

**HM Inspectorate of Constabulary
London and the East Regional Office**

**Follow-up/Monitoring Visit to Braintree BCU
Essex Police**

BCU Inspection Conducted - February 2004

Monitoring Visit Conducted - June 2005



Follow-up/Monitoring Visits to Inspected BCUs

Braintree BCU – Essex Police

Date of inspection	Lead inspector	BCU commander	Date of final report	Date of monitoring visit
February 2004	Ch Supt Nicola Grevatt	Ch Supt Sue Harrison	July 2004	June 2005

1. Significant Developments since the Original Inspection (eg, boundary changes, changes to management team, increase/decrease in strength)

- In April 2005, the BCU Commander was transferred to another post. In the interim period, prior to a successor being appointed, the divisional detective chief inspector took on the role, with the new BCU Commander taking over duties in late June 2005.
- A prisoner processing unit is now in place. Officers are seconded to the unit for six months. The BCU has seen a significant improvement in file submissions, investigative and interview skills, and an increase in guilty plea files.
- A dedicated ANPR officer has been appointed, and use of ANPR has increased across the BCU.
- The BCU has been piloting a new video identification process, Promat, resulting in an increase in identification requests and positive identifications.
- The BCU does not have a dedicated forensic team and uses forensic staff based at both Chelmsford and Harlow. Four uniform patrol officers have received forensic training for the examination of vehicle crimes.
- A comprehensive training cycle for all staff is now in place.

2. Performance Information¹

Performance Indicator	2003/04	2004/05	Change	% Change
Recorded crime per 1000 population	58.25	55.40		- 4.88%
Recorded crime detection rate	26.23%	25.76%	- 0.47	
Domestic burglary per 1000 households	7.94	5.15		- 35.16%
Domestic burglary detection rate	10.98%	17.62%	+ 6.64	
Vehicle crimes per 1000 population	5.24	4.31		-17.69%
Vehicle crime detection rate	6.33%	6.22%	- 0.11	
Robberies per 1000 population	0.15	0.18		16.13% see note below.
Robberies detection rate	22.58%	25%	+ 2.42	
Violent crimes per 1000 population	11.62	10.57		- 8.99%
Violent crime detection rate	68.54	64.84	- 3.71	
Sickness in hours per officer	91.25	52.69		- 42.26%
Sickness in hours per support staff	60.96	76.97		26.27%

Whilst robberies have increased by 16.13%, this represents an actual increase of five offences from 31 to 36.

¹ Please note that this performance information is based on non-validated returns received from forces by HMIC.

3. Inspection Recommendations

Recommendation 1	
<i>It is recommended that the BCU:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews and develops the existing performance management framework, ensuring that it is consistently applied across the BCU at all levels. • Prioritises the implementation of a QA and inspection and review unit. 	
Action taken by BCU	Measurable impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of reference established for newly formed performance management unit (PMU). • Visits conducted to other PMUs within Essex and other forces to seek and share good practice. • Monthly performance accountability meetings introduced. • Regular meeting cycle established with the divisional training officer, to ensure all relevant performance areas are fed into the training strategy. • All managers are now aware of their key performance areas and accountability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PMU and performance accountability meetings are now in place, and an inspection officer appointed. Performance management focus is embedded into BCU activity. • The BCU has introduced a performance enhancement programme designed to support officers identified as under performing. • Overall crime levels have reduced by almost 5%. Burglary, vehicle crime and violent crime have all significantly reduced. • Performance targets are now included within every officer's PDR. A 'staff member of the month' scheme has been introduced.
Recommendation 2	
<i>The BCU reviews progress on the development of the NIM model to ensure that the model is mainstreamed and driving activity at sector level.</i>	
Action taken by BCU	Measurable impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tasking and co-ordination meeting process amended and reinvigorated. • Agenda items focus on key NIM activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior manager attendance at tasking and co-ordination meetings is expected and reinforced. • Comprehensive tactical assessments are produced containing detailed intelligence, and with clear focus on performance.
Recommendation 3	
<i>The BCU reviews current operating arrangements for the tactical team in order to ensure that it is providing the best service to the BCU.</i>	
Action taken by BCU	Measurable impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational arrangements for the tactical team reviewed. • All taskings to the tactical team are now in line with divisional key performance areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of reference have been reviewed for the tactical team, which has a clear emphasis on targeting, disruption and prosecution of identified drug supply offenders along with other priority offence areas. • The tactical team are tasked in line with NIM BCU key priorities. Such taskings include vehicle crime, burglary and

	operations to tackle anti-social behaviour.
Recommendation 4	
<i>The BCU reviews the QA process for intelligence inputting in order to reassure itself that operational effectiveness is not being adversely affected by any inflexibility in the QA process.</i>	
Action taken by BCU	Measurable impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intelligence report submissions have been reviewed, common fault areas identified and feedback supplied to officers. • Quality assurance process for intelligence reports reviewed. • New remote access inputting of intelligence reports trialled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers submitting below standard reports are now identified and remedial action taken. A training programme for all BCU officers has been completed. • A mobile data project with access to intelligence systems is ongoing across the BCU with encouraging early results.
Recommendation 5	
<i>The BCU reviews its in-house crime management practices as follows:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The allocation and investigation of hate crime in terms of ensuring that there are BCU policy guidelines available giving clarity of definition to hate crime, investigation allocation and supervision procedures.</i> • <i>Maximising intelligence opportunities by minimising the time taken to enter a crime onto the system and reducing the loss of intelligence by enabling the early identification of, for example, potential crime series, similar modus operandi or descriptions.</i> • <i>Current arrangements for transporting crimes to the service desk.</i> • <i>Subsequent quality assurance processes to reassure itself that operational effectiveness is not being adversely affected by any inflexibility in the process.</i> 	
Action taken by BCU	Measurable impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flow chart clearly depicting actions and processes for hate crimes completed. • Opportunities to maximise mobile data project being exploited. • Action taken to achieve and maintain direct crime inputting requirements (12 hours) for offences of burglary. • Quality assurance processes reviewed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A forcewide review has been undertaken examining the investigation of hate crime. From July 2005 every BCU will have a domestic violence hate crime unit working to common minimum standards. • Mobile data terminals are now in place on the BCU on a trial basis, including access to intelligence systems. The trial remains ongoing, but positive feedback has been received from staff. • Inputting of priority crimes, particularly burglary, is monitored to ensure up-to-date information is available. • The PMU reviews quality assurance processes.

4. Monitoring Assessment & Follow-up Action

Have all recommendations been accepted and acted upon?	Yes
Has the remedial action/implementation plan led to demonstrable improvement?	Yes
Has performance in relation to national/local targets improved? If not, are the reasons for deterioration understood (eg, transition to NCRS) and being addressed?	Yes
Have any problems arisen since the Inspection that are likely to affect performance and merit further scrutiny by HMIC?	No
Other than notification of monitoring outcome to regional office (lead staff officer), is any further action required by HMIC inspection team – eg, contact with PSU?	No