

**ORIGINATOR: CHIEF CONSTABLE**

**PAPER NO: AP1777**

**SUBMITTED TO: ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE PANEL –  
24 FEBRUARY 2017**

**SUBJECT: SUFFOLK LOCAL POLICING MODEL - EVALUATION**

**SUMMARY:**

1. This report provides the second set of interim findings from the evaluation of the Suffolk Local Policing Model.
2. A final evaluation report will be presented to this panel in April 2017.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The Accountability and Performance Panel is asked to note the contents of this report.

## DETAIL OF THE SUBMISSION

### 1. KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- 1.1. Suffolk Constabulary implemented changes to its local policing model (known as the Suffolk Local Policing Review or SLPR) in April 2016 in order to adjust to changing forms of demand and meet savings requirements. The new policing model involved the restructure of response teams, neighbourhood teams, police stations, investigative teams and the community safety department.
- 1.2. New working practices were introduced including a realignment of working hours for PCSOs, revised terms of reference for response officers and the introduction of a new Incident and Crime Management Hub to deal with desk based investigations and diarised appointments. The Constabulary also built on changes implemented in 2015, including the deployment of the Threat, Harm, Risk, Investigation, Vulnerability and Engagement (THRIVE) triage model.
- 1.3. The key points of the new policing model are best summarised as follows:
  - a) Calls within Contact and Control Room (CCR) assessed for individual need and resources deployed accordingly: resulting in a small increase in emergencies but an overall reduction in demand for response officers.
  - b) A leaner and refocussed response function to deal primarily with emergencies.
  - c) A leaner and refocussed neighbourhood policing function to primarily work on community problem solving and protecting vulnerable people.
  - d) An enhanced desk-based investigation function supported by divisional investigation teams to attend scheduled appointments.
  - e) A smaller number of police front counters and greater focus on dealing with calls for service online, by appointment or on the telephone.
- 1.4. The first interim report on the findings of the SLPR evaluation which focused on analysis of data, concluded that the policing model is generally functioning as planned but in a challenging environment. This second interim report presents the findings of public, partner and staff consultation.
- 1.5. Between November and December 2016, the Constabulary invited open response from 567 community and statutory partners including 323 parish and town councils and over 200 contacts within other agencies. 31 responses were received – a response rate of just over 5%. As such the findings presented here should be interpreted with caution and not interpreted as the views of the majority.
- 1.6. The Constabulary has analysed these free text responses in detail, and has developed a coding framework to identify recurring themes. The most frequently raised identified are presented in this report.
- 1.7. The Constabulary also invited its own staff and officers to submit feedback and sent staff to officer briefings to collect views and opinions on the SLPR model. Due to the collective nature of some of this internal consultation it is not possible to be precise about the number of officers who contributed. These views were coded using the same method as responses from external parties.

## Community and Statutory Partner Consultation Findings

- 1.8. The most frequently observed view of community representatives was that the frequency and scope of local visible patrols has reduced (8 respondents). However, while this theme was reported more often than any other, the majority of respondents (23) did not express this view.
- 1.9. The second most common observation (6 respondents) was that the volume and/or quality of feedback on the implementation and results of the SLPR was not adequate. Again the majority (25) of respondents did not express this view.
- 1.10. Five community representatives or statutory partners indicated the following three items applied. Firstly that they had some difficulty now in accessing local crime statistics, secondly that they perceived the priorities of hidden harm and online crime to be inconsistent with the policing priorities of their local area and thirdly, they perceived that the changes to PCSO working times had meant some adverse impact in their area.
- 1.11. Statutory partner agencies reported general support for the model identifying that Safer Neighbourhood Teams are working well.

## Staff Consultation Findings

- 1.12. Staff feedback was in the main specific to the respondent's working area and as such fewer consistent themes emerged. All of the technical issues raised were previously identified in the data analysis section of the evaluation, and will be within the final evaluation report.
- 1.13. There was general support for the working principles of the SLPR and some staff reported that workloads had either reduced or had the potential to reduce.
- 1.14. The three most commonly reported themes were firstly, less capacity since the implementation of the model, secondly that abstractions of staff from their core role was having some impact on their effectiveness and thirdly that internal communications about the working of the SLPR could be improved.

## Next Steps

- 1.15. Work is underway to prepare a final evaluation report bringing together the findings of data analysis with those presented in this report. The full evaluation of the SLPR will be produced in March 2017 and a report on that evaluation made to the Accountability and Performance Panel in April 2017. The Constabulary will prioritise actions derived from this evaluation and present details of the actions it is taking within the April report.

## **2. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 2.1. The financial implications of introducing this new policing model have been outlined throughout this report.

## **3. OTHER IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

- 3.1. None.

| <b>ORIGINATOR CHECKLIST (MUST BE COMPLETED)</b>   | <b>PLEASE STATE<br/>'YES' OR 'NO'</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Has legal advice been sought on this submission?  | <b>No</b>                             |
| Has the PCC's Chief Finance Officer been consulted?   | <b>No</b>                             |
| Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered including equality analysis, as appropriate? | <b>Yes</b>                            |
| Have human resource implications been considered?   | <b>Yes</b>                            |
| Is the recommendation consistent with the objectives in the Police and Crime Plan?                                  | <b>Yes</b>                            |
| Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?               | <b>Yes</b>                            |
| Has communications advice been sought on areas of likely media interest and how they might be managed?              | <b>No</b>                             |
| Have all relevant ethical factors been taken into consideration in developing this submission?                      | <b>Yes</b>                            |