

Summary: Intervention & Options

Department /Agency: Home Office	Title: Impact Assessment of Police Green Paper: Workforce	
Stage: Draft	Version: 2.3	Date: 30/5/08
Related Publications:		

Available to view or download at:

<http://www>.

Contact for enquiries: Laura Brasnett

Telephone:

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

The police workforce has changed significantly over the past ten years with the introduction of PCSOs and more police support staff but there is still need to increase officers' time on front-line without becoming de-skilled.

Public satisfaction with the police is lower amongst those who have contact with the Police. We need to make customer service a key outcome for the whole police workforce.

The Police service needs to make better use of its resources, this means having the right workforce mix and deploying them to match demand.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

To provide clarity regarding the role of the Office of Constable to reassure the service and the public.
To ensure that constables retain skills and experience required.

To increase public satisfaction with Police through better training of customer service skills, to understand the impact on policies on the front-line and ensure more officers are deployed to the front-line. Ensuring opportunities for staff roles are explored by all Forces and all staff and officers are deployed appropriately

Provide an effective police service to diverse communities and have a representative police force.

What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.

0. Do nothing

1. Statement or consultation on the role of Office of constable and relevant training and experience
2. Integrate customer service into police training and appraisal processes across the Police Service
3. Methods to encourage Forces to scrutinise deployment to ensure good customer service before 2010
4. Methods to encourage Forces to scrutinise workforce mix to ensure good customer service before 2010
5. Ways to test the implementation of policies on the front-line (to be implemented by Spring 2009)
6. Establish either an innovators scheme and/or HMIC inspection to ensure that workforce management, processes and skills improve.
7. Develop a joint ACPO/HO/APA/HMIC and NPIA Equality and Diversity Strategy (before November 2008)

When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects?

The policy will be reviewed at regular intervals to track intended benefits. Customer service will be monitored through the performance management framework using the Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) and the British Crime Survey. In 2010 a HMIC Inspection will assess the extent to which Forces have undertaken changes to address the issues raised in the Green Paper.

Ministerial Sign-off For SELECT STAGE Impact Assessments:

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible Minister:

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 1c

Description: Consultation on the Office of Constable

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Cost (PV) £ 0
<p>Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Potential for change costs and reduction in flexibility where forces are operating outside any definition. The extent of these will depend on the content of the definition.</p>			

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'
	One-off	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Benefit (PV) £ 0
<p>Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Agreement and clarity on the role of the constable, recognition of the importance of the role for the service and the public.</p>			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

- Risk that consultation does not manage to reach agreement on the role of the constable

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ 0	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ 0
--------------------	----------------------	--	--

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England & Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	N/A			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?				
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of £	Decrease of £	Net Impact	£

Key:	Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices	(Net) Present Value
------	--	---------------------

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 2 b,c,d

Description: Public satisfaction and Customer Service

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		<p>Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'</p> <p>£165,000 – estimated cost to the Department of developing a training package & £250,000– cost to the Dept (or other funding body) of delivering training to all serving constables and sergeants. Subsequent training for new entrants is based on average increase of 7,300 constables and 2,700 sergeants per annum who will need to receive training. There will be not necessarily be any new officer time spent on performance appraisal; this should be incorporated into existing arrangements.</p>	
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs		
	£ 415,000	1		
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)			
	£ 1,000,000	4	Total Cost (PV)	£ 1, 415,000
<p>Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'</p> <p>There may be an opportunity cost of the officers' time if these courses are not included as part of existing training. The length of the training will be agreed as part of the review and development process to allow an opportunity cost to be assessed.</p>				

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		<p>Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'</p>	
	One-off	Yrs		
	£ 0			
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)			
	£ 0		Total Benefit (PV)	£ 0
<p>Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'</p> <p>Training and performance assessment for officers and sergeants on customer care leading to benefits to the public in terms of improved customer service.</p>				

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

There is a need to closely involve the NPIA in the development of any new training package to ensure that it is consistent with IPLDP. Time spent on new proposals is offset against reduced time spent on existing performance appraisal.

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ 0	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ -1, 415,000
-----------------	-------------------	--	--

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England & Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2009			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	N/A			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£ TBD			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	No			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)		
Increase of	£	Decrease of	£	Net Impact	£

Kev: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 3b

Description: Deployment

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Cost (PV) £ 0
<p>Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Cost of encouraging and helping forces to recognise resource management should be minimal. Changes to deployment may result in investment in business change by forces but this will be subject to analysis of the projected efficiency gains.</p>			

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'
	One-off	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Benefit (PV) £ 0
<p>Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Identifying and implementing changes to deployment will result in increased efficiency gains to the service and better service to the public.</p>			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ 0	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ 0
-----------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England & Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2008/9			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	Home Office			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of £	Decrease of £	Net Impact	£	

Key:	Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices	(Net) Present Value
------	--	---------------------

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 4b

Description: Workforce Mix

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Benchmark data is already collected and there are expected to be minimal additional cost to distribute it.
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Cost (PV) £ 0
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' There will be costs of implementing any resulting workforce mix changes but this should be off-set by projected efficiency gains.			

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'
	One-off	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Benefit (PV) £ 0
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Forces able to pursue best workforce to deliver greater efficiency and improved service to the public.			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ 0	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ 0
-----------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England & Wales		
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2009/10		
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£		
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A		
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A		
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£		
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£		
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A		
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of £	Decrease of £	Net Impact	£

Key:	Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices	(Net) Present Value
------	--	---------------------

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 5b

Description: Testing Implementation on the Front Line

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£		A single team is likely to cost the equivalent of £60,000 pa in officers time and expenses.
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
£	60,000	5	Total Cost (PV) £ 271,000
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'			

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'
	One-off	Yrs	
	£ 0		Improved testing of policy leading to more effective implementation and delivery of objectives
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
£ 0			Total Benefit (PV) £ 0
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ -271,000
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England & Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2009/10			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	N/A			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)
Increase of £	Decrease of £	Net Impact	£

Key:	Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices	(Net) Present Value
------	--	---------------------

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 6 b, c

Description: Identifying Good Practice and Monitoring Progress

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups' HMIC inspection costs estimated to be £1.2m but this would be offset against reduction in existing inspections.
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Cost (PV) £ 0
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Potential costs of implementing a scheme to recognise innovators and share best practice.			

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'
	One-off	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Benefit (PV) £ 0
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Increase impetus towards workforce mix and deployment thereby increasing efficiency gains and improvements in service to the public			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ 0	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ 0
--------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England & Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2010			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	HMIC/H Office			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of	£	Decrease of	£	Net Impact £

Key:	Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices	(Net) Present Value
------	--	---------------------

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 7b

Description: Equality and Diversity Strategy

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Cost result from developing the Equality and Diversity strategy
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£ 30,000		
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Cost (PV) £ 30,000
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Potential costs from implementing the resulting strategy			

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'
	One-off	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Benefit (PV) £ 0
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Reduction of work duplicated by forces. Greater consistency of approach to equality and diversity.			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ -30,000
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England & Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2008/9			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	HO & stakeholders			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of	£	Decrease of	£	Net Impact £

Key:	Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices	(Net) Present Value
------	--	---------------------

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

[Use this space (with a recommended maximum of 30 pages) to set out the evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Ensure that the information is organised in such a way as to explain clearly the summary information on the preceding pages of this form.]

The police workforce is at the centre of the policing service and provides the essential link back to the public. We recognise that in order to provide a high quality of service to the public, which makes the best use of resources, the workforce has to be focused on these aims as well. The changes that have taken place in the workforce have introduced new roles to the service and increased the scope of civilian staff – we need forces to continue to explore these roles whilst at the same time celebrating and strengthening the role of the constable. We need to consider ways to maximise the service that the public receives by providing the whole workforce with the appropriate training and development and by ensuring that people are deployed when and where they are most needed. We will monitor and assess how much progress has been made with a HMIC workforce inspection in 2010.

A. Evidence of the problem

1. Office of Constable

The current police workforce has changed significantly in the last 10 years with the introduction of nearly 16,000 PCSOs and the expansion of roles for police staff. There are over 76,000 police staff who perform a range of back-office functions in HR, finance but are increasingly employed in operational roles since the introduction of legislation following the 2002 Police Reform Act – this gave designated powers to Investigating Officers, Detention Officers and Escort Officers, enabling these staff to perform certain tasks without the need to refer to an officer. The Police Federation in particular are concerned that this has led to the erosion of the Office of Constable and threatens the unique skills base that a constable. There may also be a lack of clarity for the public in the current environment around the exact role of the office of constable.

2. Public satisfaction/customer service

There is a necessary challenge to the police workforce to improve public satisfaction and customer service. The most recent figures from 2006/07 show that confidence in the police has stabilised at 51%, and unchanged from the previous year. British Crime Survey trends show that victim satisfaction fell in the 1990s but, since 2000, has remained broadly stable between 58 and 60%. However, victim satisfaction remains 10 percentage points lower than in 1994. There is also a view that police 'culture' is characterised by 'action-orientated behaviour' (Foster, 2003) has meant that initiatives that are not considered to be 'real police work', such as community engagement can de-prioritised. Finally the 'performance culture' is not sufficiently focussed on the needs of customers, and forces are more focused on numerical targets like sanction detections.

3. Deployment

With 80% of funding going on the police workforce strategic deployment needs to be a central concern for police managers. A study from 2004 (Home Office, 2004) showed that there was very little consensus around what makes an effective shift pattern, even for more reactive teams. It also found that the pattern of demand, measured by calls for service, was very similar amongst 80 BCUs but yet there was variation in the supply/shift patterns, concluding that a well designed variable shift arrangement could provide 70% more officers at peak times than a flat supply. More recently a number of Forces have shown that effective deployment of officers and staff can result in both efficiency savings and improvements to service, with North Wales increasing numbers of incidents attended, improving the speed of the response, and making substantial savings on officer overtime.

4. Workforce mix

We also know that there is wide variation between the mix and of officers and staff which different forces use to deliver the same function. The latest Home Office figures show for example, that some forces scenes of crime functions operate entirely with staff whilst other Forces have over 20% officers. There is also disparity in the use of designated staff, with 51% of forces employing detention or investigation officers. Evidence from the previous Workforce Modernisation Pilots showed that workforce modernisation can have a range of positive impacts including increased detection rates, more officers released to the front-line, professionalizing of roles as well as efficiency savings. We need to do more to encourage forces to consider and evaluate these options.

5. Testing the implementation of policies on the front-line

[Area still be agreed Home Sec]

We do not currently test the implementation of our policies on front-line officers or staff. It is recognised that reform within the police service can have wide ranging effects. It is crucial to ensure that the impact of policies is identified and supported – this already happens through impact assessments, policy focused standing groups and practitioners within the NPIA. However there is often a gap in testing new policies which affect large numbers of operational officers – either at early stages or in order to assist implementation, examples of this could include changes impacting on 24/7 response or changes intended to reduce bureaucracy. There is an example of good practice within Whitehall working with a standing team of frontline practitioners to provide scrutiny of policy development and implementation. The Independent Review Unit (IRU) of the DCSF has worked on a range of education polices and implementation providing both support and challenge along the way. More detail can be found at www.IRU.org.uk. The Children’s Plan, published by DCSF in December 2007, committed to continue working with the IRU in the future.

6. Identifying good practice and monitoring progress

There has not been a recent HMIC inspection on workforce. The efficiency and productivity strategy and the Green Paper have highlighted a number of areas where forces are expected to evaluate current arrangements – either workforce mix, deployment or customer service provision –and make improvement as required. In addition, a mechanism for evaluating the extent of change in the service since the Strategy and the Green Paper would be useful in providing further assessment and direction to those forces who not necessarily making the best use of their resources. Police forces often argue that they would like to replicate good practice in order to make improvement, currently this is done in piecemeal way through contacts. We believe it would be beneficial to consult on how best to commend innovators and help them share good practice.

7. Equality and Diversity Strategy

Currently there are a number of different equality strands of work that exist and which are led by either NPIA, ACPO, APA, HMIC or the Home Office. There is no one consistent approach to ensuring that the police service has the trust and confidence of all communities and that the police workforce reflects the communities it serves. This can result in work being duplicated by different stakeholders and a risk that forces receive mixed messages about what subsequent action they should take.

B. Options, Costs and Benefits.

1. Office of constable

Options

- a) Do nothing
- b) Define the office of constable using a statement in the Green Paper

c) Use the Green Paper to consult on a definition of the Office of Constable.

Our preferred option is to do c) to use the green paper to consult the service, the public and stakeholders on an appropriate definition of the office of constable. If we were to do nothing there is a risk that lack of clarity or perceived lack of clarity around the office of constable could grow. However b) a definition of the office of constable would not be representative of the views of the service and could cause further tension and disagreement without necessarily improving customer service. By pursuing c) we are able to seek the views of a wider range of people and stakeholders to reach an agreed definition of the role of constable and the areas that the role should cover.

Benefits

- The benefit will be an opportunity for greater involvement in agreeing the definition of the role of constable
- Any subsequent definitions will have been discussed and scrutinised by greater number which should help to clarify the role and reassure both the service and the public of its importance.

Cost

- There is likely to be minimal costs to the consultation however subsequent changes or amendments to the office of constables could have an impact on the type of work completed or training received, for constables and/or staff which would therefore have cost implications. These costs will be considered as part of the results of consultation and any future decisions.

2. Public satisfaction/Customer service

Options

- a) Do nothing
- b) Include an objective within officers' performance appraisals to deliver high quality customer service and challenge poor performance
- c) Review current provision and integrate customer service into training for Constables and Sergeants
- d) Include customer service as part of the Integrated Competency Framework (ICF)

Our preferred option is to do b) c) and d) so including an objective on customer service within officers' appraisals because of the need to improve customer satisfaction and to ensure that officers' recognise it as one of their key objectives. We will review current training on so called 'soft' skills such as contact with the public and victim and witness care and identify areas where there is scope for further training and development. Possible providers would include the NPIA or Crime Concern. We would consider a tendering exercise to bring in private sector training providers with experience in customer care. We would also want to include customer satisfaction as part of any future changes NPIA make to the ICF.

Benefits

- Officers will recognise customer service as one of their key objectives and will therefore be assessed on their ability to provide good customer service through the appraisal system
- Constables and Sergeant will receive training in order to deliver improved customer service
- By including customer service as part of the Integrated Competency Framework NPIA will be able to align the ICF with the focus on customer service.

Cost

- The cost of including customer service within Performance appraisals should be minimal. This should not require additional time from either constable or sergeant to undertake the appraisal system.
- Based on training costs from the leadership IA, the staff cost to the Department for reviewing and developing a new customer care training module would be in the region of £165,000 (based on one G7 and two HEOS). The cost of then delivering a training module for 130,000 police constables and sergeants (based on an estimated £1,000 per 10 people per module) would be £1.3m, representing a total cost of £13m
- There would be subsequent ongoing costs for delivering training to new constables and sergeants, estimated at 10,000 new entrants per annum at £1m.

3. Deployment

Options

- a) Do nothing – resource management is already being looked at by NPIA Leadership Strategy, existing NPIA resource of simulation tools also available to forces at a reduced price.
- b) Assert that Forces should ensure that 24/7 response is rostered to meet peaks in demand via the Efficiency and Productivity Strategy monitoring. This would be inspected as part of the 2010 workforce inspection – with the Home Office articulating minimum standards of good practice in resource management that forces should be meeting. Forces would be required to demonstrate that they met these standards.

Our preferred option is, to do b), although this is addition to work already included in a). We would pursue a more assertive take with forces via the monitoring of the Efficiency and Productivity Strategy and through the relationship with the Police authority which would be inspected in 2010.

Benefits

- Force managers would recognise the importance of the resource management aspect to their role (via Leadership Strategy).
- There should be improvements to service to the public and efficiency gains for Forces who manage to roster resources more appropriately to demand.

Costs

- Central costs are likely to be minimal – the Home Office already provides XIMES software free of charge to Forces and aims to encourage forces to network to share ideas and good practice on areas such as deployment.
- The cost a force will incur will depend upon their current arrangements and their ability to meet the minimum standards. There may be minimal costs to some forces in order to meet the standards but for others subsequent changes may require a level of investment, although this is likely to be offset by savings. North Wales for example invested £250k in order to undertake a thorough assessment of their deployment; however they subsequently identified £1m in savings as a result of the changes.

4. Workforce mix

Options

- a) Do nothing – continue to evaluate Workforce Modernisation demo sites and review policing plans

- b) Provide additional data to forces to enable them to benchmark their officer:staff ratio against other forces. Encourage forces to use the PACE review to identify additional requests where specific powers may be useful.
- c) Set a target for officer:staff ratio across the service or within particular functions

Our preferred option is to do b. We do not think it would be helpful to introduce a target ratio for officer:staff mix because we recognise that forces should assess this based on their own operational requirement. Evaluating workforce mix should become part of force planning and so we will provide them with comparative data to enable them to take decisions and use PACE for them to suggest any further changes.

Benefits –

- Forces will be able to identify functions and to examine their mix making use benchmarking data as part of their normal decision-making
- Forces and authorities should be more focused on pursuing best workforce to deliver either greater efficiencies or improved customer service.
- There will be greater flexibility in the future to use staff in newer areas as more suggestions on staff powers are received.

Costs

- There will be a minimal cost for the production of benchmarking data for forces, this is already collected and summarised so will only require distribution.
- Forces who undertake changes to their workforce mix to increase to provision of either back office staff or designated staff may need to invest money into set-up costs such as uniforms, equipment, accommodation, IT etc. Cost data from previous pilots shows a range of costs, but is not necessarily transferable. Costs will obviously depend on the scale of the workforce change as well as the size of the force. Some examples from the pilots for set-up could be Surrey - £400k; Wiltshire £223k; Lincs £49k. However any additional expenditure should be off-set by the financial benefit over the medium to long term. Force business cases for any changes to the workforce mix should provide an estimate of the cost benefits.

5. Testing the implementation of policies on the front-line

Options

- a) Do nothing
- b) Introduce a one new standing group to test new policies on front-line operational officers.

Our preferred option is to create a new standing group as existing arrangements do not necessarily address the impact of policies on operational officers or adequately take into account their views. There is a tested model in DCSF – implementation review unit which requires 12 members.

Benefits

- Front-line staff are able to feed in views at an early “drawing board” stage
- The group provides a single point to get comments on implementation issues and the impact of policies on the front-line. Policies can be tested and altered to improve effectiveness.
- Group is able to look at cross-cutting issues e.g. aspect of bureaucracy

Cost

- A potential model for one group for the Police service could be for 1x Chief Super, 1 x chief inspector, 2 x Inspectors, 3x Sergeants and 5x Constables for 5 full days per year. The model is likely to function as one group that meets quarterly, produces an annual report and is supported by a secretariat within the Home Office.
- Costs are estimated at £62k per annum which includes expenses and occasional conference facilities and the opportunity cost of the officers (£12k). This cost will need to be met by the Home Office.

6. Identifying good practice and monitoring progress

Options

- a) Do nothing
- b) Consult on a scheme for recognising good practice in particular areas
- c) Conduct a HMIC inspection on the workforce in 2010.

Our preferred option is b) and c) to consult on the how to commend innovators and help them share good practice and to introduce a HMIC workforce inspection in 2010. It is considered necessary to introduce a HMIC workforce inspection in order to ensure that previous proposals are achieved i.e. deployment, workforce mix etc. A scheme to recognise innovators could also assist forces to identify good practice and to learn from other forces – we would like to consult on this proposal to agree how this would work.

Benefits

- The HMIC inspection will provide impetus for Forces to consider making changes around workforce mix and deployment. It will also identify forces that may require additional support in order to make improvements.
- A innovator/ Beacon scheme would recognise Forces that have either gained efficiency savings or improved service delivery by making better use of the workforce and would act as model of good practice for other Forces. This may be a costly proposal therefore we believe that we should consult on this.

Costs

- The HMIC inspection would be part of HMIC risk-based inspection programme and therefore should not result in an additional cost. However this would be at the cost of an inspection on a different element of policing. An inspection is estimated to cost around £28k so if we were to inspect every forces this would be £1.2m

7. Equality and Diversity Strategy

Options

- o Do nothing
- o Develop a new 3 year equality, diversity and human rights strategy for the police service.

Our preferred option is to pursue a joint strategy with NPIA, ACPO, APA and HMIC which will include support for staff associations and diversity support groups, set minimum Equality Standards for policing

Benefits

- o There will be a more consistent approach to equality and diversity delivered in partnership with all our policing partners

- Less risk of duplication of work or mixed messages to the service.

Costs

- There will be some initial costs in order to formulate and agree the strategy with all stakeholders. We estimate that this will be around £30k from Home Office budget to fund member of staff to co-ordinate meetings and discussions with stakeholders in order to develop a strategy
- There will be costs to implement the strategy. An impact assessment will be conducted during the development of the strategy to estimate costs.

Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

We have carefully considered the related impacts of this specific proposal and have concluded that it will not affect the private sector nor will it raise any issues around the other impacts listed. An Equality Impact Assessment has been produced for the Green Paper which can be seen at [\[link/page\]](#). We have considered whether a Privacy Impact Assessment was necessary and decided it was not.

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	No	No
Small Firms Impact Test	No	No
Legal Aid	No	No
Sustainable Development	No	No
Carbon Assessment	No	No
Other Environment	No	No
Health Impact Assessment	No	No
Race Equality	No	No
Disability Equality	No	No
Gender Equality	No	No
Human Rights	No	No
Rural Proofing	No	No

Annexes

Accenture/Home Office (2004) Study of Police Resource Management and Rostering Arrangements

Home Office/Accenture (2006) Police Workforce Modernisation: Impact assessment of changes to workforce mix

Janet Foster, Police Cultures, Handbook of Policing (2003)