy users (see also Section 3.1). Addressing this area of concern will, therefore, have most impact on improving the user satisfaction measures and is most likely to increase the percentage to over 85%.

Examples from the focus group of least satisfied users provided a number of instances where follow up and support was not evident in the way the police handled the situation:

*Example one - a victim of a violent crime, which happened over nine months ago, had not received any further contact from the police since the date of the incident. This included a number of telephone calls to the police to find out what was happening with the case, but no calls were returned.*

The example above represented the experience of the majority of the focus group.

Views from the police officer focus group identified a problem with lack of ownership of crimes. Only in about 40% of cases does a police officer attend the incident, investigate the incident and follow the case through the criminal justice process to its final conclusion. There are a number of causes which impact on this - ranging from the time taken to allocate a crime (up to three days), shift patterns, officers attending from a different Local Policing Team (LPT), reporting of crimes at one location but which occurred at another, and so on. All these impact on the service the user receives. This situation is further compounded by the fact that users are provided with limited details about who to contact within the organisation to get up-to-date information.

There is no corporate process or policy that determines whether an officer keeps users informed throughout the process – it depends on the officer in case. Recommendation 2 deals with this issue.

#### 4.1.2.3 BCU Crime Help Desks

Once a crime is reported, a crime report is completed and either telephoned or faxed to the Crime Input Bureau for input to the crime system. Once in the system, the crime is confirmed by the crime sergeant on the Crime Help Desk and allocated to an appropriate supervisor as soon as possible. Following receipt of the crime the supervisor will review the crime, consider the investigation required and allocate to an Officer in Case (OIC) for investigation. iCrimes is a sub-system of the crime computer system that is used to task officers and record progress of the investigation – all Crime Help Desks have access to this system.

At this stage, the Crime Help Desks send out the initial letter (generated from the main crime system) and leaflets to victims of crime (which are manually included). The letter provides victims with a crime reference number and the name of the officer dealing with the case.

Process analysis in each BCU identified no consistent approach, resulting in different standards of service to users depending on where they live. This was evidenced through the following:

- i. Crime Help Desks send out additional and different letters and/or leaflets to victims. For example, one desk sends a separate letter to burglary victims.
- ii. There is a standard letter on the crime system, which was developed several years ago, which details the telephone numbers for the appropriate Crime Help Desk. It does not include a telephone contact number for the officer. The letter is not used on all occasions.

Evidence from users and best practice recognise that providing easy access to a complaints system improves user satisfaction. Including a reference to a complaints procedure in information sent to victims and witnesses would address this. Recommendation 3 deals with this issue.

### 4.1.3 Supporting victims of crime

<b>Standard for supporting victims of crime</b>
<p>Identify and support vulnerable victims and children.</p> <p>Provide you with a Victims of Crime leaflet (and other relevant leaflets depending on the nature of your case).</p> <p>Unless you ask us not to do so, pass your details to Victim Support within 2 days.</p> <p>Keep you informed of the progress of the investigation, including arrest, caution, reprimand, warning, charge, release on bail and court proceedings.</p> <p>Ask the Court for "special measures" to be used where appropriate to assist you in giving evidence at Court.</p> <p>When relevant, give you the opportunity to make a Victim's Personal Statement.</p> <p>With your consent, pass your details on to other organisations which are involved in your case.</p>

#### 4.1.3.1 Policy

There are four policies relevant to this standard:

Hate Incident Policy and Domestic Violence Policy – as detailed in section 4.1.2.1.

Crime Reporting and Recording Policy – during the course of the review, instructions to improve victim support were emailed to all staff, to be implemented with immediate effect. These will be included in the policy in due course. The details relevant to the standard and the Code of Practice are:

- i. Referring all victims of crime to Victim Support.
- ii. Explaining key elements of the Victim Support Service.
- iii. Officer responsibilities regarding victim support.
- iv. Crime Help Desk responsibilities regarding victim support.
- v. Details of immediate and self-referral.
- vi. Details regarding express consent for 'not to refer'.
- vii. Explanation and information of the Witness Service.

Volume Crime Policy – as already identified, the victim lacks importance in the policy. The policy requires change to ensure that responsibility for managing and supporting victims is clear and supports both the Quality of Service Commitment standards and the Code of Practice. Recommendation 2 refers to the policy changes required.

Gap analysis of the Code of Practice Toolkit has identified specific requirements for police and Witness Care Units (and other organisations, not included in this review), for all stages of the process from Report to Post Trial. These best practice proposals have been documented by the review and will be passed on to the policyholder to inform the changes required.

#### 4.1.3.2 Police officers

As already determined, there is no corporate process or policy that determines whether an officer keeps victims and witnesses informed throughout the process – it depends on the officer in case.

Evidence from the focus group of least satisfied users (victims of violent crime) highlighted a positive judgment for the way in which police who responded to the incident handled the initial enquiry. However, the focus group identified that support past this point was not always demonstrated, especially where victims felt vulnerable.

Victims need reassurance, particularly those where suspects are living close by, which is often the case.

*Example two - a victim of a violent crime highlighted the lack of response and reassurance from the police after the initial incident. Once the officer had referred them to Victim Support, they received no further reassurance from the police. The perpetrator of the violent crime lived very close by and frequently 'hung around' outside the victim's house. The victim felt that an occasional presence from a local officer would deter this behaviour and felt abandoned by the police.*

This example was supported by further instances from the group.

There are two training initiatives being undertaken within the Constabulary that will facilitate compliance with the standard.

The first is No Witness No Justice training regarding the setting up of a Witness Care Unit and its impact on police processes. The training is being provided to all operational police staff up to rank of Inspector and all police staff involved in the taking of witness statements. Training will be completed by the end of December 2005. The comprehensive training will include the following items, which are relevant to the standard:

- i. Outline the information that needs to be given to witnesses.
- ii. Outline the information that needs to be obtained from witnesses and how this should be recorded.
- iii. Describe what the WCUs will be able to do for witnesses.
- iv. Outline the processes involved and relationship between the witness and CJS between first contact with the police and post court disposal.
- v. Explain the witness personal statement process.
- vi. Explain who are entitled to special measures.

- vii. List the special measures available to vulnerable and intimidated witnesses.

In addition, Professionalising Investigation Project training will be given to all PCs and this includes further instruction on special measures for witnesses.

#### 4.1.3.3 BCU Crime Help Desks

Crime Help Desks have a role to play regarding compliance with this standard as they send relevant information to users. Process analysis in each BCU identified that opportunities to take up the full range of Home Office leaflets are not taken up and there is no consistent approach in the information sent out. This was evidenced through the following:

- i. The victim personal statement leaflet is not sent from all Crime Help Desks.
- ii. Multi-lingual options are not detailed in the information sent to victims (Home Office leaflets are available in a variety of languages, in Braille and as audio tape).
- iii. Details of local contact numbers, for example councils and various charities are not included in the information sent to victims.

Recommendation 3 deals with this issue.

#### 4.1.4 Recommendations to comply with standards for 'Keeping you informed' and 'Supporting victims of crime'.

In order to ensure compliance with the standards for 'Keeping you informed' and 'Supporting victims of crime', the review has identified cost effective solutions which will:

- i. Resolve the main areas of dissatisfaction identified by users.
- ii. Improve the public confidence in policing, through contact and reassurance.
- iii. Act as an incentive for improved performance of individual officers by providing an accountability framework to the users.
- iv. Provide clarity of responsibility for victim management.
- v. Provide a standard level of service across the Constabulary.

**Recommendation 2**

Amend the Volume Crime Policy to include individual responsibilities for keeping victims informed, in compliance with National Quality of Service Commitment Standards.

SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
<p>Compliance with Quality of Service Commitments in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing high quality service</li> <li>- Keeping you informed</li> <li>- Victims of crime</li> </ul> <p>Improved Citizen Focus performance figures for user satisfaction public confidence and fairness and equality.</p> <p>Compliance with Victims Code of Practice.</p>	<p>Opportunity Costs -</p> <p>Time to develop policy (one day because all information is available).</p> <p>Time to consult and implement policy.</p> <p>Time to communicate to officers.</p> <p>1 day Detective Supt. Specialist Support <b>£329.60</b></p>

**Recommendation 3**

Adopt a customer-focused approach to initial contact information. Provide information to victims and witnesses to comply with the National Quality of Service Commitment Standards, and support the Constabulary's corporate image

SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
<p>Compliance with Quality of Service Commitments in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Providing high quality service</li> <li>-Keeping you informed</li> <li>-Victims of crime</li> </ul> <p>Improved Citizen Focus performance indicators for user satisfaction, public confidence and fairness and equality.</p> <p>Compliance with Victims Code of Practice.</p>	<p>Opportunity Costs -</p> <p>Time to develop and communicate to Area/Crime Help Desks – 3 days Detective Superintendent Specialist Support <b>£988.80</b></p> <p>Potential cost to change standard letter on the crime system.</p>

## 4.2 Process Efficiencies

During the review, a number of processes were identified as being inefficient. The review has taken the opportunity to re-engineer and streamline these processes to:

- i. Yield substantial efficiencies.
- ii. Reduce the waiting time for members of the public.
- iii. Reduce the paperwork burden on police officers.
- iv. Provide more robust accountability arrangements.

### 4.2.1 Enquiry Counter processes

Consultation with enquiry counter staff identified inefficiencies with processes, resulting in users having to be kept waiting whilst police officers are called in to deal with paperwork. (The average wait is 20 minutes for a police officer.) This issue is concerned with police staff not being able to record minor crime, details of vehicle accidents, or carrying out minor duties required for the production of vehicle documents after a motorist has been stopped by the police and has been issued a Home Office Road Transport (HO/RT) form.

Analysis of the current job description for enquiry counter staff identified that recording of minor crime on form CID6 and vehicle accidents are included as principal accountabilities. However, these duties are not being put into practice by all enquiry counter staff.

There are also various different versions of the job profile across the Constabulary.

In addition, Headquarters Criminal Justice Unit has requested an amendment to the Enquiry Counter clerk job description, to include further tasks concerned with the production of vehicle documents, as follows:

- i. Cautioning drivers on production of documents for any offences disclosed.
- ii. Recording information.
- iii. Attending court as required.

Employee Relations have been involved in the consultation necessary to rationalise and amend the job descriptions and the changes will be implemented by February 2006 following statutory 90 days' notice to staff.

Benchmarking identified that the majority of other forces already use police staff to carry out these activities.

The review concluded that Enquiry Counter processes were inefficient and not user-focused. Improvements identified will result in non-cashable efficiencies in excess of £317,000 per annum.

**Recommendation 4**

Civilianise police duties at Enquiry Counters to provide a more efficient and customer-focused service to the public and reduce bureaucracy for police officers.

SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
<p><b>Process efficiencies: £317,520 per annum non cashable</b>            £47,764 for crime recording and £269,756 for HO/RT offences</p> <p>Releasing 10.9 police officers per annum (improves sub measure of frontline policing - time spent on visible policing)</p> <p>Compliance with QoS in the following:            - Providing high quality service            - Dealing with initial enquiry</p>	<p>Opportunity Costs –</p> <p>Time to communicate to Enquiry Counter staff</p> <p>2 days per BCU Chief Inspector = £499.36 per BCU</p> <p><b>£1,498.08</b></p>

**4.2.2 Processes for dealing with Home Office Road Transport (HO/RT) forms**

A detailed process map for the HO/RT form issue and production, and the proposed revised process, can be found in Appendix 6.

The basic process is currently as follows:

- i. Motorist is stopped by police officer.
- ii. Form HO/RT 1 is issued to the motorist requesting production of range of documents within 7 days at a nominated police station.
- iii. Officer notes on form whether the documents are to be 'recorded' or 'checked'.
- iv. Copies of HO/RT 1 retained by police officer.
- v. Motorist brings required documents to the police station Enquiry Counter.
- vi. **If all documentation is in order**, Enquiry Counter clerk notes whether the officer requested a record or check.
- vii. If check, Enquiry Counter clerk completes the HO/RT 2 for a check only.
- viii. If record, Enquiry Counter clerk completes the HO/RT 2 and completes the Index Book. Clerk makes copies of the HO/RT1 and the HO/RT 2, writes a letter to the officer, and then sends all the documents to the issuing officer via internal mail.
- ix. **If documentation is not in order**, Enquiry Counter Clerk calls for an officer to complete the relevant HO/RT 2 form. Officer completes a summary file to charge the motorist.
- x. **Meanwhile, 7 days from date of issue**, officer checks with Enquiry Counter if motorist has produced required documents.
- xi. If not, a summary file is produced by the officer to charge the motorist.

Analysis of this current process identified the following problems:

- i. The process is unwieldy and unhelpful to officers, who have difficulty in tracking whether HO/RT1s they have issued have been produced within the allotted time.
- ii. Copies of HO/RT productions for 'record' are routinely sent to officers. Consultation with officers highlighted that the copies were normally discarded.

Best practice was identified at Carlisle police station. A bring forward system is used so that Enquiry Counter clerks can notify officers of 'fail to produce'. This action means that officers do not have to personally track HO/RT forms and there is more robustness in the process. This ensures that all HO/RT forms issued are followed through.

The revised processes recommended by the review are self-funding (in terms of time) i.e. additional actions offset against officer queries and sending out copies.

The findings evidence that processes are bureaucratic and ineffective. Streamlining would produce process efficiencies in excess of £65,000 per annum, £7,155 of which is cashable.

### Recommendation 5

Reduce unnecessary bureaucracy in the Home Office Road Transport process for production of documents.

SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
<p><b>Process efficiencies: £70,183 per annum</b>            £7,155 cashable – consumables to copy HO/RT            £37,991 non cashable – time saved copy HO/RT            £25,037 non cashable – time saved by Bring Forward system</p> <p>Releasing 0.9 of a police officer per annum.</p> <p>Compliance with Quality of Service Commitments in the following areas:            -Providing high quality service</p>	<p>Opportunity costs –</p> <p>Time to communicate changed process to officers and Enquiry Counter staff</p> <p>2 days per BCU Chief Inspector - £499.36 per BCU</p> <p><b>£1,498.08 total</b></p> <p>Actual costs for purchase of files for bring forward system.</p>

#### 4.2.3 Percentage of HO/RT1 forms requiring full 'record' versus 'check' of document details.

The percentage of HO/RT 1 forms requiring full record of document details is high (75% - from a sample of 445 productions taken across BCUs over a period of 10 days). This extends the amount of time it takes for an Enquiry Counter clerk to complete the paperwork by a minimum of ten minutes per production.

This is because all the details need to be transferred from the requested documents to the HO/RT2 book manually.

The high percentage requesting full record of document details could be addressed in two ways:

- a Chief Inspector (Operations) in each BCU and OS to periodically stress the importance of marking HO/RT 1 forms as 'record' only when necessary (making reference to the increased processing time taken in the Enquiry Counter process).

Consultation with Enquiry Counter staff evidenced that when officers are reminded only to request full record of documents when needed, the percentage of 'full record' requests drops, but increases again over time.

- b Alter the HO/RT1 pad to include an explanation for when to 'record' as an effective way of ensuring officers only request a 'record' when necessary.

This could be achieved by either removing the 3<sup>rd</sup> defect line on the form and replacing it with the necessary text

In addition, six months' supply of HO/RT1 pads were ordered from the external supplier in August 2005 – and this cannot be cancelled at this stage. The review therefore recommends that this modification should occur when current stocks are depleted.

For each 10% reduction in the number of HO/RT 'records', process efficiencies of £31,846 per annum will be achieved.

<b>Recommendation 6</b>	
Procedures should ensure the proper issue of Home Office Road Transport forms to members of the public, to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy later.	
SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
<p>Reduces number of HO/RT productions marked 'record', which reduces Enquiry Counter staff processing time by 10 minutes per 'record'.</p> <p>Potential efficiencies –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduction of HO/RT production full record from 75% to 65% would generate non cashable process efficiencies of <b>£31,846 per annum</b></li> <li>▪ Reduction of HO/RT production full record from 75% to 55% would generate non cashable process efficiencies of <b>£63,693 per annum</b></li> </ul> <p>Compliance with Quality of Service Commitment for - Providing high quality service</p>	<p>(a) Time to communicate to staff 4 hours per BCU Chief Inspector Operations, periodically recurring - £124.84 per BCU <b>£374.52 total</b></p> <p>(b) To alter HO/RT pad to include reason for record, losing 3<sup>rd</sup> defect line. 1 hour to alter on computer</p>

## 5. Options for Change: Performance Management

### 5.1 Performance management processes

Performance management is taking action in response to actual performance to make outcomes better than they would otherwise be. Best practice identifies that effective performance management helps an authority, force or BCU to identify its desired outcomes, prioritise its actions and understand their impact on future performance. Effective performance management enables authorities and forces to move away from a reactive 'firefighting' approach to decision-making, to a forward-looking, proactive and informed approach in which the Constabulary can take steps to improve future performance.

User satisfaction data is not currently included in any performance management processes. Inclusion in this process would raise the profile of user satisfaction throughout the Constabulary and enable targeted problem solving in BCUs.

To maintain and improve user satisfaction levels (currently 85%) the review recommends that the Constabulary:

#### Recommendation 7

Include User Satisfaction performance measures in the Performance Development processes on a regular basis, in order to raise the profile of user satisfaction within the Constabulary and maintain performance.

SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
Improved Citizen Focus User Satisfaction performance figures for user satisfaction, public confidence and fairness and equality.	Opportunity Costs – Information Management Section (IMS) time to set up - 4 days Scale 6 <b>£405.90</b> IMS ongoing - 1 day per quarter Scale 6 <b>£101.48 per quarter</b>

Performance management best practice identifies internal inspection as a means of driving a performance culture and effecting change throughout the organisation. In order to ensure that Cumbria Constabulary maintains its current performance levels, User Satisfaction data should be maintained and fed into the risk and performance indicators, which determine what is to be inspected or reviewed.

**Recommendation 8**

In order to maintain current performance levels, include quality of victim / witness contact in the inspection regime, where performance and risk analysis indicates this action.

SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
<p>Improved Citizen Focus User Satisfaction performance figures for user satisfaction, public confidence and fairness and equality.</p> <p>Compliance with Quality of Service Commitment in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Providing high quality service</li> <li>-Dealing with initial enquiry</li> <li>-Keeping you informed</li> <li>-Victims of crime</li> </ul>	<p>Opportunity Costs -</p> <p>20 days Inspector £29.01 per hour  <b>£4,641.60</b></p>

Identified best practice indicates that the Constabulary should be able to monitor input versus output as part of performance monitoring and to inform decision-making.

**Recommendation 9**

Consider using Activity Based Costing to monitor performance in user service activities.

SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
<p>Improved performance figures for SPI 11a Proportion of police officer time available for frontline policing. (Measured through Activity Based Costing)</p>	<p>Opportunity Costs -</p> <p>Best Value 4 hours PO4 <b>£71.12</b>            IMS minimal input – 10 minutes <b>£2.26</b></p>

## 6. Options for Change: Diversity

### 6.1 Black and minority ethnic satisfaction

Analysis of statistics identifies a negative difference between the 'whole experience' satisfaction levels of BME respondents (80.4%) and white respondents (86%). The current Constabulary target is that there should be no difference.

The IODA report, on multi agency consultation with black and minority ethnic community in Cumbria (June 2005), provided evidence which backs up the figures. One of its findings is that people are reluctant to report racial verbal abuse, as they are not confident that it is taken seriously. In order for the Constabulary to improve the confidence of BME users in policing, the review recommends:

#### Recommendation 10

That further research is carried out into the cause of satisfaction levels of black and minority ethnic (BME) users being lower than that of white respondents.

SMART Benefits	Estimated Cost
<p>Improved Citizen Focus User Satisfaction performance figures for user satisfaction, public confidence and fairness and equality.</p> <p>Compliance with Quality of Service Commitment in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dealing with initial enquiry</li> <li>- Keeping you informed</li> <li>- Victims of crime</li> </ul>	<p>Unknown, as dependent on findings and action taken.</p>

Page intentionally blank.

# Best Value Review Improvement Action Plan

## User Satisfaction



**Cumbria Constabulary**  
**October 2005**

**Best Value Review User Satisfaction  
Draft Improvement Action Plan**

The Action Plan includes all the recommendations from the BVR User Satisfaction. Each action has been allocated to an owner and details key milestones, deadlines, costs and benefits.

**Notes:**

Where relevant, dates have been set to enable feeds into the planning and budget setting process as appropriate.

Cost and efficiencies include September 2005 3% pay award.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**  
**Best Value Review User Satisfaction Action Plan**

Action	Priority	Complexity	Owner	Deadline	Cost of Implementing	Benefits	Evaluation Date
1. The Constabulary should ensure that enquiry counter staff have timely access to the information necessary to respond to requests from members of the public	**	**	OS Chief Supt.	Key Milestones Scoping by 30/11/05  Implemented by 31/12/05	2 days Chief Inspector Comms. Centre <b>£499.36</b>	Compliance with National Quality of Service Commitment in the following areas:  - Providing high quality service - Dealing with your initial enquiry  <i>Quality checklist:</i> Front Desks have access to phone numbers for specialist organisations	March 2006
2. Amend the Volume Crime Policy to include individual responsibilities for keeping victims informed, in compliance with National Quality of Service Commitment Standards.	***	*	Detective Supt. Specialist Support OS	Key Milestones Draft for consultation by 31/10/05  Implemented by 31/12/05	1 day Detective Supt. Specialist Support <b>£329.60</b>	Compliance with Quality of Service Commitments in the following areas: - Providing high quality service - Keeping you informed - Victims of crime  Improved Citizen Focus performance figures for user satisfaction public confidence and fairness and equality.  Compliance with Victims Code of Practice.  <i>Quality checklist:</i> Policy to include identification of the point when the Witness Care Unit will take over responsibility from police officers.	April 2006

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**  
**Best Value Review User Satisfaction Action Plan**

Action	Priority	Complexity	Owner	Deadline	Cost of Implementing	Benefits	Evaluation Date
<p><b>3</b> Adopt a customer-focused approach to initial contact information. Provide information to victims and witnesses to comply with the National Quality of Service Commitment Standards, and support the Constabulary's corporate image.</p>	***	*	Detective Superintendent Specialist Support OS	<p>Key Milestones</p> <p>Agreement on inclusion in packs and letter wording 30/10/05</p> <p>Implemented by 31/12/05</p>	<p>3 days D.Supt Specialist Support time <b>£988.80</b></p> <p>Potential cost to change the standard letter on the crime system</p>	<p>Compliance with Quality of Service Commitments in the following areas:            -Providing high quality service            -Keeping you informed            -Victims of crime</p> <p>Improved Citizen Focus performance indicators for user satisfaction, public confidence and fairness and equality.</p> <p>Compliance with Victims Code of Practice.</p> <p><i>Quality Checklist:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i Use standard letter (and only send one)</li> <li>ii Issue Home Office Victims of Crime/ Crime Prevention/ Victim Support/ Victim Personal Statement leaflets in all cases</li> <li>iii Issue flyer with local contact numbers and multi lingual option</li> <li>iv Provide a checklist for additional leaflets to ensure that correct and relevant information is being sent out</li> <li>v Include name and telephone number of OIC</li> <li>vi Include local Help Desk number for the provision of a second contact in the event of OIC not being on duty</li> <li>vii Promote the fact that the constabulary are willing to receive complaints about the quality of service received</li> </ul>	April 2006

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**  
**Best Value Review User Satisfaction Action Plan**

Action	Priority	Complexity	Owner	Deadline	Cost of Implementing	Benefits	Evaluation Date
4. Civilianise police duties at Enquiry Counters to provide a more efficient and customer-focused service to the public and reduce bureaucracy for police officers	***	***	BCU Commanders	<p>Key Milestones</p> <p><b>Action 3a</b> Implemented by 30/11/05</p> <p><b>Action 3b</b> Job descriptions have been updated (Employee Relations)</p> <p>Consultation is complete (Employee Relations)</p> <p>Feedback to BCU Commanders and staff by 31/10/05 (Employee Relations)</p> <p>Implementation by 01/02/06 following 90 days notice (BCU Commanders)</p>	<p>2 days per BCU Chief Inspector Operations</p> <p><b>£499.36 per BCU</b></p> <p><b>£1,498.08 total</b></p>	<p><b>Process efficiencies; £317,520 per annum</b>            £47,764 non cashable CID6            £269,756 non cashable HO/RT</p> <p>Releasing 10.9 police officers per annum (improves sub measure of frontline policing - time spent on visible policing)</p> <p>Compliance with QoS in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing high quality service</li> <li>- Dealing with initial enquiry</li> </ul> <p><i>Quality checklist:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i</i> Enquiry Counter clerks record crime reported to the Enquiry Counter (CID 6 completion) and</li> <li><i>ii</i> complete the relevant paperwork for Home Office Road Transport (HO/RT)</li> </ul>	April 2006

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**  
**Best Value Review User Satisfaction Action Plan**

Action	Priority	Complexity	Owner	Deadline	Cost of Implementing	Benefits	Evaluation Date
5. Reduce unnecessary bureaucracy in the Home Office Road Transport process for production of documents.	***	**	BCU Commanders	Key milestones  Communicate changes by 01/11/05  Implemented by 30/11/05	2 days per BCU Chief Inspector Operations  <b>£499.36 per BCU</b>  <b>£1,498.08 total</b>  Purchase of files for bring forward system	<b>Process efficiencies £70,183 per annum</b> £7,155 cashable – copy HO/RTs £37,991 non cashable – copy HO/RTs £25,037 non cashable – BF System  Releasing 0.9 police officers per annum (improves sub measure of frontline policing - time spent on visible policing)  Compliance with QoSC -Providing high quality service -Dealing with your initial enquiry  <i>Quality checklist:</i> i Adoption of best practice in all BCUs (that is the Carlisle bring forward system) ii Stop practice of routinely sending copies of all HO/RT productions to officers	February 2006

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**  
**Best Value Review User Satisfaction Action Plan**

Action	Priority	Complexity	Owner	Deadline	Cost of Implementing	Benefits	Evaluation Date
6. Procedures should ensure the proper issue of Home Office Road Transport forms to members of the public, to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy later	**	**	<b>6a</b> BCU Commanders OS Chief Superintendent  <b>6b</b> Print Department	Key milestones  By 30/11/05 and approximately every 6 months thereafter  Change to HORT pad with next order - approximately February 06	4 hours per BCU Chief Inspector Operations, periodically recurring <b>£124.84 per BCU</b> <b>£374.52 total</b>  HORT pad alteration: 1 hour print department staff time to alter on computer	Reduce number of HO/RT productions marked record  Reduces Front Desk staff processing time by 10 minutes per 'record'  Potential efficiencies – Front Desk staff time to complete paperwork if percentage of 'records' drops  Compliance with QoSC in the following areas: -Providing high quality service  <i>Quality checklist:</i> i BCU Chief Inspectors (Operations) regularly reminding officers of the correct HO/RT processes (that is, when to 'record' and when to 'check' ii HO/RT1 pad altered for new stock to include an explanation for when to 'record'.	July 2006

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**  
**Best Value Review User Satisfaction Action Plan**

Action	Priority	Complexity	Owner	Deadline	Cost of Implementing	Benefits	Evaluation Date
<p>7. Include 'User Satisfaction' performance measures in the Performance Development Processes on a regular basis, in order to raise the profile of user satisfaction within the Constabulary and maintain performance.</p>	***	***	Director Strategic Development	<p>Key Milestones</p> <p>Agree format 30/11/06</p> <p>Include on dashboard and in quarterly review by January 2006</p>	<p>IMS set up time 4 days at scale 6 (30 hours at £13.53 per hour including on costs = <b>£405.90</b>)</p> <p>IMS running time 1 day per quarter at scale 6 (7.5 hours at £13.53 per hour including on costs = <b>£101.48</b>)</p> <p>These costs exclude the work currently carried out preparing statistics for the Home Office.</p>	<p>Improved Citizen Focus performance indicators for user satisfaction, public confidence and fairness and equality</p>	July 2006
<p>8. In order to maintain current performance levels, include quality of victim contact in inspection regime, where performance and risk analysis indicates this action</p>	***	**	Director Strategic Development	<p>Key Milestones</p> <p>To coincide with inspection regime implementation (30/11/05)</p>	<p>Opportunity costs (20 days Inspector £29.01 per hour, 8 hours per day = <b>£4,641.60</b>)</p>	<p>Improved Citizen Focus performance indicators for user satisfaction, public confidence and fairness and equality</p> <p>Compliance with QoSC in the following areas:            -Providing high quality service            -Dealing with initial enquiry            -Keeping you informed            -Victims of crime</p>	July 2006

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**  
**Best Value Review User Satisfaction Action Plan**

Action	Priority	Complexity	Owner	Deadline	Cost of Implementing	Benefits	Evaluation Date
9. Consider using Activity Based Costing to monitor performance in user service activities.	***	*	Best Value Manager	Key milestones Business case produced by 31/10/05	Best Value 4 hours PO4 (17.78 per hour including on costs = <b>£71.12</b> ) IMS minimal input 10mins scale 6 (13.53 per hour including on costs = <b>£2.26</b> )	Improved performance figures for SPI 11a Proportion of police officer time available for frontline policing. (Measured through Activity Based Costing)  Quality checklist: i. Business case to be made for adding a victim/witness update category/code into Activity Based Costing	After next Activity Based Costing
10. Recommend further research into the cause of satisfaction levels of BME users being lower than that of white respondents	**	***	Chief Superintendent HQ Partnerships (Brian Horn)	Key milestones Scoping by 30/11/05  Report to Best Value Board by 05/01/06	Unknown as dependent on findings and action taken	Improved Citizen Focus performance indicators for user satisfaction, public confidence and fairness and equality  Compliance with QoSC in the following areas: -Dealing with initial enquiry -Keeping you informed -Victims of crime	TBA subject to action taken at Best Value Board January 2006