

Meeting	SPA Resources Committee
Date	16 June 2020
Location	Videoconference
Title of Paper	CAM Benefits Reporting - methodology for calculating benefits
Presented By	ACC John Hawkins, Local Policing North
Recommendation to Members	For Discussion
Appendix Attached	No

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to update members on the methodology being used to calculate the 'productivity gain' being delivered as a result of the implementation of the Contact Assessment Model across Scotland.

Members are invited to discuss the contents of this paper.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Contact Assessment Model has transformed the way Police Scotland manage, assess and respond to 999 and 101 calls from the public. The model introduces a robust assessment tool which allows service advisers to quickly identify threat, harm and vulnerability to enable the most appropriate and proportionate policing response.
- 1.2 As a result of Operation Talla the delivery timeline for CAM was expedited and the model is now live across Scotland. Due to the speed of delivery there remains a requirement to address some of the interim structures in the North of the country such as the resolution team in Dundee and move towards the permanent solution in Inverness.
- 1.3 To date CAM has been implemented in line with the Full Business Case and has delivered significant benefit across the organisation.

2. FURTHER DETAIL ON THE REPORT TOPIC

- 2.1 The CAM Full Business Case approved in September 2019 by the Authority set out the following key strategic benefits:
 - Improved service delivery to the public
 - Significantly improved assessment of threat, harm, risk and vulnerability at first point of contact
 - Improved management of demand
 - An empowered and enabled workforce
- 2.2 Benefit profiles are in place and are being managed through Police Scotland's portfolio assurance function.
- 2.3 Benefit profile 5 sets out how productivity is increased through improved management of demand. Call demand enters the system by members of the public phoning either 999 or 101 and seeking police assistance. CAM enables call handlers to listen to the member of the public's concerns, apply an assessment of threat, harm, risk and vulnerability (known as THRIVE) and determine which option delivers the most appropriate and proportionate response.

OFFICIAL

- 2.4 Prior to CAM most calls resulted in a policing incident being created and officers being dispatched to deal with the concern in person. This often did not meet the caller's needs or expectation and was an inefficient use of resources, as officers were routinely dispatched by call type as opposed to on the basis of a THRIVE assessment.
- 2.5 CAM delivered a menu of options which better suits the needs of the caller and ensures a more appropriate and proportionate management of demand.
- 2.6 Call handlers now have the following options:
1. To provide advice and guidance to the caller.
 2. To refer the caller to the most appropriate agency.
 3. To arrange an appointment for the police to attend at an agreed time and date.
 4. To transfer the call to a police officer within the 'Resolution Team' who can provide assistance over the phone or by video call.
 5. To arrange for officers to be dispatched either immediately or as soon as possible that day.
- 2.7 By managing demand using other options rather than routine deployment such as phone/video calls, this creates increased productivity in the system.
- 2.8 By way of example, a routine police deployment on average requires 216 minutes of officer time, the same incident managed by a phone or video call takes 25 minutes. This is due to the removal of travel time and that fact that one officer rather than two is managing the incident.
- 2.9 To enable the impact of CAM on demand management to be reported the following methodology has been approved by Police Scotland:
1. Data will be reported per police division from the date of implementation of CAM until 19/3/20, where upon the impact of Operation Talla on policing compromised year on year reporting.

OFFICIAL

2. The data collected will compare each division's deployments with the same period from the previous year (this will measure and present the difference between pre CAM operations and post CAM operations).
3. The key variable used to distinguish between both models is the number of incidents that police officers were deployed to which included diary appointment, immediate and same day deployments.
4. Increases in call demand of 6.2%, which is in line with UK figures, was recorded in 19/20 and has been factored into the calculations.

2.10 We respond to over 3 million calls a year or nearly 400 calls an hour. We create 1.2 million incidents on our command and control system and deploy officers to nearly 650,000 incidents.

2.11 The following details are presented to demonstrate how the calculation is developed. The figures are from Greater Glasgow Division from 23/10/19 until 19/3/20 (148 days)

2.12 Difference in number of incidents police officers deployed to between 18/19 and 19/20 = 12228

2.13 The number of incidents per day over 1 year ($12228/148 \times 365$) = 30156

2.14 The number of minutes saved (30156×191 mins) = 5,759,966 minutes.

2.15 Number of minutes expressed in hours ($5,759,966 / 60$) = 95,999 hours.

2.16 Number of hours expressed as Full Time Equivalent Officers ($95,999 / 1610$) = 59.6 FTE

2.17 The number of policing hours created by the introduction of CAM in Greater Glasgow Division is therefore 95999.

2.18 Failure Demand

2.19 Prior to the implementation of CAM there was an element of failure demand within the system. This occurred because the number of incidents where callers were informed the police would attend however due to a number of factors, including capacity, officers

didn't attend. This is calculated to be around 15%. This failure led to caller frustration, in particular where the caller did not require to see a police officer only to report a crime or seek advice or guidance. The implementation of CAM and the new resolution options ensure that failure demand is removed from the system.

2.20 Failure demand can be presented as the number of officer hours required to remove 'failures' from the system.

2.21 The following details are presented to demonstrate how the calculation has been developed. The figures are from Greater Glasgow Division from 23/10/18 until 19/3/19 (148 days) and demonstrate the number of hours required in Greater Glasgow to remove failure demand without the implementation of CAM.

2.22 Number of incidents per day = 69

2.23 Number of incidents in police officer minutes per day (69 x 216 mins) = 14904 mins

2.24 Number of hours per year (14904 x 365 / 60) = 90666

2.25 Number of hours expressed as Full Time Equivalent Officers (90666/1610) = 56FTE

2.26 The number of policing hours required to remove failure demand from Greater Glasgow Division without CAM is therefore 90666 hours.

2.27 Next Steps

2.28 Subject to the benefit methodology being approved by the committee a further paper will be presented capturing the overall productivity benefit realised across Police Scotland as a result of the implementation of CAM.

2.29 Operation Talla

2.30 The impact of Operation Talla to Policing and as a result call and incident demand has been significant. As a result comparing year on year data after 19/3/20 will significantly corrupt the data and would suggest significant benefit realisation being delivered. This is assessed as being due to factors such as social distancing, changes to the types of demand and the requirement for police officers to comply with government guidelines.

2.31 Going forward Police Scotland will need to consider how to demonstrate the productivity benefit being delivered solely by CAM whilst discounting the impact of the new operation model arrangements which were put in place as a result of Operation Talla.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 There are no financial implications associated with this paper.

4. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no personnel implications associated with this paper.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no legal implications associated with this paper.

6. REPUTATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no reputational implications associated with this paper.

7. SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no social implications associated with this paper.

8. COMMUNITY IMPACT

8.1 There are no community impact implications associated with this paper.

9. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no equalities implications associated with this paper.

10. ENVIRONMENT IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no environmental implications associated with this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are invited to discuss the contents of this paper.