

# **Glidewell Working Group Report**

On

**'Beacon sites'**

Southampton Portswood  
07<sup>th</sup> September 2000

***This report was prepared based upon a site visit and discussions with Police and CPS Staff working at the Hampshire CJU in Portswood, Southampton.***

Working Group members present included:  
Paul MARTIN. Tim EWEN. James FOSTER and Peter HALL

Q What systems and procedures have been put in place?

*Though the site is described as 'Nareywell', there appear to have been many of the basic requirements of the Glidewell theme implemented within this relatively small though very industrious unit.*

*CPS staff reviewed files within the unit for prosecution at Court at the next hearing (two per week – Wednesday and Friday.)*

*The whole of the Magistrate's Court (pre court) work was carried out at the CJU by admin staff, a mix of Police and CPS.*

*The systems in place were in operation for several aims*

- A Ensure existing Police admin requirements were met*
- B Ensure CPS requirements for pre Court admin were met and notifications to local CPS HQ maintained for stats and case tracking (scope?)*
- C Reduce duplication of effort*
- D Ensure inefficiencies were reduced (memos, lost files, advice etc)*
- E Ensure a better quality of service to the Magistrate's Court and all of its users.*
- F To enable the targeting of resources on Trials Team issues*

Review

A measurement of success in terms of a satisfaction survey was being planned at the time of our visit.

Q What SLA and memorandum of Understanding have been produced?

*A memorandum of understanding had been drafted and agreed, and is ready for circulation. (copy requested)*

*A process map of paperflow had also been produced (though recent changes had required it to be amended slightly).*

(i) *Staffing*

*The CPS have 153 staff for the entire area. Within this unit, two lawyers are provided on each day for the review function to be carried out. CPS have also provided one admin post.*

*The Police staff numbers have been maintained, supplemented on the administration side by CPS. The CPS admin posts will increase as work continues to 'pick up' (the CJU only took on new cases from its start date).*

(ii) *Accommodation, particularly estates*

*The office space is cramped and, as work loads increase, the space may not be adequate. The Police are hoping to free the ground floor (currently operational) for CJU use.*

*Throughout the whole area, the attitude towards estates has been refreshing. Though estates issues were known to be a huge problem, both sides have agreed to give over space to the other for the sake of efficiency and working together.*

***The Police, for example, wanted a Major Incident Unit in the north of the County, CPS offered the use of their premises at Basingstoke. CPS staff from here being relocated to more appropriate sites.??***

(iii) *Budgets*

*Budgetary issues were seen as difficult to resolve, particularly as Police budgets are held locally (by each Force) whereas CPS budgets were seen to be controlled Nationally by the centre.*

*Despite this, some issues had already been resolved e.g. furniture. Agreement being reached that the Police would purchase all of the items for the units (to achieve standardisation) and invoice CPS for their portion.*

(iv) *I.T. Including future proposals*

*The CPS had not moved their system into the CJU which was seen as necessary, to cut out the existing practice of having to send copy charge sheets to CPS HQ for registration.*

*The Police were keen to display their IT system and it's functionality. Access to the system had been offered to the CPS, but declined to date. There is the feeling that, as time passes, the practitioners will utilise this IT more and more.*

(v) *Relationships with other agencies*

*No evidence of any deterioration of relations with other agencies. The Admin staff stated that they now dealt directly with letters from local defence practices. No feedback on this was available.*

(vi) *Overall costs*

*Implementation criteria were:*

*No extra staff*

*No extra money*

*(vii) Training*

*Formal training had not been carried out before implementation  
Regular site visits and exchanges had, however, taken place and  
were perceived to have been beneficial.*

*One member of staff had made copious 'working notes' on the  
requirements of prosecutors and the new systems required to  
cover all the necessary aspects of pre Court work. This had been  
circulated to all admin staff and was seen to be their 'bible'.*

*(viii) Trade Union considerations*

*No problems with differing grades, it was recognised that there  
were issues here, but there existed contentious differing grades in  
each organisation.*

*(ix) Migration of staff*

*CPS Admin staff posts had been increased in the unit as the work  
rate had picked up and could be increased further. (the unit's  
Police Divisional coverage had increased by over 50% shortly  
before the visit and greater increases in workload were expected.*

Q Have the local arrangements for collocation met the 9 key objectives in the Model for Joint administration?

*I) Shorter lines of communication*

*Yes, all pre court work contained within the CJU. All  
Communication re pre court files was directed back to the CJU  
admin staff rather than CPS office admin staff, cutting out that  
link.*

*This meant that, on occasion the CJU admin could deal with the  
issue, or if not, would direct it to the relevant person (OIC etc) and  
ensure it was dealt with.*

*ii) Minimised transport of files between Police and CPS?*

*As above for all pre Court work.*

*Files stay within the CJU from Court adjournment to adjournment,  
until they are ready for Trial.*

*This means that at any stage pre Trial the file is with the Police  
CJU and can be readily located.*

*Evidential file additions/supplements are passed with the file to the lawyer at the CJU and any feedback to the Police is given via the CJU.*

- iii) *Cost saving by reduction of duplication?  
As above, CPS pre Court admin resolved locally within CJU.*
- iv) *Single file system?  
No it was accepted that single file system means originals only. Locally the original and one copy file is produced. This leads to the inevitable issue of dual archiving. Police archive original file, CPS archive copy file.*
- v) *Improved file quality and timeliness?  
Yes. JPM shows increase in performance, though larger increases expected in time.*
- vi) *Improved witness warning and witness care?  
Police witness warning carried out from the CJU site. Due to a greater accuracy of this data. This has resulted in a reduction in the number of officers called to Court on RD*
- vii) *More effective deployment of staff?  
The Admin staff within the CJU are able to deal effectively with all pre Court admin functions, thereby providing valuable continuity.*
- viii) *Individuals within each organisation empowered to make day to day decisions?  
The Police investigative supervision remains in place, as does file review. The CPS file review and remedial action process also takes place but with greater clarity and speed as the CJU Sergeant and reviewing lawyer are in the same CJU and communicate effectively.*
- ix) *Clearly defined single focus location for the Courts and other agencies?  
The unit does provide this single focus location, though Courts were not canvassed for their view. Additionally the CJU is the focal point for defence letters.*

Q4. What rubbing points /examples of best practice have developed?

*Best practice example is the availability of unused material for review by the lawyer at the CJU site. This saves on unnecessary copying (and disclosure?).*

*CJU ownership of the file until 'Trial ready'. Minimising unnecessary file transfer and ensuring that file upgrades and supplements are passed on with clarity, and there is a clarity of the further requirements by reviewing lawyer.*

*CPS letters/memos to officers are eliminated by this close working process, thereby reducing the delay in these being typed and dispatched to the CJU to be passed onto the OIC.*

*All Police Officers have e mail accounts with 'read receipts' upon which case actions are dispatched.*

*All CJU staff initiate the CPS file jacket.*

Q5 Funding issues?

*The Police have identified costs of £877,000 in setting up costs. The arrangement being that CPS will provide £125,000 per year over the next 10 years.*

*The Police did acknowledge that some other projects had been dropped or postponed to achieve the CJU project. The financial process taking some 6 weeks to resolve.*

*CPS had negotiated £25,000 from the CMFII fund for the project.*

***Paul, what was this money earmarked for?***

Q6 How are units managed on a day to day basis?

*Jointly by Police and CPS staff in terms of their own duties and responsibilities. The joint working in the admin unit being the only overlap. Staff appraisal and leave being considered by the relevant agency supervision, taking account of the CJU requirements. For example, if the CPS admin person were to take leave, this would be clarified with Police and a replacement CPS admin staff member provided for cover during the leave period.*

Q7 What do the new processes look like? (See TOR1)

*As described*

Q8 What are the good practice lessons?

*The 'little step' approach was considered to have been a big bonus, small 'bite size' changes leading to increases in efficiency leading to willingness to progress further..*

*In addition, the title of the project ensured that staff had not been concerned by use of the Glidewell terminology and it was the*



*The LIGs examined some of the closer detail, and personnel issues which could be addressed locally. e.g. parking.*