

**POLICE AND CRIME  
COMMISSIONER FOR  
LEICESTERSHIRE**

PAPER MARKED

**B**

**ETHICS, INTEGRITY AND  
COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE**

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Report of | <b>CHIEF CONSTABLE</b>  |
| Subject   | <b>EVALUATION OF OP EDISON ONE YEAR ON AND LESSONS LEARNT</b> |
| Date      | <b>FRIDAY 24 JUNE 2016 – 2:00 p.m.</b>                        |
| Author    | <b>INSPECTOR PETE WILLIAMS, CHANGE TEAM</b>                   |

**Purpose of Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to provide information about the 12 month review of Project (Op) Edison. Op Edison was the name given to the transformational change project which realised £10.2 million in efficiencies.

**Recommendation**

2. It is recommended that committee members note the content of this report.

**Background**

3. In June 2013, the Change Plan was agreed by the PCC which set out the following strategic objective:  

**‘With our staff and partners, transform the way we protect our communities and deliver over £20m in revenue savings by 2016.’**
4. An important element of meeting that objective was the implementation of Project Edison, which utilised end-to-end demand analysis to design a new policing model to manage volume demand more efficiently and effectively.
5. The force decided to reinvest some of the proposed £20m savings into the new model, and as a result has realised savings rising to £10.2M per annum by the end of the financial year 2016/17. (**Source- Edison 6 Month Review Report - October 2015**). At the one year point these savings are confirmed as achieved by the Finance Department.
6. The amended policing model was implemented on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2015. This has proved to have the resilience to adapt to new risks and threats, and take advantage of opportunities to refine and introduce better ways of working. This

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

has been achieved while ensuring sufficient control to prevent deviation in any one area that may have undermined the model by shifting demand elsewhere.

7. Within 2 months of introducing the new structure, the force introduced a new crime and investigation recording system, moving from CIS to NICHE. While the introduction of NICHE has provided a number of benefits to the force, it also brings challenges in relation to understanding of data extraction compared to CIS and resourcing implications for the analytical teams. This continues to be an area of development.
8. Any proposed changes to the model in the early stages were managed through the Change Board to ensure the focus of the single force model was not lost, and to allow changes to be considered and properly governed. This worked well and contributed to the successful delivery of the project.
9. An external audit conducted by independent auditors Baker Tilley, reported in April 2015 regarding the overall Change Programme. Their report said:  
  
**“Taking account of the issues identified, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Force can take substantial assurance that the controls upon which the organisation relies to manage this risk are suitably designed, consistently applied and effective.”**
10. To date there have been no significant deviations from the core model. There have been minor changes to the model within the Investigation Management Unit, mainly around procedural and culture change, delivering enhanced training to address specific needs and the implementation of the new crime and intelligence system NICHE. A business case was agreed at the October 2015 change board to refine the Managed Appointments Unit processes through the station-based diary process, as a result of continuous improvement work that identified opportunities for improvements.
11. In order to combat the risks associated with the growth in safeguarding demand a 1.99% precept growth was agreed by the PCC. This may require the model to be further refined when introducing the additional staff this will provide. This programme of work is being done in conjunction with the Change Team to ensure consistency.

### **Evaluation**

12. With the new model came an opportunity to think differently about the review process, as it is difficult to measure the new model against the old one using more traditional measures. Successful evaluation should be an ongoing process of continuous improvement and this has focussed upon...
  - Implementation and embedding of the new policing model (0-4months)
  - Embedding of the new policing model and benefits realisation (4-8 months)
  - Mature assessment of the model in meeting efficient and effective service delivery and identification of areas for improvement (12 months)
13. Reviews at the three, six and twelve month points were also conducted ensuring the strategic objective was delivered across the following outcome areas:-

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- Levels of user satisfaction
  - Recorded crime levels
  - Crime outcome levels
  - Recorded incident levels
  - Antisocial Behaviour Incidents
  - Call handling times
  - Percentage of graded incidents
  - Visibility
  - Crime investigation length
14. Analysis has been conducted throughout the implementation period and the metrics pre and post changes compared and a summary of the key themes arising along with recommendations has been provided.
  15. Edison changes reduced the establishment by over 200 police officers, with a renewed focus on taking a proportionate approach to threat, risk and harm and putting the remaining resources where they are needed most. The changes to the policing structures are significant, meaning any comparison should be done carefully.
  16. Overall the model has embedded well and become business as usual. It has demonstrated the resilience to cope with exceptional events and demand. Work flows smoothly through the model and all departments are working hard to deliver the one force approach to reducing threat risk and harm to the communities we serve.

### **User Satisfaction**

17. User satisfaction surveys are conducted 6-12 weeks after a crime/ incident has occurred. With this in mind the effect of the changes on this measure can be viewed in a number of ways. The latest All User Satisfaction level shows satisfaction at 80.1% (February 2015 – January 16). The level has been in decline since October 2014 but over the past three months has shown signs of stabilising, however for Vehicle Crime and Violent Crime this is at a lower level than prior to the changes.
18. Looking at the department of the officer in the case demonstrates the satisfaction rates for FIU and IMU departments. The highest satisfaction level being reported by Beaumont Leys FIU (85.2%), and the lowest being shown by victims dealt with by Keyham Lane FIU (76.5%). The IMU had the highest number of surveys completed (341), and had a satisfaction level at 78.6%.
19. With the introduction of the IMU, the Force was aware of the issues that may arise with the change in procedure relating to vehicle crime, and the other types of offences which are now being routed through the department. A recommendation was made in relation to this is to review how victims are informed of the process, and to incorporate managing expectations into interactions with reporters of these types of crime. This remains in progress through the Confidence and Satisfaction Tactical Group.

### **Recorded Crime**

20. Comparing 12 months of data (February 15 to January 16), against the data collected pre Edison (October 19<sup>th</sup> 14 to 8<sup>th</sup> February 15), the proportions of crimes reported within each category are relatively similar. The average

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

number of cases reported per day prior to the changes was roughly 160 per day, whereas for the 12 month period after there were on average 165 reports per day. There are some minor variations within some of the categories; however, these variations could be attributed to the introduction of Niche rather than the restructuring of the Force.

### **Crime Outcomes**

21. The number of crimes with an outcome has decreased slightly from 71.8% (pre Edison) compared with 70.2% (post Edison), however due to the time period being addressed this is to be expected due to changes in recording practices. In terms of the proportion of offences which have been closed as charged there is a 2% significant difference between pre and post structural changes, 9.6% before and 7.6% after. Cases closed as suspect no further action (NFA) evidence difficulties has significantly decreased (from 8.2% to 6.8%).
22. There is ongoing work being undertaken with regards to Niche, and performance monitoring.

### **Incidents**

23. The distribution of incidents over the categories has remained relatively static, with a slight increase in antisocial behaviour (ASB) incidents (7.2%) and Crime related incidents (25.3%). There has been an increase identified in the Countesthorpe area which is being addressed through the local partnership.
24. In terms of the grading of incidents the number of grade 1 and 2 incidents has remained static, however the number of negotiated response calls has seen a decrease (19.3%, compared with the 23.3% observed in the previous paper, conversely the number of non-attendant calls have increased to 40.5%.
25. Specifically relating to antisocial behaviour incidents there has been an increase in the number of ASB incidents graded as ARN, which represents 79% of all ASB reporting. In terms of the grading of these ASB incidents these have also shown a similar pattern to incidents overall, however the change in negotiated response and non-attendant call is more significant (negotiated response from 40.3% to 28.2%, and non-attendant 13.2% to 23.7%).
26. Examining response to all incidents there is further evidence to suggest that the new model has been successfully employed in terms of the proportion of incidents showing NPA officers as the dealing officer at 19.4% compared with 80.6% showing PRT officers as attending (Appendix Table 2.6). It is evident that the model is working in terms of ensuring the right departments are attending the right types of incidents.
27. Looking at arrival times there has been a significant increase in the average time to arrive at incidents with the change over to the new structure; however both averages are within normal thresholds (as soon as possible for emergency calls and 2 hours for priority calls). A significant finding in relation to both types of calls relates to the increasing number of calls that are graded as 1 or 2 and are attended above the requisite time. These incidents have continued above previous observed frequencies over the last 12 months.
28. In terms of attendance by Response Officers (PRT) there were some changes to the talk groups after the 9<sup>th</sup> February changes, which came into effect during July 15. These changes were brought in due to an increase in time to attend

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

incidents over some of the Force area. The effect on the attendance times should be seen over time. A higher proportion of incidents are attended by officers from Braunstone and Loughborough Hubs. Average attendance times across all the hubs and NPA's are within normal thresholds, however since October there has been a steady increase in the average number of priority calls being attended by Braunstone officers.

29. Further work has been done around those incidents which are recorded as one grade, and appear to be another, to examine any trends in these incidents. This is currently being examined by CMD and PRT.

### **Visibility**

30. To varying degrees the level of visibility for NPAs and PRT hubs has improved under the new structure, the largest difference being by officers from East Leicester from 46.6% to 57.2%, and Charnwood from 49.1% to 59%. This was an important aim of the new model and is subject to continued scrutiny.

### **Call Handling Times**

31. The number of emergency calls answered within 10 seconds has stabilised at 86.7% (9<sup>th</sup> February 15 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 16) compared with 88.4% (19<sup>th</sup> October 14 to 8<sup>th</sup> February 15). The number of non-emergency calls answered in 30 seconds has however significantly decreased examining the same time periods, 73% compared with 80.9%
32. This again has had an effect on abandoned non-emergency calls where the proportion of abandoned calls has risen from 3.6, to 7.9%, which is more pronounced during busy months.

### **Crime Investigations**

33. Since the implementation of the new model there has been a significant change in the length of case in relation to reported crime. Prior to the changes the average length of case was 22.7 days, after the new structure was applied that decreased to 17.8 days (February 15 to January 16). Examining the latest data to September 15 to January 16 the average length of case was 18.8 days. This shows the model has been effective in reducing the time taken to investigate crime.
34. Case progression data was extracted through use of officer collar numbers. In terms of volumes of cases / investigations going through different directorates there has been significant changes in a number of areas which was previously highlighted. Since the last report there has been an increase in the number of cases being held in the IMU (34.9%), followed by the FIU's at Beaumont Leys (11.9%), Euston Street (10.7%) and Keyham Lane (7.2%). This is in line with model expectations.
35. The data in relation to crime investigations demonstrates that for the most part the new structure is working for the NPA's and PRT, and for the FIU's. Some of the issues previously highlighted for the IMU have been resolved, and work remains on going for the remainder.

# NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

## **Twelve Month Review Process and Workshops**

36. The current policing model has been in place for over 12 months. This was seen as a significant enough period to allow the model to be called mature, have embedded within the organisation and for the strengths and weaknesses to become apparent following earlier assessment. Adopting a continuous improvement methodology, it made sound business sense to conduct a mature assessment of the model and seek to continually address areas for improvement, linking these to a cultural assessment of the organisation in meeting efficient and effective service delivery. Model changes advocated a one force approach but not all departments were included within the model changes. This led to certain work flows into and out of the model that were not particularly smoothly and that impacted on staff time.
37. For this reason senior managers from across the whole force, not just departments changed by the model were brought together to provide a more holistic view of where we are one year on. The findings of the day would also provide valuable information for the Strategic Alliance team. Attendees were expected to attend with a thorough knowledge of their area of business and how this contributed to the one force approach we have adopted.
38. Attendees were encouraged to go back to the Process Solution Document (the “plan”) to understand how closely (or not) their area of business adhered to the model aims, how closely the demand matched (or not) what the model forecast, and whether their establishment numbers were sufficient to service it. Having a full understanding before the event helped ensure the aims of the day could be met within the timescales provided. This also allowed constructive challenge to take place within the time provided.
39. The new process was intended to minimise the impact of any review process on senior officer time by reducing the amount of time spent between identification of issue and implementation of solution, while still providing sufficient governance. ACC Kay facilitated the workshop and discussion, setting the scene and expectations. Performance data over the year was gathered where available and an overview was then presented to the group.
40. Starting with Contact Management Department the flow of work was followed through the different departments that made up the model, and then the force. The department head talked through the role of their department, how closely it adhered to the pure Edison model and whether anything needed to change to improve efficiency going forwards. Significantly, the department head was expected to talk about not just the good work being done, but to admit to others where and how their department could do better and the knock on effect for others. This demonstrates a deeper understanding of their area of business, and already focuses the mind upon potential solutions.
41. The other department heads then discussed the interdependencies and pros and cons of such a change before moving onto the next department and repeating the process until all had been reviewed. To facilitate the day the De Bono six hats thinking tool was used to assess all departments across the model. This improved communication, and assist with capturing thoughts, ideas and feelings concisely by focusing thought processes. Concern, Control and Countermeasure was then used to have a mature discussion about the information gathered during the six hats by the exercise. This information was

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

then condensed into themes and finally into actions that will be suitable for progression.

42. Prior to the review day other key stakeholders in the process were also consulted, and an event was conducted with front line officers utilising similar methodology for consistency. As deliverers of the model, it was necessary to ensure that a realistic snap shot from the shop floor was incorporated into the 12 month review. This group will continue to meet periodically to improve the flow of information up and down the organisational command structure.
43. A new C/Inspector delivery group has been formed with representatives across the force in order to progress the agreed actions. This is another new approach to continuous improvement and evaluation. The group is intended to drive and regularly assess the effect of changes made, and turn strategic direction into tactical delivery. This group will assess information from a number of sources to ensure the progression of actions and improve communication between the various departments that make up the model.

### **Summary and Next Steps**

44. Overall the model has embedded well and become business as usual. It has demonstrated the resilience to cope with exceptional events and demand. Work flows smoothly through the model and all departments are working hard to deliver the one force approach to reducing threat risk and harm to the communities we serve.
45. There has been very little deviation from the core model and there is sufficient governance in place to ensure that any changes proposed are fully thought through. There will likely be further refinements to processes as things embed further and this will lead to improved efficiency. This is overseen by the Change Board, led by DCC Bannister. The cashable savings of £10.2m have been fully realised.
46. The culture change required has taken place, although this needs to be regularly monitored. The model was able to continue to perform when the system it was built around was replaced by a completely new crime and intelligence system, and the very significant challenges this presented.
47. The intention going forwards is to review the model each anniversary with department heads using the methodology described above as part of business as usual. Supported by the C/Insp delivery group and fed by information from the officers and staff working across the model. This will provide a continuous flow of information up and down the model structure for reality checking purposes. This is in addition to the regular scrutiny provided by the performance delivery group (PDG)
48. This structure provides the scrutiny and governance that allows the natural refinement of the model to take place outside of the change board process, and encourages ownership of the policing model by department heads and those who work within it. The change board would periodically be updated on the progress of the delivery group, and would still consider any business cases that arose as a result due to the already embedded change tolerance process.
49. The driver for forces since the early 1980's has been to increase efficiency and effectiveness and deliver value for money. By adapting our review processes to

## NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

make good use of continuous improvement techniques we become more business-like and recognise those aims.

50. The Police and Crime Commissioner can be assured that Leicestershire Police continues to deliver a quality service to the people of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and is doing this with a reduced number of officers and staff, and at a much reduced cost.

### **Implications**

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Financial:                     | £10.2m savings were identified as a key element of the project.  |
| Legal:                         | None applicable to this report.  |
| Equality Impact Assessment:    | A full EIA was completed and regularly reviewed as part of the project.  |
| Risks and Impact:              | A full register of risks along with a risk log was compiled, reviewed and managed throughout the project life cycle. |
| Link to Police and Crime Plan: | As advised in point 3 of this report.  |
| Communications:                | Communication took place throughout the project life cycle.  |

### **List of Appendices**

None.

### **Background Papers**

The following documents provide evidence of the comprehensive review process put in place around the Edison model following go live and have been referred to when writing this report:

- KPMG Final Benefits report- March 2015
- Edison Action Plan- March 2015
- NICHE Implementation Resource report – March 2015
- Proposed Temporary Uplift to IMU- April 2015
- IMU CI Team Policing Model Review April-June 2015
- IMU Life Cycle Flowchart- date unknown
- Strategic Assurance Board report- June 2015
- Threat assessment Unit Analyst Report - June 2015
- Edison 3 Month Review Report – June 2015
- NICHE in the IMU Report - July 2015
- IMU Project Charter - July 2015
- IMU CI Team Evaluation – July 2015
- Threat assessment Unit Analyst Report - September 2015
- Edison 6 Month Review Report - October 2015
- Edison Practitioner Workshop – March 2016
- Edison C/Insp Delivery Group Action Plan – April 2016

### **Person to Contact**

Inspector Pete Williams, Force Change Team

Tel: 0116 2483989, email: [Peter.Williams@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Peter.Williams@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk)