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1. **Executive Summary**

1.1 Lewisham is a large and challenging urban BCU in South East London with a resident population of almost 250,000. It has the third highest number of licensed premises within London and is one of 12 boroughs/districts nationally with the highest proportion of lone-parent families (10.5%). The borough has vibrant and diverse communities with some 34% of the residential population being from minority ethnic groups. It benefits from good transport links, shopping centres and is also home to Millwall Football Club.

1.2 The BCU Commander is an experienced chief superintendent with a variety of specialist skills including public order and football command roles, promotion assessment and complaints investigation. Lewisham BCU was his first posting as a constable and he returned as its Superintendent (Operations) in 2001 before being promoted in 2004 to become BCU Commander. He has a Senior Leadership Team (SLT) that comprises three superintendents and a business manager. The BCU Commander is highly regarded by his senior partners, SLT colleagues and staff associations alike. He maintains tight control over the BCU with a style that is engaging, professional and attentive to detail. His integrity is considered to be above reproach as is his commitment to the borough, both as its senior police officer but also as a senior member of its strategic partnership.

1.3 Performance for Lewisham BCU has been challenging over the past three years. In terms of crime reduction, PYTD\(^2\) performance against vehicle crime and Total Notifiable Offences (TNOs) is within the second quartile of the MSBCU Group with a recently improving position for TNOs. However, reductions in residential burglary and robbery are within the third quartile with burglary performance improving and robbery declining. Violent crime reduction sits within the bottom quartile and is also declining. Sanction detection performance for residential burglary, robbery, violent crime and TNOs for the PYTD is also below the MSBCU average with the BCU resting within the third quartile for each category. Only vehicle crime sits within the second quartile of the MSBCU with an improving position over the short term. Such performance inevitably heightens the public’s fear of crime and requires action to reverse any decline and improve the overall perception of community safety.

1.4 Much work has already been initiated and the impact of many such initiatives is starting to emerge. However, further change is required if the BCU is to improve performance against its MSBCU peers and it is vital the process of change engages staff in an inclusive and meaningful way. This should ensure that they become party to change management and thereby understanding the imperatives and rationale whilst also testing the viability of what is proposed before implementation. The good work already commenced on the performance management framework and to improve sanction detections now needs to be taken to a new level, as does the dynamic coordination of problem solving work. The implementation of the recommendations described herein provide a means of achieving this change and to build upon much of the good work already underway.

1.5 The BCU Commander has shaped a dynamic and potent command team, many members of which had joined the BCU during the 12 months preceding this inspection. They must now
work hard to take their respective staff with them on a journey of change that builds upon some excellent foundations. The HMIC team is confident that they have the ability, drive and determination to ensure that all staff have the necessary leadership, systems, structures and processes that are fit for purpose. The BCU will then be able to realise its true potential and make Lewisham a safer place for all to live and work.

**Recommendations and Good Practice**

1.6 The inspection team has made the following recommendations that should contribute to the drive for continuous improvement displayed by the BCU. There are also various suggestions that the SMT may wish to consider contained within the ‘**What We Found**’ section of the report (in bold type), mainly from data gathered by the inspection team or from BCU staff participating in focus groups or interviews.

**Recommendation (1): Performance Management**
To complete the implementation of the BCU performance management framework (PMF) to include:-

- Clarification as to the core purpose of each key unit in support of BCU priorities;
- The determination of a simple and concise range of performance indicators that accurately reflect this purpose (as described above);
- The development of departmental performance packs to support each monthly review meeting;
- The provision of a framework that regulates the conduct of PMF meetings from inspector and police staff equivalent and below.

This should lead to a focused and constructive PMF process that rewards success, promotes good practice and supports those with poor performance in a challenging yet supportive way.

**Recommendation (2): Improving Sanction Detections**
To create and implement a comprehensive sanction detection improvement plan that encompasses the range of activity already initiated by the BCU and the following themes:-

- The monitoring of compliance with minimum standards of primary investigation for BCU priority crimes;
- The increased and effective use of TICs as a disposal option;
- The conduct of targeted intelligence interviews.

**Recommendation (3): Staff Inclusion and Engagement**
To review the arrangements for staff consultation and inclusion so as to improve the degree to which staff are involved and consulted in the process of change;

**Recommendation (4): Coordinating Problem-Solving Activity**
To review the arrangements for the dynamic coordination of problem-solving initiatives in consultation with partners so as to create a capability, potentially in parallel with the TTCG (but with links to promote coordination), that commissions and reviews such initiatives against priorities overseen by the CDRP Executive.

1.7 The inspection team also acknowledges the following areas of good practice:

- The arrangements for policing Millwall Football Club (Para. 6.17);
2. **Introduction**

2.1 Basic command units (BCUs) are a fundamental building block in the delivery of policing services. Aligned to communities, BCUs represent the local interface with the public and are therefore highly influential in the police service’s aims to reduce crime and disorder, and to increase community confidence. BCUs vary in size and composition according to the areas they police. All share responsibility for the delivery of the national community safety plan as it affects them and with Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) colleagues, the delivery of the local community safety strategy (CSS) priorities. As such, individual BCUs will continue to be subject to increasing scrutiny of performance from both Government and local communities.

2.2 The range in performance outcomes between BCUs presents an opportunity to continuously improve and to maximise the efficiency and effectiveness of this tier of policing. A key ingredient of successful BCUs remains focus with the most successful being those that maximise focus through effective leadership at every level. They will also have a performance management framework that strikes the right balance between holding individuals to account, and providing support for those in most need. The NIM will be fully embedded and mainstreamed throughout the BCU, driving all types of proactive intervention through the systematic and skilled interpretation of intelligence. Successful BCUs will also have a thorough appreciation and desire to meet the needs, wishes and expectations of their primary customer - the communities they police.

2.3 Following a five year rolling programme of BCU inspections, HMIC has since moved to a more intelligence-led approach whereby only a small number of BCUs are selected for inspection. This follows an examination of their relative performance within their MSBCU group, together with a detailed review of their self-assessment, which was completed by a selection of BCUs as an integral part of the wider Baseline Assessment process. All BCU inspections are now directly aligned to the Baseline Assessment frameworks and police performance assessment framework (PPAF) domains, and evidence gathered at the BCU tier can easily be used to help assess overall force performance.

**Box A – Aims of BCU Inspections**

- Promoting effective leadership.
- Disseminating good practice.
- Identifying inefficiencies.
- Providing pointers to enhance performance.
- Strengthening the capacity for self-improvement.
- Leaving behind a BCU management team that has learnt about itself and is even more committed to self-improvement.

2.4 The Inspection of Lewisham BCU in the Metropolitan Police Service was conducted between 22\(^{nd}\) and 26\(^{th}\) May 2006. This report sets out the inspection findings, highlighting areas of good practice and making recommendations for improvement where appropriate. Her Majesty’s Inspector thanks the officers and staff of Lewisham BCU for the co-operation and assistance provided to members of the inspection team.
Methodology

2.5 The Inspection of Lewisham BCU consisted of the following core stages:

- Pre-visit data and analysis of BCU self-assessment
- Leadership Audit
- BCU Inspection
- Feedback to BCU
- Reporting

2.6 During the Inspection, a total of 18 structured interviews and focus groups were conducted, involving over 128 individuals. Other staff members and partnership agency representatives were interviewed during the two visits to workplace settings. Representatives from the Lewisham Community Safety and Drugs Action Partnership (LCSDAP) and the Independent Advisory Group (IAG) were also consulted in the course of the inspection. A BCU leadership audit was also conducted within the BCU.
3. **The Force/Constabulary Context**

3.1 The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) is the largest and most complex police organisation in England and Wales. It comprises 32 borough-based operational command units, sharing coterminous boundaries with the London Boroughs. The service is responsible for policing 620 square miles, with a residential population of over 7.3m (3.2m households) and also deals with the impact generated by an additional daily influx of approximately 5.5m visitors and workers. The MPS delivers a range of international, national and capital city services, as well as local service delivery across the 32 territorial boroughs. In terms of staff numbers, the MPS is approximately three times larger than the next largest force and its annual budget accounts for approximately 24% of the total bill for police services in England and Wales.

3.2 Lewisham BCU is located within South London and the Metropolitan Police District (MPD), forming part of the South East Link Group.
4. **The BCU Context – Lewisham**

4.1 Lewisham Borough covers 13.4 square miles in SE London from the River Thames (north), to Bromley (south) and between Southwark (west) and Greenwich (east). It contains some 44 parks and open spaces, most notably Beckenham Place Park and Blackheath (over 200 acres each). Lewisham has a resident population of 248,300 in 107,412 households (2003 mid-year estimate, National Statistics). In the Indices of Deprivation 2004, Lewisham was ranked at 57 out of 354 local authorities in England. Some 45% of residents are under the age of 20 and 11% are single parent households, 5.6 per cent of all economically active people aged 16-74 are unemployed (4.3% London average) and 24% of 16-74 year olds have no qualifications (23% London average). Lewisham is a multi-cultural community with 34% of the population from black or other minority ethnic groups.

4.2 A major transport interchange in Lewisham town centre contributes to a high transient street population. There are also 21 rail stations and a range of other vulnerable sites that require daily police attention. The borough has over 1,400 licensed premises (3rd highest in MPS). Lewisham Town Centre contains the enclosed Riverdale shopping centre and an outdoor street market. The Town Hall and Civic Centre are situated in Rushey Green, Catford where there is another lively shopping area and night-time economy. The Borough has a well-established Council-controlled CCTV system. Lewisham is home to both Lewisham College and Goldsmiths College, part of the University of London and one of the largest teacher training establishments within the European Union. There are around 15 secondary education establishments, including Abbey Manor College, which is a pupil referral unit. Lewisham Hospital is the major emergency healthcare facility for the region. There are numerous places of worship on the Borough for a variety of faiths and 39% of the population are non-Christian.

4.3 Lewisham Police Station is a PFI site and the largest purpose-built station in Europe although it is shared with the Specialist Crime Directorate. It contains the largest custody suite in the MPS with one of the highest turnover of prisoners. There are four satellite stations at Deptford, Brockley, Catford and Sydenham. Since the establishment of Safer Neighbourhood Teams on each of the eighteen wards in April 2006, plans are underway to create north, central and south geographic policing areas to replace the previous five sectors.

4.4 There are three enduring crime hotspots on the Borough. The New Cross ‘Corridor’ in Deptford/Brockley in the North, Lewisham Town Centre and Rushey Green in the South (Catford). Good transport links between these areas and the introduction of free travel to under-16s are contributing factors to a recent increase in robberies on buses. The Venue nightclub in New Cross and similar premises elsewhere are crime generators with intoxicated revellers causing disorder and falling victim to crime through to 6am at weekends. The borough consistently experiences one of the highest rates of domestic incidents within the MPS. There are several children’s homes that generate high volumes of missing persons. Lewisham is home to Millwall Football Club, with a notorious hooligan element, requiring a significant policing commitment.
Diversity

Minority Ethnic Groups in Lewisham

4.5 The following table shows the ethnic groups within the London Borough of Lewisham.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of resident population in ethnic groups</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which White Irish</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which Indian</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which Caribbean</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Black</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or Other Ethnic Group</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The following table shows a breakdown of religions for Lewisham:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Source: ONS neighbourhood statistics
The Leadership Audit

4.7 A critical attribute of successful BCUs is effective leadership. Leadership styles vary – some are highly transformational while others veer more towards transactional approaches. There is no ‘correct’ style because circumstances vary too, and good leaders attune their approaches to fit these circumstances. To try and explore the components of leadership and their relative impact on performance, HMIC has developed a leadership audit tool, the findings from which inform the fieldwork stage of the inspection to validate key themes. This is a developing tool that will become increasingly powerful as benchmarks are created from BCUs against which results can be evaluated.

4.8 The leadership audit is a ‘soft’ tool in that it invites perceptions from staff initially through survey and then seeks to validate these during interviews and staff focus groups. The validation process includes interviews with the BCU Commander and members of the SMT so as to provide a management context to the survey findings. Emerging strengths and areas for improvement from the audit will therefore represent a summary of validated opinions about leadership across the BCU and some caution should therefore be exercised in the use of such data. The emerging themes will only feature as HMIC recommendations, management consideration or item of good practice if they are subsequently validated by specific and triangulated evidence obtained during the wider fieldwork visit and in the context of overall BCU performance. The audit explores leadership across the whole BCU, using the headings that are applied to force-level leadership as part of Baseline Assessment and is a development from the previous focus of such inspections which primarily assessed the leadership of the BCU Commander and the SMT.

4.9 The audit process comprised three phases: a questionnaire, circulated to a statistically significant cross section of all BCU staff and returned to HMIC; focus groups with a representative cross section including inspectors, special constables and police staff; and one-to-one interviews with the BCU Commander, Crime/Operations/Partnership Superintendents and the Chief Inspector (Operations) and Business Manager. The audit also includes an interview with the relevant link chief officer line-manager who exercises line management over the BCU Commander, to explore their working relationship.

4.10 The Leadership Context – Lewisham BCU
Lewisham BCU is one of the larger boroughs in the MPS with an overall establishment of 799 staff and has some significant policing challenges including that of Millwall Football Club and tackling robbery and violent crime that have both notably increased during the PYTD. The SLT and the wider SMT have worked hard to impact these challenges, including many examples of proactive operations (such as Operation Serenity). The BCU Commander strives to continually improve the borough and this has necessarily led to changes in working practices, structures and responsibilities, all of which can impact upon staff perception of leadership.

The Audit Results
4.11 **The BCU receives appropriate support from the Chief Officer – Line Manager**
Alongside his peers, the BCU Commander regularly meets his link commander at monthly ‘link meetings’ and on a one-to-one basis. Personal objective setting (PDR) is an annual and inclusive ‘Star Chamber’ process and while there was some dissatisfaction with this year’s outcomes as not being particularly ‘SMART’, this has now been addressed in part.

The appointment of a BCU command team with complementary leadership styles is determined through a corporate level (MPS) process. Whilst accepting that there is a limited pool from which to appoint, the BCU Commander remains concerned that the postings process is weighted more in favour of the candidate’s preferences rather than the BCUs needs. The Lewisham command team are all new to their posts since January 2006 (with the exception of the BCU commander) and the BCU commander reported support from his link commander throughout the process.

Both the BCU commander and his line manager were positive in respect of the development and innovation potential of the Force’s performance environment. Both considered the existing structures effective and one to which the BCU commander regularly exposed members of his management team to assist in their development, although the link commander considered that while the outcomes were prescribed, some improvements could be made to the ways in which they were achieved.

There was clear direction from the link commander regarding the integrity of processes, both personally and through Force mechanisms such as the Data Accuracy Team and local checks and balances. However, the link commander considered that there is scope for more such activity, albeit time constraints prove to be a significant barrier.

Both the BCU commander and his line manager were content with the resource support at Level 2 but organisational changes through the Service Review process brought an element of unpredictability because specialist resources now fall within a different business group. There was positive support for the BCU commander in respect of partnerships and the BCU commander felt well supported by his line manager on issues that conflicted with the views of other chief officers.

4.12 **The BCU has an appropriate structure which is aligned to the Force Strategy**
A majority (68%) of respondents to the survey felt that their roles were generally well defined and contributed to the BCU and Force strategies with 22% taking a contrary view. Focus group interviews ratified this opinion, which was divided between managers and police staff who felt that the statement was true and constables and sergeants who felt that there were inconsistencies or improvements were needed.

Some 65% of respondents felt that they were set objectives that are clearly relative to their role and experience and achieved real benefits with 35% gave a negative view. Interviews showed that inspectors, sergeants and police staff agreed with the statement. Senior managers felt that improvements were needed whilst constables felt that it did not happen at all – they thought that objectives were not always SMART and designed to ‘tick boxes’.

A majority (68% positive, 30% negative) of respondents felt that lines of accountability and responsibility were clearly defined of which 36% felt that there was clarity which delivered real benefits. Focus group interviews showed that managers and supervisors felt that the
statement was true but sergeants, constables and police staff felt that improvements could be made.

There were more mixed views as to whether resources are effectively managed within the BCU with 43% of respondents feeling that they are managed well but 50% felt that they were not being managed effectively. Focus group interviews showed that senior managers and police staff felt that the statement to be true but inspectors, sergeants and constables considered that it was either not the case or was inconsistent, citing issues such as short-term abstractions or Safer Neighbourhoods as key issues.

Only 46% of respondents felt that BCU teams were balanced in terms of skills, experience and diversity; 38% felt that this was not the case; 17% felt that there was no consistency and 16% did not know. Focus group interviews showed that senior managers, inspectors and police staff felt the statement to be true but sergeants and constables did not, citing the young service profile as a key issue.

Some 76% of respondents felt that BCU health and safety procedures were effective and made them feel safe in their workplace and 18% were negative on this issue. Most staff interviewed agreed with this statement whilst a number identified scope for improvement.

### 4.13 The BCU has a performance culture with integrity

Some 86% of respondents felt that their manager demonstrated an interest in their performance and development with only 15% suggesting that improvements could be made. All staff interviewed except constables believed that this statement was true.

A majority of respondents (75% positive, 25% negative) felt they received the development they needed to perform their role. Senior managers and police staff said that this statement was true when interviewed but inspectors, sergeants and constables were less positive, citing issues such as TOWBAR to which supervisors have to dedicate too much time, some of which is felt would be better spent developing subordinates.

A relatively low percentage of respondents (43%) felt that good performance was recognised and rewarded with 54% saying that it could be improved. Senior officers and inspectors interviewed were positive on this point but sergeants, constables and police staff felt that there were inconsistencies and improvements could be made. Much good work apparently goes unrecognised and such recognition is based on the personality of the supervisor rather than a corporate or consistent approach.

Only 38% of respondents felt that innovation was promoted and supported and a significant 49% said that it could be improved. Only the BCU commander and police staff were positive on this statement when interviewed.

A significant response to whether effective use was made of the National Intelligence Model was ‘don’t know’ (29%), again suggesting that either communication issues or a lack of understanding might lie behind such a lack of awareness. Some 21% of respondents felt that it could be improved and 50% felt that NIM was used effectively. However, on interview, opinion was divided among senior managers and less positive among sergeants and constables.
A notable 27% of respondents did not know whether BCU managers ensure that maintaining integrity has primacy over performance. Some 44% believed that this was the case with a further 30% suggesting that improvements could be made. When interviewed, senior managers and inspectors felt this statement to be true. Inspectors said that front line staff might perceive that there was a lack of integrity but that performance was achieved with integrity. Sergeants, constables and police staff disagreed, saying that the focus was on achieving sanctioned detections at all costs.

The majority of respondents (64%) felt that the BCU delivered a good service to the community but 30% considered that improvements could be made. Senior managers felt this statement to be true but opinion among inspectors, sergeants, constables and police staff was divided, often due to the frustration at time constraints as a barrier to providing victims and witnesses with a good service.

### 4.14 Diversity

Some 66% of respondents felt that diversity was embedded within the BCU, specifically in terms of personal values and all areas of business including the selection and appointment of staff, although 20% felt it could be improved. All staff except constables agreed with this statement. Constables felt that diversity featured highly in the BCU’s consciousness but that the dialogue was sometimes neither honest nor open.

A majority (59%) of respondents felt that fairness at work procedures could be confidently used by staff without fear of recrimination from managers but 24% said it could be improved. However, 17% felt that they did not know. All staff interviewed agreed with this statement except sergeants, constables and police staff, a large number of which said that they did not know.

A large number of respondents were content with their own managers in that their operational decisions were consistent (79% positive, 17% negative), their decisions in respect of disciplinary issues were consistent (65% positive, 18% negative), they solve problems effectively (82% positive, 15% negative) and they inspired respondents with confidence (79% positive, 21% negative). When interviewed, all staff except constables agreed that their managers’ decisions were consistent in respect of operational issues but that improvements could be made. Constables cited a lack of maturity of supervisors as an issue. In respect of the consistency of managers’ decisions on discipline, there was an acknowledgement that there was room for improvement but in respect of constables and police staff, a large number did not know. There was a range of responses in interview as to whether staff had confidence in their managers to solve problems effectively.

There was a range of responses to whether sickness and welfare were managed effectively within the BCU with 58% of respondents saying that this was the case and 31% saying improvements could be made. However, 10% did not know. While inspectors and sergeants felt that this statement was true when interviewed, other staff offered a range of responses and constables in particular disagreed with it, stating that while organisational provision for welfare was good, the management of sickness absence was poor.

Some 42% of respondents felt that managers dealt with bullying effectively but a high proportion (44%) did not know. Sergeants, inspectors and police staff agreed with this
statement and senior managers felt that improvements could be made. However, the majority of constables did not know.

Exactly half (50%) of respondents felt that abstractions from duty were managed effectively within the BCU but 29% felt that improvements could be made and 21% did not know. When interviewed, senior managers and inspectors agreed with this statement but felt that improvements could be made but sergeants and constables perceived much inconsistency, saying that this depended entirely on their individual managers and was particularly poor on response teams.

Again, exactly half of respondents (50%) felt that there was no commitment to staff retention within the BCU and 40% felt that such commitment existed. When interviewed, most staff felt that retention could be improved but constables disagreed, stating that that there existed the diametrically opposite issues of either wanting to leave to the BCU for development but being unable or losing some really good staff through compulsory transfer. Police staff were also negative, citing losses of staff from the HR Department, pay banding issues and the lack of exit interviews.

4.15 Personnel Management

A large proportion of respondents (83% positive, 17% negative) felt that they had regular and meaningful contact with their line manager and a similar proportion felt that their line manager took an interest in them (85% positive, 15% negative). A majority (68% positive, 30% negative) felt their contributions were welcomed and 79% said that their manager made them feel trusted, valued and included (21% were negative). A high proportion (80% positive, 13% negative) said that their manager dealt with personnel issues in a timely manner and 74% said that their manager made them feel proud of the service they deliver (24% were negative).

When interviewed, the majority of staff felt that they had regular, personal and meaningful contact with their line manager with a few considering that there was room for improvement. Most also agreed that BCU managers took an interest in them with the exception of sergeants and constables where opinion varied, who cited issues of concern such as the lack of visibility of some SMT members. CID staff, however, felt their managers to be extremely supportive and accessible. The proportion of staff who expressed pride in the service they delivered was different to that in the survey with most considering the statement to be true with a few considering that there was room for improvement. The SMT considered that improvements could be made in respect of making staff feel trusted, valued and included. This was reflected during interviews with most focus groups saying that this was true in respect of their colleagues but not so in respect of SMT members. Most staff agreed that improvements could be made to dealing with personnel issues in a more timely manner, with the HR Department the subject of most negativity.

Some 70% of respondents felt that they were encouraged to learn by their manager but 30% were negative on this point. When interviewed SMT members and inspectors felt that promotion was supported where appropriate but sergeants did not feel that this was the case, with the BCU showing no demonstrable commitment such as promotion classes or permitting study leave. Constables also did not feel that learning or development was encouraged with most citing the time constraints as the key issue.
There was a mixed range of responses to whether training and development was allocated on the BCU according to need; 44% felt that this was the case; 46% said that it could be improved or lacked consistency and 10% did not know. Some 56% of respondents felt that they were prepared for future changes but 41% felt that there was a lack of consistency or improvements could be made. A relatively high proportion of respondents (25%) said that they did not know whether coaching and mentoring was available to them if they needed it. The remaining responses were mixed with 43% being positive and 31% stating that improvements could be made.

4.16 Communication

The majority of respondents (57%) did not feel that the BCU Commander and SMT had a high profile within the BCU; however, 40% felt that their profile was high. On interview sergeants and inspectors did not feel that the SMT had a high profile and other staff responses were mixed across the board.

A high proportion of respondents (81% positive, 19% negative) felt that their manager communicated relevant information to them but only 48% felt that they had been consulted on matters of policy and strategy, with 50% suggesting that improvements were needed or that current systems were inconsistent. Senior managers and inspectors acknowledged that there was room for improvement when interviewed about whether their managers communicated relevant information to them but police staff unanimously felt that the statement was true. However, sergeants said that this was not the case and constables conveyed a perception of inconsistency. In respect of consultation on matters of policy and strategy, most staff again felt that there was scope for improvement but sergeants and constables overwhelmingly felt that they had not been consulted.

A high proportion of respondents (84% positive, 16% negative) felt that their manager was available when needed but this proportion reduced to 36% in respect of the availability of the BCU Commander and SMT; 43% said that the SMT were not available at appropriate times or that improvements could be made. Managers to the rank of inspector felt that they were available to staff at appropriate times as did police staff but sergeants and constables were much less positive about this statement.

Some 52% of respondents felt that the BCU Commander and SMT did not respond in a positive way to feedback from staff whereas on 32% felt that they did so. When asked whether this was the case with their own managers, a notably higher 82% of respondents felt that they responded in a positive way to feedback from staff (16% were negative). Managers to the rank of inspector felt that they responded in a positive way to feedback from staff but sergeants, constables and police staff did not all feel that this was the case – there were inconsistencies and room for improvement.

4.17 Audit Conclusions

Both the surveys and focus groups/interviews showed that the single most significant issue on the leadership of Lewisham Borough was one of communication. This manifested itself in a number of ways throughout the audit process. Of concern to the audit team were the number of key issues such as use of the National Intelligence Model, disciplinary processes and bullying, indicated by the ‘don’t know’ responses. Many such responses were from constables/police staff and first line supervisors and managers, where senior managers clearly
felt that the highlighted issues were in place and had been promulgated effectively throughout the BCU.

A key issue that was raised, although not specifically incorporated into the questionnaire, was that of neighbourhood policing. It is clear that the Safer Neighbourhoods structure is viewed by some as a barrier to performance and resilience. Under the lead of its SMT champion and within the MPS Safer Neighbourhoods Strategy, the BCU must continue to act to market the benefits of Safer Neighbourhoods and reduce the negativity among staff – it is clear in some other MPS boroughs that neighbourhood policing has been embraced and is genuinely becoming mainstreamed. Such perceptions were reinforced by responses to questions in the ‘communication’ section of the questionnaire that related specifically to the BCU Commander and SMT members where responses to each were more negative than positive.

Of concern is the fact that the BCU Commander and SLT believed that the five key issues highlighted by the audit were all being addressed, albeit there was room for improvement in a small number, whereas there was clearly some great dissatisfaction among more junior ranks. A small number of SMT members were acknowledged to be good leaders and the CID in particular was recognised to be well led.

Where questions related to immediate line management there were greater levels of all-round satisfaction with systems and processes on small teams. Many constables and sergeants felt demoralised and frustrated at the barriers they needed to overcome in order to deliver what they felt was the best quality of service they were able under the circumstances. Most staff agreed that diversity was embedded into the BCU culture although there was some belief that the dialogue was not open and honest, that the BCU focused on what they could do, rather than addressing the more challenging issues.

Lewisham BCU has some excellent and committed staff who, despite a number of perceived barriers, want to deliver both to colleagues and the community. The BCU currently appears to be operating in a number of silos in respect of leadership. The SMT needs to acknowledge this fact and utilise the findings of this audit to drive enduring change through effective and consistent leadership.
5. **BCU Performance**

5.1 BCU objectives should reflect both national priorities - as set out in the National Policing Plan and reflected quantitatively in the public service agreement (PSA) targets - and local needs. In inspecting BCUs, HMIC covers both achievement of locally set targets and, more specifically, the delivery against national objectives – target crime reduction and sanction detections in particular. Considerable attention is paid to the MSBCU group positioning and direction of travel, both against the BCUs past performance and relative to its MSBCU group.

5.2 This is illustrated numerically in the following tables, and graphically using ‘Boston Box’ charting techniques (Appendix ‘C’) which illustrate performance against national priorities over the short (12 month) and medium (3 years) term against the MSBCU average - which is denoted by the horizontal and vertical lines that cross each chart (the ‘crosshairs’).

### Residential Burglary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>2743</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>-15.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05 PYTD Crimes</td>
<td>2611</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005/06 PYTD Crimes</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>-11.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes per 1,000 Households – 2004/05</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crimes per 1,000 Households - PYTD</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBCU Group Position – Crimes for 2004/05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSBCU Group – Crimes for PYTD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBCU Group – SD Rate for 2004/05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSBCU Group – SD Rate for PYTD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vehicle Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>4406</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>4172</td>
<td>-5.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05 PYTD Crimes</td>
<td>3946</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005/06 PYTD Crimes</td>
<td>4172</td>
<td>+5.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes per 1,000 Population – 2004/05</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crimes per 1,000 Population - PYTD</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBCU Group Position – Crimes for 2004/05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSBCU Group – Crimes for PYTD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03 – 2005/06 SD Rate</td>
<td>5.61% (2002/03) – 5.61% (2005/06)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004/05 - PYTD SD Rate</td>
<td>4.21% (2004/05) – 5.61% (2005/06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBCU Group – SD Rate for 2004/05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSBCU Group – SD Rate for PYTD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Most Similar BCU

5 PYTD = April 2005 to January 2006
### Violent Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crimes 2002/03</th>
<th>Crimes 2005/06</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>7795</td>
<td>11147</td>
<td>+43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05 PYTD</td>
<td>10048</td>
<td>11147</td>
<td>+10.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crimes per 1,000 Population – 2004/05**

- 41.2

**MSBCU Group Position – Crimes for 2004/05**

- 10

**2002/03 – 2005/06 SD Rate**

- 19.41% (2002/03) – 20.24% (2005/06)

**MSBCU Group – SD Rate for 2004/05**

- 10

**2002/03 Crimes**

- 1627

**2004/05 PYTD Crimes**

- 1783

**2005/06 Crimes**

- 2304

**2004/05 PYTD Crimes**

- 2304

**Crimes per 1,000 Population - PYTD**

- 7.4

**MSBCU Group – Crimes for PYTD**

- 9

**2002/03 – 2005/06 SD Rate**

- 17.95% (2002/03) – 11.2% (2005/06)

**MSBCU Group – SD Rate for 2004/05**

- 5

**2002/03 – 2004/05 SD Rate**

- 15.79% (2002/03) – 16.82% (2005/06)

**MSBCU Group – SD Rate for 2004/05**

- 7

### Robbery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crimes 2002/03</th>
<th>Crimes 2005/06</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>+41.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05 PYTD</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>+29.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crimes per 1,000 Population – 2004/05**

- 7.4

**MSBCU Group Position – Crimes for 2004/05**

- 9

**2002/03 – 2005/06 SD Rate**

- 14.08% (2002/03) – 11.2% (2005/06)

**MSBCU Group – SD Rate for 2004/05**

- 5

**2002/03 – 2004/05 SD Rate**

- 13.27% (2002/03) – 16.82% (2005/06)

**MSBCU Group – SD Rate for 2004/05**

- 7

### Total Notifiable Offences (TNOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crimes 2002/03</th>
<th>Crimes 2005/06</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>28763</td>
<td>33387</td>
<td>+16.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05 PYTD</td>
<td>34833</td>
<td>33387</td>
<td>-4.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crimes per 1,000 Population – 2004/05**

- 141.0

**MSBCU Group Position – Crimes for 2004/05**

- 7

**2002/03 – 2004/05 SD Rate**

- 13.27% (2002/03) – 16.82% (2005/06)

**MSBCU Group – SD Rate for 2004/05**

- 7
What We Found

6.1 Following a review of the BCU’s performance, the GL3 (Going Local 3) self-assessment, the findings from the leadership audit and other key documentation, HMIC conducted its fieldwork at Lewisham BCU. The inspection team sought to validate acceptable practice and investigate/evidence further both potential good practice and any areas for improvement (AFIs). This report does not, therefore, reiterate what is and should be happening on a BCU in terms of its core functional activities, given that these are detailed within the GL3 self-assessment process. Instead, the following section highlights areas against the Baseline Assessment frameworks that are evidenced by the inspection team as either particular strengths or opportunities for improvement against the core business of the BCU.

The Baseline Assessment Frameworks

- Citizen Focus (Domain A)
  - Fairness and Equality in Service Delivery
  - Neighbourhood Policing and Problem Solving
  - Customer Service and Accessibility
  - Professional Standards

2. Reducing Crime (Domain 1)
   - Volume Crime Reduction

3. Investigating Crime (Domain 2)
   - Managing Critical Incidents and Major Crime
   - Tackling Serious and Organised Criminality
   - Volume Crime Investigation
   - Improving Forensic Performance
   - Criminal Justice Processes

4. Promoting Safety (Domain 3)
   - Reducing Anti-Social Behaviour
   - Protecting Vulnerable People

5. Providing Assistance (Domain 4)
   - Contact Management
   - Providing Specialist Operational Support
   - Strategic Road Policing

6. Resource Use (Domain B)
   - Human Resource Management
   - Training, Development and Organisational Learning
   - Race and Diversity
   - Managing Financial and Physical Resources
   - Information Management
   - National Intelligence Model

7. Leadership and Direction
   - Leadership
   - Performance Management and Continuous Improvement
LEADERSHIP AND DIRECTION

6.2 Leadership

Strengths

- The BCU Commander enjoys the full support of his senior partners, staff associations and SMT colleagues. He is hard working, completely dedicated to the BCU and successfully manages a considerable workload. Senior partners consider him to be part of the team and his integrity is above reproach;
- Recent efforts by certain members of the SMT are acknowledged and the proposals for SMT cover in Operation Serenity are supported. The engagement by Supt (Crime) has been highly impactive and illustrates the potential benefits of closer staff engagement, inclusion and consultation;
- The recent use of ‘emotional intelligence’ by the BCU Commander to inspire action from staff to tackle robbery is innovative and has been impactive.
- The introduction of the patrol sergeant post has made a positive impact to improve resilience amongst duty officers. The proposals for the new custody inspectors to undertake PACE reviews are supported as is the intended adjustments to the roster for dedicated custody officers that should help improve sergeant’s resilience.

Areas for Improvement

- There is a need for an appreciation of the currently limited capacity of uniformed sergeants, which has resulted from reductions in their establishments that were necessary so as to resource the Integrated Borough Operations (IBO) Unit and remaining SNTs. SMT decisions should be cognisant of this point particularly when fresh demands are made of their time;
- There is difficulty in recruiting to CID as the core team shift pattern is so good and there is a ‘them and us’ culture that has developed. The BCU needs to consider its options to make the CID a more attractive proposition for uniformed staff such as improved understanding of its purpose, a route-map into the CID and potential incentives for staff;
- There is a need to provide clarity as to the remit, role and purpose of each key team/unit and how each potentially contributes towards the BCU priorities within an overall policing style statement. This should be supported with simple key performance measures that indicate success in their support of BCU priorities. Once finalised, this product should inform role profiles of staff and will need to be widely marketed and communicated to staff;
- Many staff felt that the BCU often operated in a compartmentalised way with limited joined-up work across the four departments. This has recently been illustrated by Operation Serenity, by the limited awareness by staff of the BCU Control Strategy and its influence over BCU activity;
- There is a need to improve the SMT engagement of IBO staff so as to identify and champion issues that require resolution with the C3i team through existing user groups.
There is a perception amongst response team staff that they are not valued and appreciated. This has impacted upon morale and motivation;

- Staff on response teams do not recognise their potential contribution towards BCU priorities and consider themselves to be wholly reactive with no time whatsoever for proactivity. This is not helped by the term ‘response’. In conjunction with work to improve demand management and the consequential increase in capacity, this perception needs to be challenged and changed;

- Whilst the current focus upon robbery is fully acknowledged and supported, there needs to be a measured and coordinated approach towards the action taken, that limits any potential detrimental impact upon other priorities. Operation Serenity needs to be underpinned by a sophisticated analysis of the problem, leading to a coordinated action plan that deploys the range of tactical options, including problem-solving, schools, PPOs and proactive operations. This should be driven within a wider partnership-based coordinating group that includes a strong community consultation strand;

- Many staff interviewed did not feel consulted or involved in the process of change and that many decisions were simply imposed. Communication is sometimes weak between the SMT and inspectors/PSEs and within the CID environment. This has diluted ownership of the issue and in some cases may lead to decisions that are perceived as not practically viable (e.g. the target for achieving sanction detections by response teams). There is therefore a need to win the ‘hearts and minds’ of staff and consider options to directly engage those most affected by change.

6.3 Performance Management and Continuous Improvement

Strengths

- The BCU routinely generates data on disproportionality in the use of stop and account powers which is shared with partners to generate discussion. This open approach is commendable and will help improve understanding of causation and reassure that management action is taken when appropriate;

- The new Performance Management Framework (PMF) is an excellent piece of work that pools related strategies, policies, action plans and performance information, under a single application with a user-friendly front-end. Its availability and potential use is not widely known and should be strongly marketed to supervisory ranks/grades and above;

- The performance review unit (Catford) has generated some quality audit work that has examined opportunities to improve sanction detections and improve NCRS compliance. These were commissioned by the SLT and should be discussed at SLT/SMT meetings so as to ensure shared understanding of the issues and learning points;

- There is absolute clarity across the BCU that reducing robbery is the top priority and that all efforts should be made to reduce the crime;

- The creation and continued development of five monthly performance review meetings – SMT, Operations, Crime, Partnership and Business Management – is logical and has the potential to be highly impactive;

- The BCU is considering moving from five to three parade sites for core teams so as to
improve the quality of briefing, supervision and teamwork. This move is supported and its potential benefits are recognised and the BCU will need to allay any potential concerns from the public regarding accessibility through an associated media strategy. It should be supported by improvements to the briefing facilities at non-HQ sites and consultation over any potentially displaced units/staff arising from the changes.

Areas for Improvement

- The BCU planning process needs to include a diagnostic element to identify which internal processes are working well and where opportunities for improvement exist. This should be introduced into the planning round and be conducted in conjunction with staff, leading to the generation of an action plan for agreed change management issues that support BCU priorities;

- There is no obligation for the BCU to complete all MPS Level I audits and they are time consuming, inconsistently completed and not undertaken according to risk. These should be discontinued unless a case is made that the function is high risk, a potential vulnerability or impactive upon BCU priorities. This should generate increased capacity to pursue SLT determined audits/thematics, that improve key processes in a more selective fashion;

- There is a need for a standardised structure and agenda for each of the four departmental performance review meetings. These should engage chief inspectors and inspectors (or police staff equivalents) using bespoke performance packs and be subject to action sheets that are accessible to all on AWARE;

- Alongside the work to clarify the remit/purpose of each key unit, the SLT leads need to consider the identification of a limited number of key indicators with achievable targets that reflect success and which are easily understood by staff. These should feature with a performance pack for each of the four BCU Departments and which could sit alongside a BCU-level equivalent pack, which purely concentrates on BCU outcomes against priorities. This could be further complemented by variable thematic pages in the reports specific to the department concerned that periodically concentrate on other areas of concern;

- Consideration should be given to introduce a simplified daily allegation sheet that shows daily and Planning Year to Date (PYTD) crime allegations against target for the BCU, North, Central and South SNTs. This one-page document should be circulated to all inspectors and police staff equivalents at a given time each day and accessible through AWARE to all staff;

- There is a need to clarify and distinguish the purpose and remit of the Borough Commander’s Daily Briefing from the DMM. The former meeting could concentrate upon performance and compliance issues whilst the latter could focus upon intelligence and emerging crime patterns with a view to determining proactive tasking. Both need to be supported with succinct management/performance information to inform discussion;

- Care is required in the setting of team-based targets so as to make them realistic and achievable. Their determination should be subject to meaningful research, consultation with staff affected and SLT colleagues;
Whilst it is acknowledged that performance discussions do take place between inspectors, sergeants and constables and police staff equivalents, these occur in an unstructured and inconsistent way. The BCU is therefore encouraged to introduce a template agenda for such meetings with reference to the departmental performance packs as sources of data to be used for discussion. Actions sheets arising there from should be regularly reviewed by SMT members so as to promote compliance.

CITIZEN FOCUS

6.4 Fairness and Equality in Service Delivery

Strengths

- The BCU has a vibrant and highly valued Independent Advisory Group (IAG) that is actively used to advise on investigative strategies, campaigns and at Gold Groups;

- A detailed audit of the use of stop and search powers was completed by the BCU and the findings were openly shared with partners at a conference during the last planning year. This bold innovation has helped allay concerns regarding misuse of police powers and improved understanding of this complex subject.

6.5 Neighbourhood Policing and Problem Solving

Strengths

- The BCU Commander is engaged with the Lewisham Public Service Delivery Board that comprises senior partners from key organisations with executive responsibility as distinct from members of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) who are concerned with matters of governance. This forum provides an excellent opportunity for the development of strategic initiatives across the partnership and the BCU Commander is encouraged to exploit them;

- There is a vibrant Special Constabulary that has recently been aligned to the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. This is a positive step that increases the capacity of these units, giving officers a focus and which has been generally welcomed by those concerned;

- The implementation of the new (10) Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) has been managed well thus far, within a Lewisham Safer Neighbourhoods Strategy. Inspectors are fully briefed, there is a significant effort to maximise external publicity and points of contact for local communities have been widely publicised. More work nevertheless remains within the BCU to publicise the purpose and remit of SNTs;

- Neighbourhood Panels have been established for the original eight Safer Neighbourhood wards and they are in the process of being established for the remaining 10 that were established last April. These are rightly chaired by a member of the community and will mature with time. The issue of balancing the needs of communities with those of the MPS and Borough require a resolution in a way that does not disenfranchise communities and the panel members.

Areas for Improvement
The BCU Commander is encouraged to negotiate with partners to promote increased performance management and accountability at the CDRP together with an increased sense of shared responsibility across all key partners, including the CPS and Courts whether through the CDRP or LCJB6;

Only a limited number of staff on the Safer Neighbourhood Teams appear to have been trained in problem-solving techniques. Whilst acknowledging that a good deal of problem-solving activity already takes place on wards, this will constrain the implementation of such initiatives and the consequential benefits to be derived;

There appears to be scope for Safer Neighbourhood Staff to assist in responding to certain non-urgent community-related calls from the public. This would help alleviate the workload of core teams, whilst not necessarily prejudicing their core purpose. This needs to be explored further in the context of MPS policy and with a clear policy published for the benefit of all BCU staff, particularly those on SNTs, Core Teams and in the Integrated Borough Operations (IBO) Unit;

There are Safer Schools Officers in place within the six most challenging schools and a notable proportion of robbery offences concern suspects/victims who attend these schools with offences mainly committed en route to or from the school. Under Operation Serenity, there is an opportunity for joint problem solving work between these officers; their SNT colleagues and school’s staff so reduce robbery.

### 6.6 Customer Service and Accessibility

**Areas for Improvement**

Accepting the use of quarterly, borough level customer satisfaction data, such information is limited and not yet available at a ward level to inform SNT work and there is limited analysis of any emerging issues. There is also a desire from some partners for a closer interface between junior officers/staff and on diversity issues so as to improve their appreciation of the issues and perceptions held.

### 6.7 Professional Standards

**Strengths**

The BCU Commander has a fair and reasonable approach to considering options when disciplinary matters arise. This takes account of the views from staff associations, the representatives of which have planned to provide guidance to SNT supervisors on disciplinary processes for police staff and PCSOs. This work could be further enabled by consolidating corporate responsibility for professional standards within a single entity and the BCU Commander is encouraged to lobby the force in this regard.

---

6 Local Criminal Justice Board
REDUCING CRIME

6.8 Volume Crime Reduction

**Strengths**

- There are a number of worthy partnership initiatives being progressed by the BCU including linking the licensing section with the local authority and the provision of a guide for London Borough of Lewisham street wardens on robbery;

- The BCU has enhanced its robbery squad strength so as to progress a backlog of outstanding robbery investigations. This is consistent with the BCU Control Strategy and will help tackle the issue, albeit the process of change would have benefited from increased consultation with supervisors affected.

**Areas for Improvement**

- Several partners and staff identified opportunities to be exploited in the reduction of robbery and increasing public reassurance by examining the transport routes taken by robbery suspects/victims, offences linked to The Venue in Deptford and reassurance patrols outside train stations at rush hour times.

INVESTIGATING CRIME

6.9 Managing Critical Incidents and Serious Crime

**Strengths**

- As part of an MPS pilot ‘command vehicle’, the introduction of a patrol sergeant who has responsibility for the initial supervisory action at the scene of a critical incident is seen as a positive change. It minimises risk by using an individual who is trained and well versed in the initial action required during the ‘golden hour’ stages of critical incidents;

- Staff have received input regarding the action required at critical incidents and this is reportedly good. Ongoing and updated training for this will need to be maintained.

**Areas for Improvement**

- At the time of inspection, there was no general CID (Reactive) capability with the CID Reactive teams dissolved and major crimes allocated to the Sapphire and Community Safety Unit (CSU) staff. This may fall foul of MPS policy regarding the work of CSUs and consideration needs to be given towards establishing a combined General Crime Investigation Unit that combines detectives with uniformed officers to investigate the range of Beat and Major Crimes not taken by specialist teams/squads.
6.10 Tackling Serious and Organised Criminality

Strengths

➤ There are two trained officers designated to undertake asset confiscation work and they have recovered some £82k during the PYTD albeit no element of this has yet to be received by the BCU. Whilst the BCU has yet to notionally ‘break-even’ against the FIU\(^7\) costs, it has made a good start towards exceeding this threshold. There would also be value to publishing guidelines on the application of the Proceeds of Crime Act so that other staff are aware of its content.

Areas for Improvement

➤ There is a growing ‘gang' culture on the borough that has connections with robbery and which requires a more detailed understanding and a partnership-based response. This phenomenon has many facets not least the links gang-members have with schools, bus routes used and the potential migration from low-level crime into more serious criminality sometimes seen elsewhere in the country. The crimes committed by gangs often involve significant violence and could perpetuate a cult that needs to be strongly challenged.

6.11 Volume Crime Investigation

Strengths

➤ The Crime Management Unit is well organised and operates a range of ethical housekeeping practices that maximise sanction detections with a detections team. These include the regular running of ASGARD checks, dip-sampling, reconciling the Custody/CRIS systems and the release of a computer based training package on sanction detections. That said, there remained a number of staff who did not understand what a sanction detection comprised.

Areas for Improvement

➤ The existence and use of bespoke minimum standards for priority crimes is a positive step to raise the quality of the primary investigation. However, this is diluted by the absence of compliance monitoring and the production of management information on the same. This could be implemented firstly for robbery until a requisite standard has been met and then other priority crimes and including secondary investigations;

➤ The investigative workload of robbery squad staff is relatively high. Account should be taken of the complexity of many of these investigations and the time required to break the reactive investigative spiral that has recently developed;

➤ The quality of primary investigations is generally poor. Beat crimes that are screened in are allocated to core team officers for secondary investigation and workload pressures

\(^7\) Financial Investigation Unit
alongside inexperience often result in a poor quality secondary investigation and potentially lost sanction detections. There is therefore merit in considering the re-introduction of a Beat Crimes Unit staffed primarily from the Core Teams (the staff from which previously investigated these crimes). This unit could be combined with the major crime capability to form a General Crime Investigation Unit;

- There is a great deal of activity taking place on the BCU to improve sanction detection rates. This includes improvements to housekeeping practices, audits and subsequent improvements in bail management and cannabis seizures, the use of FPNDs and in ethically challenging false reports. However, more can be done to improve the quality of primary investigations, exploit TICs and to conduct targeted intelligence interviews. These need to be coordinated under a sanction detection improvement plan that is championed by the Superintendent (Crime) and overseen by the SLT.

6.12 Improving Forensic Performance

Areas for Improvement

- Whilst there is a relatively low rejection rate for the use of Livescan, there remains scope to increase the use of the Print to Mark (P2M) facility for suitable cases.

6.13 Narrowing the Justice Gap

Strengths

- The BCU has an effective system in place to tackle outstanding warrants with notable reductions in recent years. There was only 34 outstanding Category ‘A’ warrants at the time of inspection. These are allocated to the officer in the case or core team officers when that is not possible. Priority crime and PPO warrants are given a premium service. Management information on warrants is used and routinely published;

- There has been positive progress and success in recent months to meet the target for reducing the rate of cracked and ineffective trials with figures at the time of inspection running at 23% against a 24% target. This has been primarily due to the success of the witness care programme;

- The BCU has recently introduced an additional two inspectors to the custody suite taking the total to three and has reviewed the roster and number of dedicated custody officers. The revised roster provides increased levels of coverage at times of greatest need and is therefore supported by the HMIC team. The use of six Dedicated Detection Officers (DDOs) and two contracted gaolers on a 24-hour basis will also greatly assist in the reduction of abstractions from core teams.

Areas for Improvement

- The relationship with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) has been challenging in recent years and has considerable scope for improvement, including their involvement in the CDRP. The BCU needs to rectify this situation through dialogue and negotiation. The CPS needs to be persuaded of the need to provide a premium service for priority crimes and Prolific and Persistent Offenders (PPOs) and to thereby more closely reflect the needs of the community. This extends from the Local Criminal Justice Board
(LCJB) level to meetings on cracked cases and practitioner exchanges;

➢ There is no policy for either the CJU or the custody suite staff to provide a premium service for priority crime or PPO cases. This needs to be reviewed so as to fast track and provide maximum effort for such cases, with effective systems of communication that ensure the latest PPO details are available to all.

PROMOTING SAFETY

6.14 Reducing Anti-Social Behaviour

Strengths

➢ Staff on the SNTs link into the work of the Lewisham Anti-social Behaviour Action Team (ASBAT) and work in this area is gathering momentum. Plans are in place for the issue of its second Dispersal Order to tackle anti-social behaviour that has been progressed in conjunction with partners. This has also been tested for proportionality and fairness using existing mechanisms within the partnership.

6.15 Protecting Vulnerable People

Strengths

➢ There is a good level of awareness regarding the risks associated with children missing from homes (MFH) with a risk-assessed approach taken to their investigation. Work is also being progressed to explore options to improve demand management in this area including problem-solving opportunities arising from debriefs;

➢ There appears to be widespread use of the positive arrest policy for domestic violence cases. Staff use and have been trained in the use of Book 24D and when officers do not follow the policy, the DI (CSU) will speak with the individual personally.

Areas for Improvement

➢ The BCU needs to consider how it will adopt the new Risk Assessment Management Panel (RAMP) arrangements that are soon to be instigated;

➢ There are some 250 registered sex offenders on the borough plus potentially dangerous persons that are managed by a team of just one DS and four DCs who are all correctly accredited. This presents a risk to the BCU and consideration should be given towards tasking low-risk cases to police officers on SNTs, when the individual resides within their ward.

PROVIDING ASSISTANCE

6.16 Call Management

Strengths
The work to model and seek to align demand against resources for core team staff is acknowledged as a positive first step towards improving efficiency in this area;

Areas for Improvement

Research indicates that the average number of CAD calls (I, S & P) per head of officer on minimum strength per 24-hour period amounts to approximately 1.3 or 2.6 if double crewing is the norm. This figure is low relative to other BCUs (e.g.; Barnet had 6 calls per officer or 12 if double-crewed) and yet contrasts with reports from staff and an open-incident (OI) list of 30-40 calls at the conclusion of each shift. The explanation for this difference is multi-faceted - resources on core teams do not accurately match demand, MetCall do not seem to manage the OI list, inappropriate calls are sometimes despatched and there is a heavy throughput of prisoners, etc. One factor that seems most pertinent is the way in which C3i MetCall manages calls and it appears that silent running for all but 'I' calls is resulting in inappropriate units being despatched to attend. This requires further exploration with MetCall in conjunction with other boroughs that are C3i live so as to ascertain whether the practice is having a disproportionate impact upon core team resources;

Whilst the ongoing and regular meetings between the IBO manager and MetCall (C3i) are acknowledged, there remain many outstanding concerns regarding the new arrangements that directly impact upon the BCU. This includes concerns that MetCall do not effectively manage the open incident list; that inappropriate (non-police) calls are often routed to the BCU; silent dispatching causes delays and undermines command and control;

The monitoring of compliance with NCRS from the command and control perspective is apparently the responsibility of C3i MetCall. Feedback from staff indicates that the level of compliance is patchy and dependent upon staff understanding the rules and asking necessary questions of staff so as to result crime-related incidents correctly;

To inform regular meetings with MetCall managers, there is a need for the BCU to ensure that feedback is sought from both IBO staff and officers on core teams. This will ensure that the full range of issues is identified for potential resolution and their consequential impact.

6.17 Accessing Specialist Operational Support

Strengths

The policing arrangements for Millwall FC have been honed over the years to become a well-rehearsed and professional policing operation. This has involved excellent partnership working with the club together with some high quality investigative work to prosecute offenders following matches.

RESOURCE USAGE

6.18 Human Resource Management
Strengths

- The BCU Commander and his SLT colleagues have quarterly meetings with the elected Police Federation representatives to discuss policy/change issues and to consider issues that may be raised. The meeting is considered to be useful and there is an open invitation to the Police Staff Association representative to attend;

- The levels of police officer and police staff sickness are relatively low at 7.2 days per officer/annum (target 8) and 9.4 days per staff/annum (target 9) whilst PCSO sickness is somewhat higher at 14 days per PCSO/annum;

- Work is underway to improve workforce planning so as to better control the ebb and flow of staff against an accurate skills base. This will need to be closely linked to the duties management system (CARMS) and to any new Resource Management Group;

- The processes for managing health and safety issues are robust and effective. They include six-monthly inspection visits by staff association representatives and the regular completion of generic risk assessments.

Areas for Improvement

- Decisions regarding staffing, postings and abstractions are not made in a formalised, consultative manner. The BCU therefore needs to consider the introduction of a forum to make such decision against the backcloth of the BCU Control Strategy. The group needs to involve all departments, duties and staff associations. Decisions need to be recorded for reasons of transparency and so as to provide an audit trail;

- The PDR system lacks credibility amongst staff and is not fully utilised in a performance management context. Workplace objectives need to be linked to the CSFs for teams and common objectives/targets identified to support BCU priorities where possible. Only 60% of PDRs were submitted on time for 2005/06 and little is done to monitor or test quality;

- There is scope to improve the interventions made by management for cases of persistent sickness within the context of return to work interviews. These will require defined thresholds for intervention (force policy levels), a process to coordinate interviews, manage referrals and the provision of management information to inform each session;

- Whilst there is a range of formal methods of staff recognition that are actively used and celebrated (including bonus payments), there remains considerable scope to improve the degree of informal staff recognition. This needs to be conducted in a sincere, timely and proportionate fashion and a new ‘thank-you’ culture needs to be nurtured.

6.19 Training, Development and Organisational Learning

Strengths

- The BCU Commander has recently introduced a Band C post to lead and coordinate development and training issues on the BCU. Facilities have been secured and adjusted within the BCU HQ site in liaison with the PFI contractor;

- The BCU is participating in a new MPS detective training programme aimed to encourage and support the development and retention of female and ethnic minority staff within the
CID environment. It has now taken its second person from the programme.

Areas for Improvement

- The BCU needs to promote its mentoring scheme for BME staff and for HPDS officers so as to maximise development and minimise staff wastage;

- There is a need to improve the linkage between the PDR system and the discretionary element of the BCU training programme. The determination of training themes should be based upon mandatory themes, risk and information arising from performance review meetings and should be directed according to need in the most efficient and effective way.

6.20 Race and Diversity

Strengths

- The Human Resources (HR) Manager has instituted effective processes to ensure that staff selection processes are fair and non-discriminatory. All policy has been review for compliance with the new race legislation and a system is in place to ensure that all new policies are Race Equality Scheme (RES) proofed prior to publication;

- Flexible working, job-shares and part-time working is widely enabled to the point that there is now a recognition that increased guidance and qualified HR input is required before many decisions are finalised. This should ensure that inappropriate cases are challenged in way that minimises risk to the BCU and MPS.

6.21 Resource Management

Strengths

- The outturn for 2005/06 was an overspend of just £150k which was more than accounted for by the overspends in Force Medical Examiner (FME) and Interpreter costs (some £243k) over which the BCU has no control. The HMIC were reassured to learn that these items may be removed from BCU budget lines in future;

- The delegation of police and police staff overtime budgets is effective as are the BCU mechanisms for monitoring expenditure against budget. It is also suggested that future allocation of budgets be subject to a more scientific assessment of need;

- The BCU actively recovers the costs associated with policing Millwall FC (under the SSA) and from the Immigration Service for handling their prisoners. Partnership funding is also utilised to fund short-term PCSO posts albeit little activity occurs under sponsorship or in the capture and recycling of efficiency savings;

- The inspection team was encouraged by the recent work to review the minimum strengths of core teams against demand. This work is necessary to improve demand management and should include the benchmarking of workload, the application of the MPS single-crewing policy where possible and the utilisation of a skills base for teams.

Areas for Improvement
In consultation with the MPS, the BCU needs to introduce a mechanism to monitor compliance with the Working Time Directive (WTD) so that management interventions occur when WTD thresholds are tripped;

The creation of a BCU Demand Management Strategy is a commendable first step towards alleviating the demand upon staff and maximising proactivity. This needs to be supported by an action plan to implement the various strands of activity, including increasing the proportion of crimes taken by Telephone Investigation Bureau (TIB) from the current level of about 30% and the deployment of volunteers together with the oversight of either the SLT group or a separate Demand Management Group.

6.22 National Intelligence Model (NIM)

Strengths

- The Borough Intelligence Unit (BIU) is structured appropriately according to the requirements of the BCU. Key functions are in place and systems for monitoring RIPA\(^8\)s, tasking, PATPs, ASBO\(^9\)s, F302\(^{10}\)s, etc were all found to be effective albeit tasking compliance could be improved. Most NIM products were routinely produced for TTCG\(^{11}\) and the STCG\(^{12}\) purposes to a good standard;

- The inspection team observed a core team parade at Lewisham. The parade was conducted in a room that was somewhat scruffy and also being used by others at the time. The sergeant personally led the parade in a competent and engaging manner using the MetBats system. A 'default' tasking was given, as was intelligence although there was limited intelligence-based discussion and there was a perception that capacity to complete taskings was non-existent and they therefore had little relevance;

- There is an intelligence culture on the BCU that could be further enhanced by the careful use of performance measures to promote quality entries in support of the BCU priorities and PPOs. There is nevertheless scope to increase the quantity and quality of community intelligence from SNTs and Safer Schools staff;

- The TTCG meeting is structured well, engages the right individuals and is supported by a good quality tactical assessment together with a performance backcloth. There is partnership representation at the meeting and summarised information is taken on outstanding forensic dockets, warrants, PPOs and PATP\(^{13}\)s.

Areas for Improvement

- The Dedicated Source Unit needs to be more proactively tasked for intelligence on the BCU priority crimes (particularly robbery) and PPOs as the flow of intelligence in this regard is limited compared to other BCUs;

---

\(^8\) Regulation of Investigative Powers Act
\(^9\) Anti Social Behaviour Orders
\(^10\) MPS form used to initiate a problem solving initiative
\(^11\) Tactical Tasking & Coordinating Group
\(^12\) Strategic Tasking & Coordinating Group
\(^13\) Proactive, Assessment & Tasking Packs
The NIM Control Strategy needs to be more widely publicised within the BCU and should become much more influential in the determination and prioritisation of work for all staff on the BCU, including support departments/units;

The taskings issued by the BIU tended to concentrate upon hotspot patrols in the belief that core team staff have little time to do anything else. As the measures to improve demand management start to take effect, any scope to increase taskings for core teams should be seized and fully exploited;

Accepting the current priority of robbery, there is a need for a balanced approach to the posting of proactive resources that ensures a flexible focus within certain proactive teams (e.g. the BSU and Proactive Team) whilst minimising disruption to other key aspects of policing. The suggested introduction of a Resource Management Group will assist in achieving this aim;

The BCU has rightly recognised the potential of the Persistent and Prolific Offender (PPO) Scheme and recently increased resources on the team that are based within the BIU. The implementation of PPO interventions is correctly coordinated through the PPO Strategy and Tactical Groups. However, each PPO needs to have a NIM Subject Profile together with an intervention plan and a named lead from any member of the partnership. The scheme needs to become more dynamic with PPOs moving between tiers and, if interventions are successful, off the scheme. There also needs to be clear expectations of what is expected from staff regarding PPOs, together with information regarding the named lead and their organisation;

The PPO scheme is at an early stage of development with some 32 individuals identified. It would benefit from a hierarchy of offenders with graduated engagement of partners according to the tier in which they sit and the capacity of partners/stakeholders. The selection of PPO subjects needs to be evidenced based and compliant with the Home Office Scheme. It should also reflect the BCU/Community Safety Strategy (CSS) priorities as emphasised by the BCU Control Strategy irrespective of the ethnicity, gender or age of the subject;

Whilst there is a CDRP structure in place to oversee the implementation of actions plans in support of CSS priorities, there is a need for a group to dynamically consider and commission problem-solving initiatives across the BCU. This group needs to be separate from and yet operate parallel with the TTCG (with summarised information provided), engage key partners and review the progress of problem solving work previously agreed.
## Leadership Audit - Staff Survey results

### Key to Scores:
- 0 = Don’t Know
- 1 = No - this doesn’t happen
- 2 = This happens occasionally but there is no consistency
- 3 = Yes this usually happens but it could be improved
- 4 = Yes this is recognised as the way we do business, and we achieve real benefits
- 5 = This is an integral part of our culture and operation and can be regarded as best practice.

### Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Percentage response by score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The BCU has an appropriate structure which is aligned to the Force Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My role is clearly defined and contributes to the BCU and Force Strategy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7 16 16 26 24 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am set objectives which are clearly relative to my role and experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 14 21 16 33 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lines of accountability and responsibility within the BCU are clearly defined</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17 13 32 25 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resources are effectively managed within the BCU including specific issues of demand and deployment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25 25 27 11 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Throughout the BCU teams are balanced in terms of skills, experience and diversity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21 17 32 11 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The health and safety procedures on the BCU are effective and make me feel safe in my workplace</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10 8 30 35 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The BCU has a performance culture with integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My manager demonstrates an interest in my performance and development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 13 25 32 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I receive the development I need to perform my role</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 13 35 30 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Within the BCU, good performance is recognised and rewarded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 24 32 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Innovation is promoted and supported on the BCU</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24 25 24 14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. On the BCU there is effective use of the National Intelligence Model - resources/tasking/coordination</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5 16 24 21 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. BCU managers ensure that maintaining our integrity is more important than achieving good performance</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15 23 10 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The BCU delivers an effective service to the community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 24 30 29 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Diversity is embedded within the BCU, specifically in terms of personal values and all areas of business including selection and appointment of staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 15 16 34 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Fairness at work procedures (e.g.: grievance or appeals) can be confidently used by staff on the BCU without fear of recriminations from managers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19 5 21 30 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My manager’s decisions in respect of operational issues are consistent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 6 14 43 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My manager’s decisions in respect of disciplinary issues are consistent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8 10 14 35 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My manager to solves problems effectively</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 7 27 32 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My manager inspires me with confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 10 29 25 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sickness and welfare are effectively managed within the BCU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17 14 24 17 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Managers deal effectively with bullying</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8 5 6 25 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Abstractions from duty - other than sickness - are effectively managed within the BCU</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16 22 22 22 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. There is a commitment within the BCU to staff retention</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33 17 21 14 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I have regular and meaningful contact with my line manager</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 11 10 35 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My manager demonstrates a genuine interest in me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 10 19 37 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I feel that my contributions are welcomed and valued</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 9 8 38 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My manager makes me feel proud of the service we deliver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 16 30 33 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My manager makes me feel trusted, valued and included</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 10 14 41 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Training and development is allocated on the BCU according to need</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21 25 17 24 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am encouraged to learn by my manager</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 17 24 33 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I feel prepared for future changes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 22 33 17 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Coaching and mentoring is available to me if I need it</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17 14 19 14 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Personnel issues are dealt with by my manager in a relevant and timely manner</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8 5 17 41 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The BCU Commander &amp; Senior Management Team has a high profile within BCU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40 17 8 27 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My manager communicates relevant information to me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 14 19 37 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I feel that, where it is appropriate, I am consulted on matters of policy and strategy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 29 16 19 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. My manager is available when I need to talk to him/her</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 16 14 43 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The BCU Commander, Senior Management Team are available to staff at appropriate times</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29 14 17 13 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The BCU Commander and SMT respond in a positive way to feedback from staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33 19 16 13 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My manager responds in a positive way to feedback from staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 8 22 38 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix ‘C’

**MSBCU Total Crime Reduction - Lewisham BCU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 year performance (2002/03 to 2005/06)</th>
<th>12-month performance (YTD - August to July - 2004/05 to 2005/06)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>MSBCU group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>Lewisham BCU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MSBCU Domestic Burglary Reduction - Lewisham BCU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 year performance (2002/03 to 2005/06)</th>
<th>12-month performance (YTD - August to July - 2004/05 to 2005/06)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>MSBCU group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>Lewisham BCU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MSBCU Violent Crime Reduction - Lewisham BCU**

12-month performance (YTD - August to July - 2004/05 to 2005/06)

3 year performance (2002/03 to 2005/06)

**MSBCU Total Crime SD rate - Lewisham BCU**

12-month performance (YTD - August to July - 2004/05 to 2005/06)

3 year performance (2002/03 to 2005/06)
MSBCU Domestic Burglary SD rate - Lewisham BCU

12-month performance (YTD - August to July - 2004/05 to 2005/06)

3 year performance (2002/03 to 2005/06)

-120.00% -100.00% -80.00% -60.00% -40.00% -20.00% 0.00% 20.00% 40.00% 60.00% 80.00% 100.00% 120.00%

-180.00% -140.00% -100.00% -60.00% -20.00% 20.00% 60.00% 100.00% 140.00% 180.00%

MSBCU Robbery SD rate - Lewisham BCU

12-month performance (YTD - August to July - 2004/05 to 2005/06)

3 year performance (2002/03 to 2005/06)

-120.00% -90.00% -60.00% -30.00% 0.00% 30.00% 60.00% 90.00% 120.00%

-120.00% -90.00% -60.00% -30.00% 0.00% 30.00% 60.00% 90.00% 120.00%
MSBCU Vehicle Crime SD rate - Lewisham BCU

12-month performance (YTD - August to July - 2004/05 to 2005/06)

3 year performance (2002/03 to 2005/06)

-160.00% -110.00% -60.00% -10.00% 40.00% 90.00% 140.00%

GOOD

-160.00% -110.00% -60.00% -10.00% 40.00% 90.00% 140.00%

POOR

MSBCU Violent Crime SD rate - Lewisham BCU

12-month performance (YTD - August to July - 2004/05 to 2005/06)

3 year performance (2002/03 to 2005/06)

-60.00% -40.00% -20.00% 0.00% 20.00% 40.00% 60.00%

GOOD

-60.00% -40.00% -20.00% 0.00% 20.00% 40.00% 60.00%

POOR
NOTIONAL CONTRACT

Purpose
This ‘notional contract’ follows an HMIC inspection of **Lewisham BCU** in the **Metropolitan Police Service**, that was conducted on the **22nd to 26th May 2006** and sets out the action required by the BCU together with the improvement outcomes required. It is between the HMI, the BCU Commander and his/her ACPO line manager.

Action Required
BCU inspection reports published by HMIC contain both recommendations and ‘management considerations’. Save for exceptional circumstances rendering the implementation of recommendations impossible or inappropriate, the implementation of recommendations is presumed to be a reasonable expectation. Management considerations entail more discretion, giving BCUs the option not to implement them if the BCU can show good reason why they should not be adopted.

For **Lewisham BCU**, HMIC requires that the following recommendations be implemented by the **1st June 2007** at the latest:

**Recommendation (1):** To complete the implementation of the BCU performance management framework (PMF) to include:-

- Clarification as to the core purpose of each key unit in support of BCU priorities;
- The determination of a simple and concise range of performance indicators that accurately reflect this purpose (as described above);
- The development of departmental performance packs to support each monthly review meeting;
- The provision of a framework that regulates the conduct of PMF meetings from inspector and police staff equivalent and below.

This should lead to a focused, informed and constructive PMF process that rewards success, promotes good practice and supports those with poor performance in a challenging yet supportive way.

**Recommendation (2):** To create and implement a comprehensive sanction detection improvement plan that encompasses the range of activity already initiated by the BCU and the following themes:-

- The monitoring of compliance with minimum standards of primary investigation for BCU priority crimes;
- The increased and effective use of TICs as a disposal option;
- The conduct of targeted intelligence interviews.

**Recommendation (3):** To review the arrangements for staff consultation and inclusion so as to improve the degree to which staff are involved and consulted in the process of change;
Recommendation (4): To review the arrangements for the dynamic coordination of problem-solving initiatives in consultation with partners so as to create a capability, potentially in parallel with the TTCG (but with links to promote coordination), that commissions and reviews such initiatives against priorities.

In addition, HMIC expects all ‘management considerations’ contained within the GL3 BCU inspection report to be implemented within the same timescale, save for good reasons as described above.

Improvement Outcomes

The implementation of recommendations and management considerations should ultimately lead to improvement in BCU performance. It is therefore essential that this notional contract includes expectations as to future performance that are firmly linked to force and BCU priorities.

**Lewisham BCU** is expected to meet or exceed the following performance targets **by 1st June 2007**:

- To maintain or improve MSBCU quartile positioning for its crime reduction from the time of inspection for total notifiable offences (second) and vehicle crime (second);
- To improve MSBCU quartile positioning for its crime reduction from the time of inspection for robbery and residential burglary (from third to second) and violent crime (bottom to third);
- To maintain or improve MSBCU quartile position for its sanction detection rate from the time of inspection for vehicle crime (second);
- To improve MSBCU quartile position for its sanction detection rate from the time of inspection for total notifiable offences (third to second); domestic burglary (third to second); robbery (third to second) and violent crime (third to second).

It is acknowledged that there will be occasions when circumstances change beyond the control of either the force or the BCU Commander whereby the implementation of certain recommendations or improvement outcomes is rendered unrealistic and void. Account will therefore be taken of these factors when the HMIC revisit is conducted within the timescale described herein.

**BCU Revisit and Review**

**Lewisham BCU** will be revisited by HMIC (Allington Towers, London) on or soon after **1st June 2007** to determine whether this notional contract has been fully discharged. At the 12 months stage (1st June 2007), HMIC will make an overall assessment that will fall within one of the following four options:

1) fully discharged;
2) partially discharged with further revisit scheduled;
3) fully or partially discharged with aspects voided; and
4) not discharged with PCSU referral.