

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Appendix 3

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
BOCU 'Receipt of a complaint at the front counter' Issue No.1	OBJ 1, 2	Currently, a member of the public enters the police station to make a complaint and is initially spoken to by a Station reception officer (SRO) or a Constable. As a result, the customer (complainant) is told to wait whilst a supervising officer (Sgt/Insp) is contacted to deal with the complaint. The complaint is received by the supervisor and dependant upon the discretion of this officer, is recorded on a form 3352.	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Retention of current standards</i></p> 1 Currently, a member of the public enters the police station to make a complaint and is initially spoken to by a Station reception officer (SRO) or a Constable. As a result, the customer (complainant) is told to wait whilst a supervising officer (Sgt/Insp) is contacted to deal with the complaint. 2 The complaint is received by the supervisor and if identified as a S.65 (Police Act 1996) complaint, an allegation of misconduct by a police officer must recorded on a form F3352. 3 When an officer is approached in the street by a customer (complainant), the officer is required to contact the Duty Officer/officer designated, if immediate action is required. 4 In any case, the officer is directed to make a pocket book entry and direct the customer (complainant) to the nearest police station. The officer must then inform the Duty Officer/officer designated. 5 If public complaint, recorded on F3352 by Duty Officer/officer designated 6 A customer (complainant) telephones a police station to make a complaint. 7 If the telephone call is received by a CAD operator, a CAD message is created and attempts to locate a supervisor are made.	These processes are the subject of ongoing research. The expected outcomes of the research will realise: - Reduction of time taken by BOCU personnel in fielding public complaints leading to 'efficiency gains' Increased public knowledge of the complaints system leading to 'customer satisfaction' and increased 'public confidence' Increased recording of public complaints leading to 'a rise in the quantity and quality of intelligence on the nature of complaints, complainants and those complained against'
	PI I, V, VI			
	STRAND A, B			
BOCU 'Receipt of a complaint in the street' Issue No. 2	OBJ 1, 2	Currently when an officer is approached in the street by a customer (complainant), the officer is required to contact the Duty Officer if immediate action is required. In any case, the officer is directed to make a pocket book entry and direct the customer (complainant) to the nearest police station. The officer must then inform the Duty Officer.	6 A customer (complainant) telephones a police station to make a complaint. 7 If the telephone call is received by a CAD operator, a CAD message is created and attempts to locate a supervisor are made.	Increased recording of public complaints leading to 'a rise in the quantity and quality of intelligence on the nature of complaints, complainants and those complained against'
	PI I, V, VI			
	STRAND A, B			
BOCU 'Receipt of a complaint by telephone' Issue No.3	OBJ 1, 2	A customer complainant telephones a police station to make a complaint. If the telephone call is received by a CAD operator, a CAD message is created and attempts to locate a supervisor are made. There is potential for telephone complaints to be 'lost' if the person receiving the call chooses not to record it as such.	6 A customer (complainant) telephones a police station to make a complaint. 7 If the telephone call is received by a CAD operator, a CAD message is created and attempts to locate a supervisor are made.	Increased recording of public complaints leading to 'a rise in the quantity and quality of intelligence on the nature of complaints, complainants and those complained against'
	PI I, V, VI			
	STRAND A, B			

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits	
BOCU 'Receipt of a complaint by a letter' Issue No. 4	OBJ 1, 2	Currently, these are dealt with in an ad hoc manner within the Command. The letter is normally forwarded to ACUs through BOCUs, or they are distributed geographically by CIB2. They may be recorded on CDS.	8	An immediate response to public complaints by telephone investigators empowered for decision making leading to; 'a reduction in the time taken to investigate public complaints'; 'a filter to ensure that priority is given where appropriate' and; 'efficiency gains'	
	PI I, V, VI		9		
	STRAND A, B		10		
BOCU 'Receipt of a complaint by a prisoner' Issue No. 5	OBJ 1, 2	Currently, the custody officer has the responsibility of recording complaints on the custody record. They should be recorded on F3352 by the Inspector dealing with the complaint.	10	<u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS= Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =	
	PI I, V, VI		11		
	STRAND A, B		12		
BOCU 'Critical Incident' now 'Mandatory Investigations' Issue No. 6	OBJ 1, 2	BOCUs are currently determining their own definition of Critical Incidents by virtue of MPS policy. Whenever a perceived Critical Incident occurs advice is sought from either CIB2 or the local ACU on an ad hoc basis. There is no clear guidance on these issues	13	A corporate standard still has to be formulated for this process and is identified as a 'gap'.	
	PI II, III, VIII				<u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS= Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =
	STRAND A, B				

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
BOCU 'Internal Investigations' Issue No. 7	OBJ 1, 3	Enquiries into failures in standards initiated otherwise than by way of "Public Complaints". There is anecdotal evidence that the introduction of the 'Written Warning Procedure' has led to confusion at BOCU level over the continued use of the Divisional Discipline Book.	14 This corporate standard still awaits consultative group process 15 There should be a 'Corporate Standard' decision matrix as guidance for dealing with internal informal and formal routes for reporting a 'Failure in Standards'. 16 Adoption of the terms 'Failure in Standards' to deal with minor breaches of misconduct; 'Informal Investigations' to deal with areas of increased concern i.e.	Efficiency gains: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where the number of cases referred to DPS for investigation is reduced Bureaucracy reduction: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in use of F162 Process • Commanders provided guidance within the matrix in order to achieve 'corporacy' in the use of the written warning procedures. • Reduction in referrals to DPS Opportunities: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support of the Corruption, Dishonesty Prevention Strategy: - • in the development of methods to detect 'early warning' • process that will deliver greater accountability and management intervention at BOCUs. • parity of decision making
	PI III, IV, VI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV		16.1 that an officer has frequently failed in the delivery of the standards expected of him, 16.2 the circumstances warrant a referral to a more senior officer, 16.3 it is necessary to carry out preliminary enquiries to establish the failure in standards (Phase2). 16.4 Phase 2 investigations to be recorded on F162. 16.5 The recording of minor misconduct, formerly known as 'pocket book cautions' to be dealt with by way of evidence in the supervisor's pocket book (Phase1). 16.5.4 See attached decision matrix APPENDIX 'D'	
	STRAND A, B, C		16.6 The supervisor's pocket book entry to be used as evidence for use in annual appraisals (Phase1) 16.7 All F162s to be copied and forwarded to the DPS. 16.8 F162s can be used for intelligence and information purposes. This supports the Corruption, Dishonesty Prevention Strategy in the development of methods to detect 'early warning' of potential problems.	

Directorate of Professional Standards

PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
			<p>16.9 Guidance for BOCU Commanders for circumstances when the DPS will conduct investigations to be included on the matrix.</p> <p>16.10 BOCU Commanders should be provided guidance within the matrix in order to achieve 'corporacy' in the use of the written warning procedures, whilst also providing clear direction for the standards to be applied to the acceptance of investigations by the DPS. There has been a clear misuse of written warnings in cases, such as dishonesty. This will enhance awareness of appropriate use of such disposals, whilst also forming part of SGW.</p> <p>16.11 Internal investigations reports 'requests to DPS' from BOCU Commanders must be subjected to Screening, Grading and Weighting. Requests must be made either through the Complaints Management Unit, or 'Reserve Line' (out of hours).</p>	<p><u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS= Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =</p>

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
ACU 'Letters to Customer (complainant)' Issue No. 8	OBJ 1, 3, 4	<p>Currently two letters are sent to the customer (complainant) at 14 day and 21 day intervals. The first letter is a standard contact letter. The second letter is delivered by means of recorded delivery. The purpose of the 21 day letter is to provide evidence for an application for 'Dispensation' from the PCA.</p>	<p>17</p> <p>There should be 'Corporate Standards' in the methods employed to make contact with customer (complainants) pan London.</p> <p>17.1 There should be evidenced (decision log) attempts to contact the customer (complainant) by telephone and/or by way of personal visit, if appropriate.</p> <p>17.2 I.O.s to include evidence of all other ancillary enquiries made to trace the customer (complainant).</p> <p>17.3 The enquiries to trace and contact the customer (complainant) can be carried out and recorded on behalf of the I.O. by any DPS officer, and recorded on the decision log.</p>	<p>Efficiency gains: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> where tasks are carried out at an appropriate level. <p>Opportunities: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> customer satisfaction <p><u>Measurable</u></p> <p>Efficiency Gain</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=£37,740.51</p> <p>Bureaucracy Reduction</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=14 Days</p> <p>Intelligence</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Satisfaction</p> <p>=</p>
	PI IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, XI, XII, XIII, X, XVI	<p>Currently, the majority of ACUs do not make attempts to telephone or make any other form of enquiries to trace the customer (complainant).</p>		
	STRAND B, C, E			
ACU 'Service of 163s (Reg. 9 Notices) on Customer (officers)' Issue No. 9	OBJ 1, 3	<p>Currently the I.O. prepares the F163s for service on officers subject of an investigation. The F163s are either served by the I.O. or are forwarded with the file to BOCU for service.</p>	<p>18</p> <p>Any DPS investigator can serve F163s on an officer under investigation</p> <p>18.1 Service to be completed within 10 working days of receipt at BOCU</p>	<p>Efficiency gains: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> where tasks are carried out at an appropriate level. timeliness less cases being rejected for procedural irregularities <p>Opportunities: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased customer satisfaction. <p><u>Measurable</u></p> <p>Efficiency Gain</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=£12,651.16</p> <p>Satisfaction=</p>
	PI IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, XI, XIII, XIV, XV	<p>On completion of the service of 163s the file is returned to the ACU.</p>		
	STRAND B, C, D			

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
<p>ACU 'Initial Action by I.O. – Sub-judice'</p> <p>Issue No. 10</p>	<p>OBJ 1, 3, 4</p> <hr/> <p>PI IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI.</p> <hr/> <p>STRAND A, B, C, E</p>	<p>Currently, if a customer (complainant) makes a complaint against a customer (officer) and the customer (complainant) is the subject of a criminal charge, the complaint is not fully investigated until the completion of criminal proceedings.</p> <p>In the main, ACU staff (police officers) monitor the progress of the case.</p> <p>A letter is forwarded to the customer (complainant) explaining the various options. Frequently complaints are made on behalf of these individuals by their solicitors and all correspondence or contact with the customer (complainant) is dealt with through these channels.</p>	<p>19 This issue is currently the subject of Counsels Advice.</p> <p>19.1 The DPS will fully investigate all public complaints subject of sub-judice, where there are clear indications of the nature of the allegation(s). (i.e. There is a statement of facts provided by correspondence, solicitors' representation or by other means recorded on the F3352)</p> <p>19.2 The letter to the customer (complainant) should include the HRA issues relating to both customers.</p> <p>19.3 The DPS should be prepared to become involved in investigations where there may be a requirement to disclose evidence for a defence case in criminal proceedings.</p> <p>19.4 Use of the CDS 'Bring Forward' system for the monitoring of the progress of cases subject of sub-judice, by administration staff.</p> <p>19.5 There is currently a project being conducted by Sue KNIGHT and Steve DAN at Norbury that is reviewing this subject. These options should be forwarded to them for consideration.</p> <p>19.6 Learning Lab issue.</p>	<p><u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS= Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS=£722.40 Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =</p>

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
<p>ACU 'Receipt of Complaint' Issue No. 11</p>	<p>STRAND A, B, C, D, E.</p>	<p>Having received the completed F3352 an ACU Superintendent decides whether it is a public complaint. The form is also checked for evidence of attempts at IIR by BOCU. If remedial action at BOCU is required, the file is returned.</p>	<p>20 This issue is the subject of further research by SEO HARRIGAN who will conduct a scoping and costing exercise around these issues</p>	<p>Efficiency gains: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prioritisation • SGW • complaints management • resource management • appropriate empowerment to deal with complainants 'front end' – timeliness • appropriate use of risk management • appropriate ranks aligned to accountability <p>Opportunities: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • customer satisfaction • increased intelligence • 'freeing up' of staff for demand reduction <p>Bureaucracy reduction: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complaints issues dealt with by management unit on complaint receipt
	<p>OBJ 1, 2, 3,4</p>	<p>If remedial action is not required, the Superintendent appoints an I.O. at the ACU.</p> <p>There is little evidence of procedure for complaints received by telephone at ACUs</p>	<p>20.1 The creation of a central DPS Complaints Management Unit (CMU) for the reception of all F3352s, letters or other correspondence relating to complaints against the police.</p> <p>20.2 The management of the CMU to be responsibility of DCS (Borough Support) and would be assisted by D/Supts. (Borough Support)</p> <p>20.3 The introduction of a screening, grading and weighting (SGW) system as a measurement method for the appropriate use of resources.</p> <p>20.4 SGW to form part of the process for the appointment of I.O.s by D.Supt. (Borough Support) Operations, thereby achieving appropriate communications between Borough Support command and the new 'Branch Commanders' on resource management.</p> <p>20.5 Any complaints against a Superintendent or above must be referred to Commander O&I.</p> <p>20.6 Any complaint received by telephone should follow the 'Corporate Standard'. Issue No.3. The complaint should then be transferred by fax/email to the BOCU, if not resolved, for action within 24 hours.</p> <p>20.7 The F3352 should be forwarded to BOCU to arrive within 3 working days for attempts at IIR.</p> <p>20.8 Retention of current 'interim position' for ACPO resilience.</p> <p>20.9 Commander O&I will review those investigations dealing with: -</p> <p>20.10 <u>Racially discriminatory behaviour</u></p>	
	<p>PI II, IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI.</p>		<p>20.10.1 When the Investigating</p>	

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
			<p>Officer (IO): -</p> <p>20.10.2 Proposes 'Dispensation',</p> <p>20.10.3 Concludes an allegation to be 'Unsubstantiated' or,</p> <p>20.10.4 Submits papers to the Crown Prosecution Service</p> <p>20.11 <u>Irregularities in evidence</u></p> <p>20.11.1 When the Investigating Officer (IO): -</p> <p>20.11.2 Proposes 'Dispensation',</p> <p>20.12 <u>Corrupt practice</u></p> <p>20.13 When the Investigating Officer (IO): -</p> <p>20.13.1 Proposes 'Dispensation',</p> <p>20.13.2 Concludes an allegation to be 'Unsubstantiated' or,</p> <p>20.13.3 Submits papers to the Crown Prosecution Service</p> <p>21 <u>Other Investigations to be forwarded to Commander O&I</u></p> <p>21.1 It is acknowledged that there are other investigations that require a direct ACPO input. They are determined to be those that have <i>evidence of</i>: -</p> <p>21.2 Public Interest (Intense media interest etc)</p> <p>21.3 Collateral damage to the MPS is likely</p> <p>21.4 Potential damage to harmony within a community</p> <p>21.5 VIPs concerned</p> <p>21.6 Racially motivated misconduct</p> <p>22 <u>Other proposals for 'Dispensation' and investigations where there is no suggestion that a criminal offence may have been committed by an officer and are concluded to be 'Unsubstantiated' will be submitted by the IO direct to the PCA.</u> (Local unit processes in relation to Superintendents supervising case paper submissions can be followed whilst the project team work towards our 'Corporate Standards')</p> <p>23 Commander D/C&A will review all substantiated public complaints and all substantiated internal investigations that result in recommendations for either formal or informal discipline.</p>	<p><u>Measurable</u></p> <p>Efficiency Gain</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Bureaucracy Reduction</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Intelligence</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Satisfaction</p> <p>=</p>

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
<p>ACU ' Initial Meeting with the Complainant '</p> <p>Informal Resolutions Not Proceeded With(s) Withdrawn(s)</p> <p>Issue No. 12</p>	<p>OBJ</p> <p>1, 3, 4</p>	<p>Currently, the IO meets with the customer (complainant) and explains the options for the conduct of the investigation. Dependent upon the wishes of the customer (complainant) the allegations against a customer (officer) are the subject of informal resolution (IR), they are withdrawn (W), not proceeded with (NPW) or they are the subject of a full enquiry.</p>	<p>24</p> <p>There should be a 'Corporate Standard' for the recording of customer (complainant) decisions.</p> <p>24.1 A statement should be obtained for all (IIR), (IR), (W) and (NPW). The signing of the F3352 for (IIR) & (IR) no longer necessary.</p> <p>24.2 A corporate standard for the content of the statement should be adopted</p> <p>24.3 The service of F163s should be expedited (See recommendation 9)</p> <p>24.4 Completed file through CMU</p>	<p>Efficiency gains: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delay in the service of F163s in these cases is reduced. • timeliness in processes that follow • evidence to reduce opportunities for litigation <p>Opportunities: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • customer satisfaction <p><u>Measurable</u></p> <p>Efficiency Gain</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=£235,017.69</p> <p>Bureaucracy Reduction</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Intelligence</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Satisfaction</p> <p>=</p>
	<p>PI</p> <p>V, VIII, IX, XIV, XVI.</p>	<p>If the allegations are the subject of being (W) or (NPW) a statement is obtained. If the allegation is the subject of (IR) the F3352 is signed.</p> <p>In the case of (IR) a F163D is served on the customer (officer). In the case of (W) or (NPW) a F163A is served on the customer (officer).</p>		
	<p>STRAND</p> <p>B, D, E</p>	<p>The file is then returned to the ACU. A letter confirming (IR) is sent to the complainant.</p> <p>A minute is prepared on the file for the local Superintendent, signed and the file is 'Put-Away' at General Registry.</p>		

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
<p>ACU 'Dispensation'</p> <p>Issue No. 13</p>	<p>OBJ</p> <p>1, 2</p> <p>PI</p> <p>II, III, V, VII, IX, XIV, XVI</p> <p>STRANDS</p> <p>A, B, D, E</p>	<p>A dispensation may be sought in the following circumstances:</p> <p>Complainant is anonymous or refuses to cooperate.</p> <p>Complaint is vexatious, oppressive or otherwise an abuse of the procedure.</p> <p>Complaint is repetitious.</p> <p>A delay of 12 months or more between the incident and the making of the complaint.</p> <p>A pro-forma style report is submitted to the PCA detailing the reason(s) for the dispensation being sought.</p> <p>The file is returned agreeing or recommending that further enquiries should be made.</p> <p>Following agreement, the file is sent to General Registry and 'Put Away'.</p>	<p>25</p> <p>Guidance for I.O.s should be issued about an agreed standard with the PCA for dispensation reports.</p> <p>25.1 Adoption of an agreed 'proforma' report, to a maximum 3-page length.</p> <p>25.2 A copy of the dispensation pro-forma and supporting documents will be forwarded to the PCA. Should the matter require further investigation it will be returned to the IO.</p> <p>25.3 In addition to the current reasons for dispensation, continued research to be conducted regarding the possibility of an interim dispensation style report for cases where there are clear emerging findings that a complaint is not founded on fact, and there is no realistic prospect of successful proceedings ensuing. (see reports)</p> <p>25.4 Further Action: Decision deferred pending consultation with PCA</p> <p>25.4.1 <u>Learning Lab issue</u></p> <p>25.5 An 'applied' use in the SGW mechanism, of the regulations. 'Where to investigate the complaint would be disproportionate'.</p> <p>25.6 Further Action: Decision deferred pending consultation with PCA</p> <p>25.6.1 <u>Learning Lab issue</u></p>	<p>Efficiency gains: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • timeliness of report writing • timeliness with PCA - agreed format • reduction in full enquiries <p>Bureaucracy reduction: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • corporate report format • reduction in full report compilation <p>Opportunities: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • customer satisfaction • stakeholder partnerships <p><u>Measurable</u></p> <p>Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS=£13,475.77</p> <p>Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =</p>

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
ACU ' Reports' Issue No. 14	OBJ 1, 3	Currently, reports are compiled throughout the DPS in four (4) different formats, F3353, F3359, F728 and plain paper. The reports are prepared and assembled by police officers.	26 There should be a 'Corporate Standard' in the 'makeup' of the reports for submission to all 'key-stakeholders'. 27 Options	Efficiency gains: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • timeliness of report writing • timeliness with PCA/CPS - agreed formats • reduction in full enquiries • reduction in training requirements Bureaucracy reduction: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • corporate report format • reduction report compilation Opportunities: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • customer satisfaction • stakeholder partnerships
	PI V, VII, VIII, IX, XIV, XV, XVI	The format for the reports to the CPS and PCA differ, in that the conclusions of the report vary for each agency response. The reports are passed through a large number of supervisors before a decision is made at the appropriate levels, currently ACPO and Superintendents.	27.1 The adoption of one of the current complaints and discipline forms for completion of all reports to and from the DPS. 27.2 The adoption of MG Forms for the completion of all reports to and from the DPS 27.3 Adoption of a corporate format for reports 27.4 Introduction of file compilation according to recommended outcome. (IIR), (IR), (W) and (NPW) Files 27.6 (Retained in bulk docket) 27.7 <u>Dispensation Files</u>	
	STRANDS B, D, E	Remedial action is dealt with at various stages by the various supervisors concerned, and there appears to be little attempt to deal with qualitative issues in a corporate manner.	27.7.1 Vexatious 27.7.2 Repetitious 27.7.3 Unfounded 27.7.4 Non-cooperation (over 12 months) 27.7.5 Disproportionate 27.8 Dispensation File 27.8.1 Adopted Formatted Proforma (max. 3 Pages) 27.8.2 F3352 27.8.3 Reg. 9 Notices 27.8.4 Letters to/from customer (complainant) 27.8.5 Letters to/from solicitors or agent (if appropriate) 27.8.6 Relevant documents 27.9 <u>Abbreviated Complaint File (Public & Internal)</u> 27.9.1 Police perspective that the complaint is suitable for (IR) although complainant disagrees, and a full investigation would not influence the recommendation to the PCA 27.9.2 Cases that are directed for limited investigation by PCA.	

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
			<p>27.10 <u>Abbreviated Complaint File</u></p> <p>27.10.1 Adoption of a re-formatted F3353, the form should be typed</p> <p>27.10.2 Assemble file in following order;</p> <p>27.10.3 Statements can be handwritten, provided that they are legible.</p> <p>27.10.4 KEY statements are those that will support your conclusions and recommendations.</p> <p>27.10.5 Index to KEY statements</p> <p>27.10.6 Complainant</p> <p>27.10.7 Public witnesses</p> <p>27.10.8 MPS employees</p> <p>27.10.9 Any statements omitted must be referred to in your report, <u>in brief</u>.</p> <p>27.10.10 Index to Documents</p> <p>27.10.11 F3352</p> <p>27.10.12 reg. 9 Notices</p> <p>27.10.13 short descriptive notes (SDN) of interviews</p> <p>27.10.14 in cases of referrals to CPS, postings of officers</p> <p>27.10.15 SDNs of interview can be hand written, provided that they are legible. Reference can be made to the existence of: -</p> <p>27.10.16 supporting letters from customer complainant</p> <p>27.10.17 any other documents that are not relevant to your conclusions and recommendations, in chronological order of creation</p> <p>27.10.18 The body of the report must address the following points: -</p> <p>27.10.19 Brief summary of events that led to the allegation(s)</p> <p>27.10.20 Result of criminal proceedings</p>	

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
			<p>28 Full Investigation File (public & Internal)</p> <p>28.1 Any investigation that amounts to either;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">28.1.1 substantiated allegations with a recommendation for formal discipline or,</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">28.1.2 CPS directions where there is more than 51% likelihood of criminal charges.</p> <p>29 Full Investigation File (public & Internal)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ALL TO BE TYPED</p> <p>29.1 Adoption of a re-formatted</p> <p>29.2 F3353</p> <p>29.3 Assemble file in following order;</p> <p>29.4 Index to statements</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.4.1 Complainant</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.4.2 Public witnesses</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.4.3 Professional experts</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.4.4 MPS employees</p> <p>29.5 Index to Documents</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.5.1 F3352</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.5.2 supporting letters from complainant</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.5.3 reg. 9 Notices</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.5.4 all others in chronological order of creation</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.5.5 transcripts of interviews (ROTIs)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.5.6 in cases of referrals to CPS, postings of officers</p> <p>29.6 The body of the report must address the following points: -</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.6.1 Brief summary of events that led to the allegation(s)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.6.2 Result of criminal proceedings</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.6.3 Delays in service of Reg. 9 Notices with reasons</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.6.4 Reason s for not taking statements from named witnesses</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.6.5 Delays that have had a bearing on the investigation</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.6.6 DO NOT SPECIFY DATE & TIME OF EVERY ACTIVITY</p> <p>29.7 Two options for report style conclusions & recommendations;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.7.1 By allegation or,</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29.7.2 Officer complained of.</p>	<p><u>Measurable</u></p> <p>Efficiency Gain</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Bureaucracy Reduction</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Intelligence</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Satisfaction</p> <p>=</p>

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
ACU 'Court Instructions' Issue No. 15	OBJ 1, 3	Currently this issue is dealt with by two sets of standards. In straightforward cases where it is likely that the customer (officer) will be convicted of a criminal offence that will result in Misconduct Proceedings, all the evidence is gathered through a 'Long' Court Instruction. This instruction details the extent of the investigation, and the evidence that may be required	30 That the processes are made transparent by defining them for the benefit of customer (officers) who may potentially face Misconduct Hearings.	Efficiency gains: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieved in reduction of unnecessary attendance at court by DPS investigators. • appropriate rank to serve Reg. 9 Notices • timeliness Opportunities: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoidance of missing hearings – leading to prolonged enquiries <u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS=£96,051.20 Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =
	PI V, VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIV, XVI	In less serious cases, a 'Short' court instruction is issued, which requires a lesser amount of investigation, but for the same purpose.	31 <u>'Long' Court Instruction</u> 31.1 Upon conviction in criminal proceedings, it is highly likely that the officer will be disciplined.	
	STRANDS A, B, C, D, E	The investigations include the seizure of relevant supporting documentation, the evidence of conviction, and the service of Reg. 9 Notices. An IO conducts this activity of attending court, witnessing conviction and obtaining the facts. DPS Discipline Support issues the court instructions.	32 <u>'Short' Court Instruction</u> 32.1 Protects the position of the DPS in its' right to instigate Misconduct Proceedings in all cases. 33 Any DPS police investigator may attend the court hearing, and serve Reg.9 Notices. 34 DPS investigators should attend all effective court hearings.	

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
ACU 'Investigation' Issue No. 16	OBJ 1, 3, 4	Currently there is little evidence of 'proactivity' and considerations for intelligence and policy (both in terms of investigation and the MPS) during the investigation processes.	35 This issue is currently under review by the 'Best Value Crime Review Team'.	Efficiency gains: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appropriate levels of command • structured approach to investigation • appropriate ranks aligned to investigative processes Opportunities: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear lines of leadership and management • parity in decision making • clear strategic approach – ILP • adoption of 'best practice' in other investigative processes • customer satisfaction <u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS=£138,784 DPS=£365,968.86 (PC) DPS=£1,709,004 (AC) Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction = (AC=Actual costs) (PC=Process costs)
	PI IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI.		36 Introduction of the Directorate of Professional Standards	
	STRANDS A, B, C, D, E		36.1 'Centralisation' 36.2 SMT re-structured 36.3 That an 'interim' Corporate Standard for 'investigation' for the DPS be adopted dealing with; 36.4 Taking complainants statement 36.4.1 Consideration of proactive steps 36.4.2 Securing of exhibits 36.4.3 Making witness enquiries 36.4.4 Taking witness statements 36.4.5 Conducting research 36.4.6 Conducting interview of officers 36.4.7 Identify and address policy, leadership and management issues 36.4.8 Identify and address intelligence issues 36.4.9 Evaluate and review 36.5 A pilot investigative team model is to be deployed at Norbury BSCU in February 2001. This will deliver a revised structure to deal with public complaints and internal investigations, with Investigating Officers being of Inspector rank and investigators of Sergeant and Constable ranks with AO.	

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
<p>ACU 'Matters' Issue No. 17</p>	<p>OBJ 1, 2</p>	<p>Currently, any other business that enters an ACU which does not fall into the categories of Public Complaints or Internal Investigations are dealt with as matters.</p> <p>'Matters' relate to such business 'direction and control' or policy type issues</p> <p>Definition: - At the time of assessment by the DPS; anything which is not an Internal Investigation or a Public Complaint (S.65)</p> <p>Intelligence Led Policing does not only apply to investigation processes. It applies to all aspects of policing, including strategy and policy.</p>	<p>37 This corporate standard still awaits consultative group process</p> <p>37.1 There should be a clear definition of what a 'Matter' is, and a policy for disseminating any information or intelligence emanating from them.</p> <p>37.2 A central clearing 'point' for dealing with 'Matters' identified. If adopted, the Central Complaints Management Unit.</p> <p>37.3 'Matters' are to be retained on a bulk Registry file and retained for 7 years.</p>	<p>Efficiency gains: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • from 'freeing-up' BSCU staff to deal with complaints support processes. <p>Opportunities: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • with 'matters' dealt with by a central point • information and intelligence correctly disseminated <p>Bureaucracy reduction: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • removal of report responsibility at BSCUs <p><u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS= Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =</p>
	<p>PI VIII, XI, XIII</p>			
	<p>STRANDS A, B, C, D, E</p>			

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
<p>ACU 'Reports to DPS Departmental Support - Misconduct'</p> <p>Issue No. 18</p>	<p>OBJ</p> <p>1, 3</p>	<p>Currently, following an investigation and any other possible outcome involving the CPS, a substantiated complaint file with recommendation for Misconduct proceedings is forwarded to CIB1.</p>	<p>38 This corporate standard still awaits consultative group process</p> <p>38.1 A minimum standard for content is required by means of a checklist of contents for files with such outcomes.</p> <p>38.2 The Corporate Standard for a Full File is to be followed.</p> <p>38.3 The checklist should be attached</p>	<p>Efficiency gains in terms of; -</p> <p>Timeliness: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in a reduction of remedial action • expediting the discipline process
	<p>PI</p> <p>V, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XIV, XVI</p>	<p>On receipt of the file, it is skim read. A substantial number of the files are found not to contain a number of basic elements required for proceedings. This results in the file being returned to the IO for remedial action and/or a delay in the allocation to the caseworkers.</p>	<p>38.3.1 <u>Checklist</u></p> <p>38.3.2 No original documents are to be attached</p> <p>38.3.3 If there is any allegation of crime, has it been to the CPS?</p> <p>38.3.4 Have all of the officers been informed of the findings of the CPS?</p> <p>38.3.5 Full transcripts of the interviews attached (if appropriate-consult DPS, Directorate Support (CIB1)</p> <p>38.3.6 Has the case been reviewed under the correct regulation – burden of proof?</p> <p>38.3.7 If there is video evidence – copy of videotape attached.</p>	<p>Opportunities: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality assurance 'right first time' • early identification of potential training issues for BSCU personnel • customer satisfaction
	<p>STRANDS</p> <p>B, C, D, E</p>			<p>Bureaucracy reduction: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • file movement for remedial action <p><u>Measurable</u></p> <p>Efficiency Gain</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Bureaucracy Reduction</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Intelligence</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Satisfaction</p> <p>=</p>

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
ACU 'File Movements' Issue No. 19	OBJ 1	Currently, investigation files are sent to BOCU Commanders for the service of Reg. 9 Notices. Some files have to be forwarded from one BOCU Commander to another. In many cases, the investigation cannot be progressed until this process is completed.	39 Investigation files should not leave the DPS during the investigation process. 39.1 The Corporate Standard for service of Reg. 9 Notices should be applied, if they are not served within 10 working days by BOCUs. 39.2 In substantiated (formal) cases, BOCU Commanders or their appointed representative should be personally briefed by a DPS SIO/Supt. or by an agreed representative. This briefing can be conducted personally or by telephone, by agreement. 39.3 In substantiated (informal) cases the F163As together with the relevant information required to deal with the misconduct disposal extracted from the report, are to be forwarded on unregistered correspondence. 39.4 In unsubstantiated cases, Reg.9 Notices should be sent by email. 39.5 Electronic transfer of files should be a general aspiration for all file movements in the future.	Efficiency gains: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • timeliness-delay removed leading to shortening of the discipline process Opportunities: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • good customer relations and BOCU liaison • links with IBIS government systems Bureaucracy reduction: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • file movement <u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS= Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =
	PI V, VII, VIII, IX, X, XIV, XVI	The same process is adopted at the completion of the investigation There is evidence from process mapping interviews that there are considerable time delays involved in sending the investigation files to BOCU Commanders.		
	STRANDS B, D, E			
ACU 'Suspension' Issue No. 20	OBJ 1	Not Reviewed	40 Policy Introduced. In process of review by Commanders and Solicitors. 40.1 Process map on completion	<u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS=£304.00 Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =
	PI X			
	STRANDS C			

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
DPS 'Outside Force Investigations' Issue No. 21	OBJ 1, 3	In cases that are PCA supervised, a request is received from the PCA to approach another police force to investigate. ACPO officers then phone various forces and request assistance. There is a list of current investigations being conducted by outside forces. The PCA then approve the appointment of the IO.	41 Corporate Standards for Public Complaints and Internal Investigations should apply. 41.1 An ACPO 'on call' list to provide a direct call system.	<u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS= Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =
	PI II, III, V	ACPO officers are contacted by other police forces to investigate. An IO from the MPS is then appointed, and approved as above.		
	STRANDS A, C	The cost of the investigations is then billed		
ACU 'Civil Actions' Issue No. 22	OBJ 1	Currently, our response to civil actions is triggered by the receipt of a communication by a customer through a solicitor. This is normally dealt with by MPS Solicitors. A period of negotiation follows some investigation; in a number of cases the MPS settles the action with a financial payment.	42 The workshop concluded, that due to the 'specialism' of this subject, and the interests of various departments, a separate workshop consisting of membership from: - 42.1 MPS Solicitors 42.2 Civil Actions Department 42.3 Corporate Standards Workshop	<u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS= Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =
	PI I, VI	Kingston ACU developed a means of investigation whereby they achieved a reduction in payments.		
	STRANDS A, B			
ACU 'S75 Memorandum' Issue No. 23	OBJ 1	Currently a S75 memo is prepared by the IO at the conclusion of the full/limited investigation of a public complaint. It is prepared in the format of a letter, which is then attached to the report.	43 This issue is currently the subject of urgent deliberation at the Learning Lab. 43.1 That the contents of the S75 memo be included in the body of the report. 43.2 If the current 'interim position' is adopted as a corporate standard, all cases falling within it should have the S75 memo or statement prepared by the IO for signing by the relevant ACPO officer.	Efficiency gains: - • Timeliness Bureaucracy reduction: - • file movement <u>Measurable</u> Efficiency Gain MPS= DPS= Bureaucracy Reduction MPS= DPS= Intelligence MPS= DPS= Satisfaction =
	PI VII, X, XVI	The letter is signed by a Supt. and then forwarded with the report to the PCA.		
	STRANDS C			

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
<p>Misconduct Pleas and Directions Hearings</p> <p>Issue No. 24</p>	<p>OBJ 1, 2</p> <hr/> <p>PI I, III, X</p> <hr/> <p>STRAND B, C, D, E</p>	<p>Currently there are no formal processes for examining issues such as: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues in law <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ legal argument ○ severance ○ legal rep ○ disclosure / defence statements ○ panel membership • Sickness / health • Witness notification by officers concerned • Opportunities for guilty pleas • Character evidence (reasons for senior officer to provide live evidence) • Tape transcripts (reasons why police have to provide – costs) • Proportionality • Hearing time/date fixing <p>These issues cause the process undue delay to the detriment of the officer concerned and the MPS.</p>	<p>44 This issue is currently under review by Commander James</p> <p>44.1 Misconduct Pleas and Directions Hearings (MPDH) for Discipline & Misconduct</p> <p>44.2 MPDH to deal with issues: -</p> <p>44.2.1 Opportunities for guilty pleas</p> <p>44.2.2 Legal argument</p> <p>44.2.3 Severance</p> <p>44.2.4 Legal rep</p> <p>44.2.5 Disclosure / defence statements</p> <p>44.2.6 Panel membership</p> <p>44.2.7 Sickness / health</p> <p>44.2.8 Witness notification by officers concerned</p> <p>44.2.9 Character evidence (reasons for senior officer to provide live evidence)</p> <p>44.2.10 Tape transcripts (reasons why police have to provide – costs)</p> <p>44.2.11 Proportionality</p> <p>44.2.12 Hearing time/date fixing</p> <p>44.2.13 Facts admitted</p> <p>44.2.14 Exhibits</p> <p>44.2.15 Alibi</p> <p>44.2.16 Screens/Live television links</p> <p>44.3 Facts admitted, above, may be used at the hearing</p> <p>44.4 MPDH to determine whether hearing can be fixed for effective date for live evidence in officer's absence</p> <p>44.5 The official recognition and adoption of CPIA 1996 'type' disclosure rules, for Misconduct Investigations.</p>	<p>Efficiency gains: -</p> <p>Timeliness in the completion of the Discipline process</p> <p>DPS Cost savings through reduced adjournments</p> <p>MPS cost savings by quicker disposal in terms of suspended officers and wage payments</p>

Directorate of Professional Standards

PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
			<p>44.6 The adoption of the MPDH questionnaire.</p> <p>44.7 The official recognition and adoption of CPIA 1996 'type' disclosure rules, for Misconduct Investigations.</p> <p>44.8 The defence witnesses in the category above whose statements have been served and whose evidence the presenting officer or counsel for the presenting officer will agree and accept in writing</p> <p>44.9 Any additional witnesses who may be called by the presenting officer or counsel for the presenting officer and the evidence that they are expected to give</p> <p>44.10 Facts which are to be admitted and which can be reduced into writing within such time as may be directed at the hearing, and of the witnesses whose attendance will not be required at the hearing</p> <p>44.11 Exhibits and schedules which are to be admitted</p> <p>44.12 The order and pagination of the papers to be used by the presenting officer, or counsel for the presenting officer, at the hearing and the order in which witnesses are likely to be called by the presenting officer or counsel for the presenting officer</p> <p>44.13 Any alibi</p> <p>44.14 Any applications to be made for evidence to be given through live television links by child witnesses in cases involving violent or sexual offences</p> <p>44.15 Any applications to submit pre-recorded interviews with a child witness as evidence in chief</p>	

Directorate of Professional Standards

PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
			<p>44.16 Any applications for screens, for use by witnesses seeking a visual break between themselves and any relevant parties</p> <p>44.17 Whether any video, tape recorder or other technical equipment will be required during a hearing where tape recorded interviews have taken place, of any dispute or agreement as to the accuracy of any transcript or summary</p> <p>44.18 Any other significant matter which might affect the proper and convenient hearing of the case, and whether any additional work needs to be done by the parties</p> <p>44.19 The estimated length of the hearing, to be agreed more precisely taking account of any views expressed by the panel and the other parties</p> <p>44.20 Witness availability and the approximate length of witness evidence so that attendance can be staggered during lengthy hearings, agreeing likely dates and times of attendance, taking into consideration real hardship and inconvenience to a witness where applicable</p> <p>44.21 Availability of advocate</p> <p>44.22 Whether there is a need for any further directions</p> <p>44.23 Defence shall apply to hearing for the case to be listed for mention if they are unable to obtain instructions from the officer concerned. If the officer concerned fails to attend the MPDH, the Presiding Officer to consider whether an effective date can be fixed for the hearing where live evidence can be heard in the absence of the officer concerned</p>	

Directorate of Professional Standards

PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
			<p>44.24 Each party shall, at least 14 days before the date of the hearing, confirm to the hearing panel that all such directions have been fully complied with.</p> <p>44.25 The questionnaire, which mirrors the PDH questionnaire (Plea and Directions Hearings in the Crown Court Practice Rules 1995) to be completed as far as possible with the agreement of the advocates for all parties and to be handed in to the hearing prior to the commencement of the MPDH.</p>	

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
CIB1 –Action on Receipt of File with Recommendation for Formal Discipline Issue No. 25	OBJ 1	No quality assurance systems are currently in place to ensure that remedial action is taken prior to a discipline file arriving at CIB1. Currently, a file containing a recommendation for formal discipline arrives at CIB1 and is assessed in up to 3 stages, with remedial work initiated at any point after arrival.	45 Development of a “Right First Time” QA system at Branch Office level, incorporating an incremental approach to providing non administrative functions currently carried out by CIB1 at Branch Office. 45.1 Quality Assurance checks to be carried out at Branch Office level prior to a file leaving, thereby ensuring that only high quality products are received at CIB1. I.O.s to be made accountable for the content and accuracy of their files by use of relevant performance indicators 45.2 I.O.s at Branch Offices to have the opportunity to submit files for early legal advice in discipline cases. 45.3 The file containing a recommendation for formal discipline should be allocated to a caseworker on receipt at CIB1. 45.4 A Corporate Standard for remedial action to be adopted. 45.5 Notification of the necessity for remedial action to be sent via electronic means to the I.O., with a copy to the Branch Commander for Management Information purposes. 45.6 Use of the CDS ‘Bring Forward’ system for the remote monitoring of the progress of cases subject to remedial action. 45.7 Remedial action to be completed within 10 working days of notification of requirement. 45.8 The necessity for further briefing note(s) based on the I.O.’s report to be dispensed with.	Efficiency gains: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appropriate centralization of all misconduct (discipline) processes • reduction in time taken by BSCU staff in administration Opportunities: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • workshop / surgeries, with input from experienced DPS, Departmental Support staff • quality assurance at branch level. • methods of increasing the quality and timeliness of disposals
	PI I, III, V, X	A separate briefing note and note of recommendations are prepared prior to the file being passed to ACPO for a disposal decision/identification of further remedial work.		
	STRAND B, C, D, E	<p>The file containing a recommendation for formal discipline arrives at CIB1 and is “skim” read by a Chief Inspector in an initial assessment.</p> <p>Currently, any obvious remedial work is identified and the file returned to the originator for action. In the event that no remedial work is identified the file remains pending prior to allocation for a period of up to 3 months.</p> <p>At the point of allocation to an Inspector caseworker, a detailed read of the file takes place. Any remedial work is identified and the file returned to the originator for action.</p> <p>Common mistakes are evident on many files, and lead to delay. Files returned for remedial action are currently not subject to performance indicators relating to timeliness.</p>		

Directorate of Professional Standards
PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Process Reviewed	Link to Results	Pre-Review Standard	Adopted 'Corporate Standard'	Expected Benefits
			<p>45.9 Development of a 3 year plan to move to a central misconduct 'CJU' style department</p> <p>45.10 <u>Year 1 Activities</u></p> <p>45.10.1 Training needs analysis and delivery of relevant internal and external training.</p> <p>45.10.2 Succession planning to ensure knowledge management of current skills</p> <p>45.10.3 Create and adopt policy files</p> <p>45.10.4 Develop and Implement structure for Complaints Management Unit</p> <p>45.10.5 Develop and Implement structure for Complaints Management Unit</p> <p>45.11 <u>Year 2 Activities</u></p> <p>45.11.1 Reduction in current workload as "Right First Time" activities take effect.</p> <p>45.12 <u>Year 3 Activities</u></p> <p>45.13 CIB1 evolves into CJU type function, providing support for Branch Offices over administrative file maintenance, Court Cases and Misconduct Hearings, ongoing witness liaison, warnings etc. Staff carrying out administrative functions of appropriate rank/grade</p>	<p><u>Measurable</u></p> <p>Efficiency Gain</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Bureaucracy Reduction</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Intelligence</p> <p>MPS=</p> <p>DPS=</p> <p>Satisfaction</p> <p>=</p>