

Tilley Award 2003

Project Title

'Problem Solving Process Implementation Programme'

Category

Organisational Support

Name of Police Force

Metropolitan Police Service

Endorsing Chief Officer

A/Supt Matthew Bell (Territorial Policing Headquarters TPHQ)

Contact details

Name: Neil Henson
Position: MPS Problem Solving Advisor
Address: Territorial Policing Headquarters
Victoria Embankment
London SW1A2JL
Telephone number: 020 7321 9033
Email address: probenisolvinguiiit@met.pohce.uk

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme
Organisational Support

Table of Contents

Chief Officers letter	page 2
Summary	page 3
Purpose	page 4
Objectives of the project	page 4
Defining the problem	page 4-5
Response to the problem	page 5-7
Delivery and application	page 7-8
Evaluation	page 8-13
Conclusion	page 13
Appendices index	page 14
Reference list	page 15



**METROPOLITAN
POLICE**

Working for a safer London

Matt Bell
Territorial Policing HQ

Police Headquarters
Victoria Embankment
London
SW1A2JL

Telephone: 020-7321-9027
Facsimile: 020-7321-7347
e-mail: matt.bell@met.police.uk
www.met.police.iik

Your ref:
Our ref:

29th May 2003

Dear Sir,

This letter supports the submission to the Tilley Awards of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Problem Solving Unit at Territorial Police Headquarters.

Over the course of the past 18 months the unit has worked to develop and mainstream In the day-to-day working of operational units, an effective problem solving process for London. The success of the process, its' associated training and support package, and face-to-face implementation guidance has resulted in real gains in crime reduction, partnership working and increasing public reassurance in both Borough and Pan-London units.

The MPS Problem Solving Process has become a crucial element of the MPS Operational Policing Model, driving the reform of our policing style towards a 'citizen focussed' delivery of services and ensuring we meet the needs of communities by tackling local' problems in partnership with statutory and community stakeholders.

I wholeheartedly recommend this submission to you.

Matthew Bell
A/Supt TPHQ

Tilley Award 2003

Project Title: 'Problem Solving Process Implementation Programme'
Police Force: Metropolitan Police Service
Contact person: Neil Henson
020 7321 9033 problemsolvingunit@met.police.uk

The nature of the problem addressed

The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) re-launched Problem-Solving in 2001. Consequently, a training need for police and business partners was identified which required problem-solving training on all 32 Boroughs. In meeting their needs the following objectives were identified:

- To design an implementation programme that overcame the barriers discovered whilst conducting the research.
- To design a training programme that incorporated the necessary additional identified skills that enabled practitioners to apply problem solving.
- Apply a monitoring system that would capture and share best practice, working in the long-term to reduce crime, reduce the number of repeat calls and generally improve the quality of life of Londoners.

The evidence used to define the problem

In 1985, the MPS unsuccessfully attempted to introduce problem-solving as the *modus operandi* for crime reduction.

In 2001, to reduce crime in the Metropolitan Police Area and reintroduce the problem-solving approach to policing, Deputy Assistant Commissioner Tim Godwin introduced the 'Operational Policing Model' (OPM). The model demonstrates a lasting need for problem-solving and comprises six elements: Investigation, Forensics, Targeting, Intelligence, Diversion and Problem-Solving to be adopted across the 32 London Policing Boroughs.

Historically, the MPS had repeatedly responded to the symptoms of a problem without identifying the root underlying cause. Growing organisational demands on the MPS, required the re-launch of Problem-Solving to support the reduction of strain on the Service.

The response to the problem

Before designing the training course, members of the Problem-Solving Unit consulted key officers involved in the 1985 project. Further research involved speaking to other forces, around the country. Their findings revealed lack of time, money and resources as the main barriers to effective problem solving.

The Unit's groundwork resulted in a two-day course divided into four half-day modules, to cater for part-time working and other needs. The course introduces students to the Problem-Solving Process (PSP) and associated skills.

Such training is reinforced with follow-up visits aimed at initiating live problem-solving initiatives.

The Impact Of The Response And How This Was Measured

Last year, over 50 problem-solving initiatives were started involving police and business partners. The PSU set itself a student satisfaction target of 90%. A recent inspection of the past 600 evaluation sheets shows a 97% satisfaction rate.

Over the last financial year, the Unit cost the MPS £140,000 in salary and training equipment. There is no cost implication for any Borough to receive the training, as delivery of the operational policing model is centrally funded.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme
Organisational Support

Force: Metropolitan Police Service

Contact: PS Neil Henson 0207 321 9033 problemsolvingunit@met.police.uk

Purpose

This report for the Tilley Award, will detail the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Problem Solving implementation-training programme. How the problem was defined, list the objectives of the project and the response to deal with the problem. The project's current evaluation and how the programme benefits the MPS in its overall approach to problem solving.

Objectives of the project

To achieve our Aim the following objectives were identified: -

- To design an implementation programme that overcame the barriers discovered whilst conducting the research.
- To design a training programme that incorporated the necessary additional identified skills that enabled practitioners to apply problem solving.
- Apply monitoring system that would capture and share best practice, working in the long-term to reduce crime, reduce the number of repeat calls and generally improve the quality of life of Londoners.

Defining the problem

Problem solving was first introduced as a concept into some police forces in the 1980s. Goldstein (1979) referred to improving policing by using a Problem-Oriented Approach and later Eck J and Spelman W (1987) referred to Problem-Oriented Policing. Both of these highly respected professors presented critical examinations of the current police policies and practices. They both suggested that new solutions were required to truly understand the nature of the problem and therefore create organisational environments and change that work towards properly solving them.

(Improving Policing: a Problem-Oriented Approach)

(Solving Problems: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News, Washington)

In 1985 the then Commissioner of the MPS Sir Kenneth Newman had unsuccessfully attempted to introduce problem solving as the *modus operandi* for the MPS as a crime reduction method.

In 2001 to reduce crime in the Metropolitan Police Area & reintroduce the Problem Solving approach to Policing, Deputy Assistant Commissioner Tim Godwin introduced the 'Operational Policing Model' (OPM). The model demonstrates a lasting need for Problem Solving & comprises of six elements, Investigation, Forensics, Targeting, Intelligence, Diversion and Problem Solving to be adopted across the 32 London Policing Boroughs.

The MPS had constantly responded to the symptoms of a problem, however with growing organisational demands on the MPS, Problem Solving was reintroduced to deal with the root cause of problems, leading to a reducing in crime & disorder problems.

Each strand would work on separate projects to improve the MPS performance but interlink to provide a co-ordinated change management approach.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme **Organisational Support**

The current problem solving team (PST) was formed consisting of two seconded officers who had to decide on how to introduce the subject of problem solving into the MPS. They started their research by gathering information from various sources such as the Internet, textbooks and government reports.

Several United States police forces adopted the concept successfully to reduce crime by looking deeper into the root cause of the problem, rather than regularly dealing with just the individual instances or consequences.

To discover any good practice or establish why problem solving had failed, the PST interviewed officers from other forces and within the MPS involved in problem solving training and or previous implementation programmes.

The PST quickly established several barriers that could prevent sustained problem solving success. The following are just two of the examples: -

- Firstly, it was found that after initial training, the practitioners required regular support, guidance and practical advice otherwise their enthusiasm and understanding could waver, causing problem solving to fail. Due to constraints of finance & resources it was established that several Forces were unable to provide a through problem solving support mechanism
- Secondly, without a practical recording process available to both police and their local partners, details of any important problem solving work had been lost. The problem was that several Forces had no established recording process easily accessible to officers & their business partners.

Response to the problem

Having considered the requirement to provide a practical and simple process to really solve long-term problems, the MPS has adopted the Problem Solving Process (PSP).
(Appendix A)

(Demand, Problem, Aim, Research, Analysis, Problem solving session, Options, Response, Evaluation and Review).

Subsequently Form 302 was designed to create greater understanding and record each stage of the process for those partners or police engaged in practical problem solving.
(Appendix B)

Early history revealed that both police and their business partners should be involved at the earliest stages for problem solving to be effective, by providing positive working partnerships.

The training is designed for up to 20 students consisting of police officers and representatives of their local partnership agencies actively engaged in day-to-day problem solving. The venue is decided by the attendees and does not have to be on police premises. Those attending generally consist of two-thirds police officers and one-third invited representatives from their local partnership organisations.

The cost of the implementation programme is based on staffing the unit and purchasing the relevant training equipment over a financial year at a total cost of £140,000 to the MPS. There is no cost implication for any Borough to receive the training, as delivery of the operational policing model is centrally funded.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme **Organisational Support**

To be effective problem solvers the research established that students would benefit from the following skills: -

- Guidance on how to complete business reports.
- Methods to be considered when giving presentations.
- Negotiation techniques to be employed when engaging partners
- How to conduct shorter and more productive meetings.

Preparation of the two-day course identified that Video Arts produce business-training material that incorporates the necessary above listed skills. Government Office for London (GOL) were approached & purchased the relevant training material that is now utilised on the problem-solving course. These skills further enable practitioners to engage in problem solving initiatives with representatives of partnership agencies and business.

The following two-day course was designed around four half-day modules, to cater for part-time working and people with other needs. The course provides students with knowledge of the PSP structure and the above four skills.

The students would apply the process to a current problem affecting the group and learn how to record the process onto Form 302. Examples have been 'drugs on stairwells' 'anti social behaviour' 'youth intimidation of residents on an estate' 'residential burglary' 'traffic accidents' and 'robbery'. Depending upon who created the demand to work on the problem and their key performance indicators, the process could be owned and managed by either police or a local partnership group or agency.

Course structure

Day 1 - Introduction into the process with associated skills

Module 1 - 'Understanding the problem solving process'

Module 2 - 'Forming and strengthening partnerships'

Day 2 - Applying the (PSP) to a local problem and associated skills

Module 3 - 'Examining local problems and reaching solutions.'

Module 4 - 'Managing problem solving sessions.'

The training was initially piloted on five of the London Boroughs starting in November 2001. The Problem Solving unit (PSU) was increased to five officers in May 2002, to meet the increased training and facilitation demands placed on the unit. Following the pilot tests a decision was taken to role out Problem Solving to the other 27 Boroughs.

After lengthy reflection during team meetings of the current practice, several improvements were made to **the** training. It was highlighted that although training was occurring, a manageable assessment system of the process and those involved in applying it was not. Some of the changes included making the training multi layered.

It now consists of the initial two-day training course, followed by a more in depth facilitated session on another occasion with the group (police or partner) leading on that particular problem, on how to input the information gathered correctly onto the Form 302.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme **Organisational Support**

Our Service Level Agreement (SLA) commitment to the individual trained Borough, is that a member of the (PSU) is available to conduct the Boroughs first two site visits and or facilitate problem solving sessions.

(See Appendix C)

Attend to give the Borough assistance in setting up and maintaining their particular recording process with practitioners and senior officers. This ensures all problem-solving Boroughs are co-ordinated in their approach to adopting, recording and managing the PSP.

The training programme is constantly assessed using the student feedback evaluation sheets.

(See Appendix D)

In addition to this, the entire training documentation is fully inspected every six months by the PSU. Recent improvements include a more user friendly website with full explanations of how to complete the documentation. Regular updates to all current and new in post Borough Advisors on the emerging good practice method of structuring the PSP information library.

Delivery and application

The Problem Solving implementation-training programme began in November 2001 and should to be completed on all of the 32 London Boroughs by April 2004. However, an individual Borough can decide whether to completely or partially adopt any of the six strands of the operational policing model, as no strand is mandatory.

On receiving a request to assist a Borough, the PSU Inspector and one of the sergeants will deliver a presentation, on the Units 'aims and objectives' and the training implications and benefits to that Borough. The presentation consists of the functions of the PSU, the implications of adopting a long-term Problem Solving approach to local quality of life issues & evidence of how the PSP has been applied successfully to tackle re-occurring problems and have a direct impact on the level of demand placed on their officers and the Boroughs individual priority crime.

The two-day training is either delivered over eight weeks or over two consecutive days within a four-week period. This depends on the availability of staff and the Boroughs commitments. The latter has proved more successful in meeting the student's individual training needs, by having better continuity. At present over half of the 32 London Boroughs have been trained in the PSP programme.

As part of our service level agreement and prior to the commencement of training, a Borough should employ a Problem Advisor. The advisors role is to co-ordinate current problem-solving initiatives recorded on Form 302, and then establishes whether there are any emerging crime trends occurring across the Borough.

They then highlight the initiatives to the Borough Co-ordination & Tasking Group (BC and TG) meeting. This effectively links Problem Solving with the National Intelligence Model (NIM) as a method of co-ordinating crime reduction and improving quality of life.

The Form 302 is a non-data standard form that documents the current and up to date position of a particular problem. Benefits are that it can be discussed openly at any relevant meeting called to discuss the problem with all the partner agencies involved.

Any sensitive information relating to any possible vulnerable person is placed on the secure database system of the various agencies working on the problem.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme **Organisational Support**

Form 302 highlights who created the 'Demand 1' for the problem to be worked on and who is involved in solving the issue.

What is the 'Problem 2' and the agreed 'Aim 3' that all efforts are focused towards to solve the problem.

The 'Research 4' conducted and the 'Analysis 5^s' established both separated into 'Victim, Offender and Location' categories.

The 'Problem solving session 6' generates ideas to solve the problem, with the 'Options 7' being recorded.

At any stage when action is taken, this is shown under 'Response 8'. This could range from local environmental changes to pro-active operations, or work to re-assure victims regarding the fear of crime.

Each response is then 'Evaluated 9' regarding their individual contribution to the solution and finally a 'Review 10' is conducted as to whether the 'Aim' was achieved or not and why.

There are currently (19) Borough Problem Advisors in post with whom members of the PSU keep in regular contact by offering support, guidance and also updating them of relevant issues. To support them in their role and improve their individual knowledge, advanced Problem Solving training days are held where additional problem solving tools and techniques are demonstrated and discussed.

The Problem Solving unit has created a website on the MPS Intranet site that contains details of all the training, guidance notes for completing Form 302 and an explanation of the Problem Solving Process PSP.

Evaluation

Objective 1

The objective of the project was to design an implementation programme that overcame the barriers discovered whilst conducting the research.

- This was achieved by designing the multi-layered training programme that includes the initial Borough training
- Assistance in setting up and monitoring of the PSP & facilitation of practical problem solving sessions.
- The appointment of a Borough Problem Solving Advisor to act as co-ordinator and local champion, who would be available to give advice to practitioners with consistent assessment and guidance from the MPS Problem Solving unit.

Objective 2

To design a training programme that incorporated the necessary additional identified skills that enabled practitioners to apply problem solving.

This has provided students with continued support & guidance as a summative assessment process following the two-day course, enabling officers to practically apply the PSP and improve their individual performance towards the delivery of problem solving.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme **Organisational Support**

Evaluation sheets are given to all students at the end of any training or facilitation session. (See Appendix D)

These are collated by the PSU to consider whether any improvements could be made to the training. An example being the PSU are currently researching on how to add 'information sharing protocol' to the training.

The PSU aim for a student satisfaction rate of 90%. A review of the last 600 evaluation sheets collated over the past 6 months, show a student satisfaction rate of 97%.

To improve the MPS Problem Solving implementation-training programme, the PSU compared and contrasted whether the PSU should continue to deliver problem solving training locally on Borough, OT by using a central training unit at a static location. We spoke with other members of the PSU team, course students, colleagues involved in central training at Hendon training college, and in other forces.

The following were the identified advantages and disadvantages that were highlighted through holding those discussions and meetings. This will identify whether the PSU is delivering current training most effectively?

Training delivered by the MPS Problem-Solving Unit

Advantages

- Police and partners receive local training on site without the need to travel
- Trainers have been and still are practical problem solvers
- The team is multi skilled with various members being qualified in training, sales and marketing, crime prevention and previous practical problem solving backgrounds
- Trainers have credibility and can share practical experiences with students
- Trainers are involved in current problem solving initiatives that can be shared to assist students with similar problems
- Consistency of student assessment and development
- Consistency in assisting students to apply the process
- Staff of the PSU are always available to assist students with advice

Disadvantages

- Trainers have to travel considerable distances to locations around the MPS
- Trainers have to carry course material to each separate location
- Small team with increasing workload achieved through positive feedback

Training delivered centrally at a static location

Advantages

- Consistency of student assessment
- Trainers would work at a fixed location, saving on travelling time
- Course material would be available on site

Disadvantages

- Both the police and local partners receiving training would have to travel from various Boroughs around London to the training unit
- Would the training team stay multi skilled in current areas necessary for successful problem solving
- Trainers would no longer be active in practical problem solving
- Trainers would lose credibility as any practical experience diminishes

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme
Organisational Support

- Trainers could have difficulty in sharing best practice, not being up to date with current initiatives that could assist students with similar problems
- Trainers would have difficulty in assisting students apply the process, being based at a set location
- Trainers would not always be available to assist students with advice
- Training team may need increasing and not being involved practically this could cause recruitment issues
- Consistency of further student development would difficult to be maintained

The above findings show a parallel with our own experiences. The summative assessment process the PSU uses are fair for all students and benefits their individual learning needs.

When comparing the two lists the PSU has been able consider further training options relevant to the development of the PSU. We are now able to discuss the benefits of each option and improve our delivery of problem solving, relevant to the needs of the practitioners.

Several forces found that after the initial training and interest in problem solving, it took local champions to motivate and facilitate students. Success only happened through the local champions and it failed without continued support and advice with consistent assessment from skilled problem solvers.

Therefore, after reflecting on current practices, the only suggested refinements to our training would be: -

- Consider further in depth student/practitioner training to cover additional skills and techniques to use when applying problem solving,
- Devise a mechanism to record continuity between trainer and student when offering advice or facilitation.
- Consider placing training and guidance notes on the MPS Internet site. Other forces can then gain access and offer suggestions or improvements.

Objective 3

A monitoring system that would capture and share best practice, working in the long-term to reduce crime, reduce the number of repeat calls and generally improve the quality of life of Londoners.

The PSP Form 302 was introduced as a monitoring system to ensure all Boroughs adopting Problem-Solving are co-ordinated in their approach with other Boroughs across the MPS. The 'Demand 1' 'Problem 2' 'Aim 3' and 'Authorisation 4' stages of Form 302 are pasted onto the MPS secure database (Crimint).

This enables practitioners to search the Crimint system for current and closed PSPs either on their Borough or elsewhere in the MPS to share good practice. During the past 12 months evaluation demonstrates that this easily searchable system has been utilised by officers to review previous problem solving work in similar topics.

The Boroughs of Kensington and Chelsea and Brent are just two examples of Boroughs that have adopted the PSP as a change management approach to long-term crime problems across the Borough.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme **Organisational Support**

Brent

The Borough of Brent has priority crimes of 'Robbery', 'Burglary' 'Class A drugs' and an emerging gun culture. These offences are dealt with by the usual means of pre-planned pro-active operations.

However with the introduction of the PSP structure, the 'Community/Sector teams' are now prioritising their individual community problems by completing Form 302 to record the initial 'Demand 1*' through to 'Review 10'. They range between particular 'Anti Social Behaviour', 'Class C drugs distribution', and the 'intimidation of local residents' to list just a few of the Boroughs present (PSP) examples.

This has improved performance by identifying the route cause of a problem not just the symptoms, for the relevant action to be taken more decisively and by the correct agency.

Current PSPs being worked upon are discussed by the Chief Inspector operations at the Borough Co-ordination & Tasking Group (BC and TG) meetings. This method heightens awareness to emerging crime trends that may be occurring at an early stage, enabling the Borough to consider a delivery structure that works towards making a reduction to their priority crime and local disorder problems.

The process also enables the Borough to link in with the Assistant Chief Police officers (ACPO) National Intelligence Model (NIM) guidelines regarding setting a 'Control Strategy' and then identifying individual Problem profiles or priorities that require action.

The whole Borough has restructured within the last six months to utilise the MPS Problem Solving approach as a change management system, although excellent partnership work was being undertaken prior to the introduction of the PSP, Officers have reported that by using the structured approach of the PSP, partners have engaged more willingly assisting in working towards finding a solution for a particular problem. They recognise the benefit of identifying the specific 'Problem 2' and then work towards achieving the 'Aim 3'.

A North London school was suffering from repeated thefts of computers and IT equipment. By using the PSP and Form 302 of Victim, Offender and Location, the specific 'Offenders' were identified, profiled and the relevant action taken. This crime problem has not reoccurred in the past four months after employing the PSP structure as a method of crime reduction.

Kensington and Chelsea

The Borough of Kensington and Chelsea also deals with its priority crime by means of pre-planned operations. To conduct a pre-planned operation an officer was required to submit a research document on a particular problem prior to taking an action. The Borough Intelligence Unit (BIU) analysts would then conduct the necessary research prior to the introduction of the pro-active operations.

This incurred several hours of the analyst's time spent conducting research into a perceived problem. On several occasions, the analysis would show a pre-planned operation was unnecessary when risk assessing the scale of the problem. A police response was not necessarily the right course of action and another agency could have dealt with the problem more effectively freeing up the analysts time for other issues..

Priority crime is still managed by pre-planned operations. However, since the introduction of the PSP research pre-planned operation documents are no longer used.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme **Organisational Support**

Form 302 is submitted highlighting the problem and the pro-active 'Community/Sector team' Inspector prioritises each one for action according to the individual 'Demand 1's. All submitted Form 302's authorised for action or not, are filed on the Crimint system, therefore should the 'Demand 1' increase action can be started straight away on the problem.

The Borough had over 100 research pre-planned operations submitted in the first six months of 2002, currently there have been less than 10 submitted in 2003. Adopting the PSP, the Borough analysts have been able to deal more efficiently with their workload. The benefit to the Borough has been time saved, with the analysts being able to be properly directed to concentrate on their core business

An analyst would spend on average of two hours on each research document. That is a saving of at least 180 hours of analyst's time, at a cost of £15 per hour. Total cost saving to the Borough is at least £2,700 by adopting the PSP in this area alone. There are 19 Boroughs trained in problem solving, so this has the benefit of a much larger cost saving implication for the MPS in general.

Examples of current PSP Form 302's being worked upon on the Borough are 'Café thefts regarding mobile phones', 'parking meter thefts' and 'specific anti social behaviour issues in four separate locations'.

Kensington and Chelsea officers have also reported, that partners have engaged more willingly to assist in working towards finding a solution for a particular problem by using the structured approach of the PSP.

Similar to Brent, current PSPs on Kensington and Chelsea Borough are discussed at the BC and TG meetings, for emerging crime trends enabling the Borough to consider a delivery structure for the reduction of their priority crime and local disorder problems.

By using the PSP method, Crack houses were identified on the North part of the Borough, One of the 'Responses 8' employed, was by means of pro-active operations, these effectively dealt with the problem successfully. Thus saving the Borough from an entrenched long-term crime and disorder problem.

The Borough has completed several PSPs for Crime and or Disorder problems.
Two examples are: -

1. Street drinkers were causing disorder at one location and Rough sleepers were also causing disorder problems at a separate location. By adopting the PSP method of problem solving a solution was found to both issues, resulting in fewer complaints and disorder issues and an improved quality of life in the area.
2. Another example was prostitute cards being placed in phone boxes. Here the community again created the 'Demand 1' for action to be taken as disorder and related crimes had started to occur by these locations. The PSP approach was applied with action being taken as per the process. The Victims were involved in the process and re-assured. Pro-active action was taken against the Offenders and a method of clearing the Locations was achieved. A reduction in the low level crimes and disorder has been achieved by employing the PSP structure.

Hertfordshire officers, who are currently using the S.A.R.A model for problem solving, attended the PSP training. They have overlaid the ten stages of the PSP over the S.A.R.A model on their problem-solving documentation.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme **Organisational Support**

Initial feedback from Hertfordshire practitioners has been positive as problem-solving officers find the various stages easier to follow and recording the relevant information necessary to deal with the particular problem more straightforward.

The Reassurance project funded by the Home Office has been piloted on four London Boroughs. Kensington and Chelsea, Enfield, Merton and Southwark. It focuses on quality of life issues, the environmental factors and frequent low level crimes that cause public concern or fear. The Reassurance project has adopted the PSP and Form 302 is used on the project as the recording process within the MPS. All four pilot sites have current PSPs that are tackling a range of disorder problems.

Other partners that have adopting the PSP are: -

- Merton wardens
- Customs and Excise
- Southwark street wardens
- Enfield council.

During 2002 there were over 80 PSP Form 302s submitted on London Boroughs within the MPS. Several were for issues such as 'drugs on stairwells' 'anti social behaviour' 'intimidation on an estate' 'contravening road signs' 'street drinkers' and 'street prostitution'

In addition to delivering PSP to the 32 London Boroughs, the following are some of the current PSP projects that the PSU are engaged on.

- British Oil Security Syndicate (BOSS) To reduce crime on service station forecourts
- MPS Operation Sapphire regarding central London rapes
- MPS Traffic Department regarding road deaths on the A4 at Chiswick
- Bexley Borough regarding crime and disorder by the Co-op shopping complex
- Newham Borough regarding street robberies at Stratford
- Wandsworth Borough burglary strategy

Conclusion

This report has shown the history to present day of the development of problem solving within the MPS and the research undertaken by the problem-solving unit to design the training programme.

How the Problem Solving Process PSP implementation programme has been delivered and is currently being applied on several Boroughs across the MPS as a method of reducing crime and reoccurring disorder problems.

The Metropolitan Police Problem Solving Unit has effectively designed and delivered a training programme that has improved the delivery of problem solving both within and outside the MPS. Several London Boroughs have implemented a change management approach as the result of the programme, with examples of current PSPs.

How the implementation-training programme has delivered results in reducing crime and disorder problems. Thus the unit has promoted and ensured that problem solving is being adopted properly across London as an effective method of long-term crime reduction and generally improve the quality of life of Londoners.

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme
Organisational Support

Appendices

Appendix A	Problem Solving Process (PSP)
Appendix B	Form 302
Appendix C	Service Level Agreement
Appendix D	Evaluation sheet

Partnership Problem Solving Process

Purpose - This enables you to see the complete picture on one sheet.
At any time in the process you can go back to a previous stage.

The Demand. Who or what identified that there is a problem? (Head office, MP letters)
Who are our identified partners? What is the initial assessment?

What is the problem? Identify and contact suitable partners and identify Problem lead
Identify partners at every stage.

What is your Aim? What is it you want to achieve?

Research - Victim
Include the partners

Research - Offender
Include the partners

Research - Location
Include the partners

Analysis -Victim

Analysis - Offender

Analysis - Location

Problem Solving Session(s). This is where you, your colleagues and other people, who are also interested in resolving the problem or who can make a contribution, meet and develop a range of options to resolve the problem by using the research, analysis and local knowledge.

Options - Victim
Include short and long term options

Options - Offender
Include short and long term options

Options - Location
Include short and long term options

Response - Victim

Response - Offender

Response - Location

Evaluate - Victim

Evaluate - Offender

Evaluate - Location

Review - Has it met the Aim?

How to complete Form 302

The Demand is not necessarily the problem. The demand is what the complainant asks the Problem Solver to deal with

Clearly identify the source(s) of the demand e.g. residents, local businesses, councillors and MPs, calls to the venue, supervisors' memos, analysts' reports or requests for action made during meetings. Record their contact details for future reference.

Don't put sensitive information on the 302 as they are open to public scrutiny.

Who else is involved or affected by this issue? Partners may have useful information. Their role might make them suitable for inclusion in the response(s) or to assist with future funding. Record their details and contact numbers.

Write a clear description of **The Problem**. If you are writing more than two sentences, check to see if you have more than one problem. Remember that you are looking for the root cause of the problem – not the symptoms of the problem.

There should only ever be one problem per 302.

Enter **The Aim** here. What do you want to achieve? What is the desired goal? Remember **the Impact Scale** (Page 1)? The setting of a clear Aim is vitally important because it focuses and drives all efforts and activities

Your description of the Aim should use **SMART** Objectives (Specific - Measurable - Achievable - Relevant - Timescale).

You should submit the form to a line manager for their approval (**Authorisation**). They will decide whether or not they support the 302 and record their reasons. They should also set an evaluation period e.g. every week, every month, etc.

The unique reference number for this 302. (Number/Dept/Year e.g. PSP/12/CX/2003 or PSP/33/Wardens/2003)

Form 302

This is where you put your company/journal details and if you wish, your Logo

URN PSP / / /

PROBLEM SOLVING PROCESS

Administration			
Department/ Unit			
	Name	Pay / Warrant Number	Telephone Number(s)
Person Leading			
Deputy			
Date Started	Last Update		

- The Demand**
 - 1.1 What is the demand?
 - 1.2 Where is the demand coming from?
 - 1.3 Who are our partners?
- The Problem**
 - 2.1 What is the problem?
- The Aim**
 - 3.1 What is it you want to achieve?
- Authorisation**

Unit Manager

Have checks been made to ensure that no one else is working on this problem?

Have appropriate background checks been completed (e.g. INFOS)?

I am the line manager and I do do not support the need for action to resolve this problem.

My reasons are:

I recommend an evaluation every:

Name	Pay / Warrant No.	Date

Problem Solving Advisor's Comments

Name	Pay / Warrant No.	Date
- Researching the Problem**
 - 5.1 Victim(s)
 - 5.2 Offender(s)
 - 5.3 Location(s)

Enter details of all **Research** undertaken by everyone involved in the process. Your role is to co-ordinate research gathering. It does not entail you carrying out all the research. You will engage the help of the partners and other departments who hold information.

You need to research your problem. Has any work been done before, who did it (Collect their contact details, as they may be able to offer help and advice) and what worked and what failed? You will need to collect as much information about who or what is causing the problem, who or what is being affected and exactly when and where is it taking place.

Exchanging information with partners is not a problem provided that the necessary protocols are followed.

Both Police and Partners can appoint **Problem Solving Advisors** to oversee the Problem Solving Process. The Advisor is able to check that the Problem and the Aim have been correctly defined. He/She is also able to advise and suggest interventions based upon their knowledge of previous and current Problem Solving research and activities.

Analysis means making sense of the information you've gathered. You can complete the analysis yourself. Alternatively, an analyst working within your organisation could do it (depending on the type of problem).

Under **Victim** you should record useful information such as: Where had the victim come from? Were they local? Had they just used public transport? Are all the robbery victims the same?

Offender is where you record the work undertaken by yourself or, if police, the Intelligence unit. You will need to include any relevant crime reports entry references, custody reports, housing reports, education reports, etc.

Under **Location** you should record the features of the area or environment that contribute to the problem. These may include environmental surveys, Crime Prevention Officers' reports or security works by the local authority, etc.

The **Problem Solving Session** is where all interested parties get together and work through the problems using all the research, analysis and their own experience and expertise to develop and discuss options. Several PSP Sessions may take place tackling Victim, Offender and Location separately (as identified partners may be different for each).

Enter details of all Sessions on the 302. Record details of persons present, their name, contact details and the organisation(s) they represent. These details will prove useful for those developing the Problem Solving Process in the future. You **must** take minutes at each session and record on the 302 where the minutes can be found.

Record all **Options** that were put forward during the PSP sessions in the relevant sections. Identify which options are relevant and those that are not. Explain the reasons why.

Remember to consider the implications of the Human Rights Act 2000.

6 Analysis
6.1 Victim(s) profile
6.2 Offender(s) profile
6.3 Location(s) profile
7 Problem Solving Session(s)
8 Options
8.1 Victim(s)
8.2 Offender(s)
8.3 Location(s)
9 Response
9.1 Victim(s)
9.2 Offender(s)
9.3 Location(s)
9.4 Risk assessment
10 Evaluation
10.1 Victim(s)
10.2 Offender(s)
10.3 Location(s)
11 Review
11.1 Has it met the aim?
11.2 If yes, how has it met the aim?
11.3 If no, why did it not meet the aim?

Response. These are the options that will be applied, short, medium and long term. Identify who or which organisations can implement the responses and their time frame.

A risk assessment has to be completed for each response.

You will need to **evaluate** your responses throughout the life of the problem (Your line manager may have suggested review dates e.g. monthly, three-monthly etc.). Should your action(s) be stopped, changed or maintained?

This is a final **Review**, when your action is complete.

- Have you achieved your aim?
- If yes, how can you tell?
- If not, why not?

It is a common mistake to think that just because a solution worked in one place it can be applied elsewhere. The circumstances that made it successful may not be present. However, if it could be applied elsewhere, record the fact and why.

Form 302 - Police Procedure

The 302 is a *Microsoft Word* document with expandable boxes that allows Problem Solving to be recorded in a logical and clear way. The diagrams on pages 20-21 show you how to complete the boxes. The 302 can be used by any organisation to record the PSP.

The next few pages contain additional notes about the 302 that relate to Metropolitan Police procedures.

Obtaining the form

Download the 302 from the MPS intranet Forms Site. If you do not have access to the MPS intranet or work for another agency for police service, an electronic copy can be obtained from the MPS Problem Solving Unit.

Save the 302 to your personal directory. If you are an OTIS user **please** follow the on-screen dialogue box. Save the document after selecting the '*Dont use suggested format*' option. If you are an AWARE user, you can save it as you would any other *Word* document.

Administration

- Enter your personal details and those of the deputy officer. This will normally be the unit sergeant.
- Ensure that you **always** complete the *Last Update* section to allow the most recent version to be worked on.
- You don't need to add the URN to the form at this time.

The Demand

Enter any sensitive details on CRIMINT and cross-reference the 302 with the CRIMINT number.

The Problem

- See Page 20.

The Aim

- See Page 20.

Authorisation

You will need to have completed INFOS (where applicable) and CRIMINT checks. Also consider PNC, CRIS, CAD and other sources, including those from outside agencies and partners.

E-mail your 302 to your unit manager (e.g. Inspector) for their approval. They will forward your 302 to the Borough Problem Solving Advisor whether authorised or not.

What does the Borough Problem Advisor do?

- They issue the URN number (Number/OCU/Year e.g. 12/CX/2003)
- They add comments and advice. They are able to view the problem from a Borough perspective and can therefore co-ordinate efforts.
- They 'cut & paste' the front page of your 302 onto CRIMINT.
- They place the 'Live' 302 into the PSP folder, which is held within *Library* on either OTIS or AWARE. Access on OTIS4 is via *TeamWare*. Access on AWARE systems is via *Public Folders*.
- They inform the lead officer that your 302 is now in the relevant *Library* folder and ready to be updated.
- The intelligence Unit should then create an 'Object Card' (a folder within the intelligence system) so that all associated intelligence reports and sensitive information in relation to your 302 can be stored

What do I do next?

Continue to apply the Problem Solving Process to your problem.

Update your 302 regularly with new information and progress.

Search the intelligence system for associated CRIMINT reports. On an agreed basis you will inform the BIU to enter these reports into the associated Object Card

Research

- See Page 21.
- Advice about information sharing protocols and the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) can be obtained from your Borough Intelligence Unit or Borough Problem Solving Advisor.

Analysis

- See Page 21.

Problem Solving Session(s)

Record details of all PSP Sessions on the 302. Keep minutes of each. If the minutes are very long, store them on OTIS/AWARE and make a note of their location on the 302.

Options

- See Page 21,

Response

Details of any police operation must be submitted and recorded on a PATP (Form 5457). The PATP reference number is entered in this section along with a one-line entry referring people to the specific CRIMINT entry.

A risk assessment (Form 5469) has to be completed for each response.

Record the CRIMINT reference number or other agency reference -- depending on who completed the assessment.

Evaluation

- See Page 21.

Review

E-mail a copy of the completed review to your Unit Inspector and to the Problem Solving Advisor.

Once it has been 'signed-off', the Problem Solving Advisor will transfer the review to CRIMINT as a permanent searchable record of police action. Your 302 will remain in *Library* for six months, before being filed on Division.

Service level agreement

Service level agreement between Territorial Policing Problem Solving Team and Borough

Borough commitment:

Provision of an appropriate training site equipped with suitable facilities.
(Seating, heating, lighting, power, wipe board(s) and flipchart with stand.)

Identification of a borough contact who will co-ordinate necessary training arrangements.

Notification of a training site at least 24 hours before the start of training.

Attendance of **NOT** more than 18 students at each training session.

Nomination of a borough Problem Advisor.

Identification of a problem solving lead from the Senior Management Team,

Name
Borough
Date

Problem Solving Team's commitment:

Delivery of four, one-day, training sessions on modules one and two from the problem solving training package.

Delivery of four, one-day, training sessions on modules three and four from the problem solving training package.

Facilitation of two, half-day development sessions designed to support problem solving initiatives.

Identification of two members of the team who will become problem solving tactical advisors for your O.C.U.

Paul Scott
Problem Solving Insp.
Date

MPS Problem Solving Unit Evaluation sheet

Purpose

We are employed to support you in applying Problem Solving by providing training, advice and support. We need to make sure that we are doing these things in the best possible way. By answering the questions on this sheet you will be helping to make sure that we are doing just that.

Date Location

Circle the relevant section

Day 1 Modules 1/2	Day 2 Modules 3/4	Day 3 Modules 5/6	Recording Form 302	Meeting or P S session	Advice
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	--------

How satisfied were you with training / session / advice?

Very satisfied Satisfied Unsatisfied Very unsatisfied

Why did you give the above answer?

How satisfied were you with Trainer(s) / Facilitator / Advisor?

Very satisfied Satisfied Unsatisfied Very unsatisfied

Why did you give the above answer?

What has been particularly useful to you, today?

What has been the least useful to you, today?

What will you tell others about the training, facilitation or advice given?

Our advice, training and facilitated problem solving sessions are reviewed regularly. We would like to contact you at different stages to see whether they are working for you. If you are prepared to be contacted could you please leave your details below.

.....

'Problem Solving Process' (PSP) implementation programme
Organisational Support

Reference List

Eck J and Spelman W (1987) *Solving Problems: Problem-Oriented Policing* Police Executive Research forum

Goldstein H (1979) '*Improving Policing: A Problem-Oriented Approach*' *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol 25. Pp.236-258

Goldstein H (1990) *problem-oriented Policing* Temple University press

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (2000) *Calling Time on Crime* London Home office

<http://www.cambs.police.uk/> <online>

<http://www.gmp.police.uk/serlet/SiteMap> <online>

<http://www.hampshire.police.uk/> <online>

<http://www.lancashire.police.uk/pop.html> <online>

<http://www.met.police.uk/job/job900/5.htm> <online>

http://mpsweb03.intranet.mps/tphq/policy/problem_solving_hp.htm <online>

Stevens M (1996) *How to be a better problem solver* Kogan Page