



**VANCOUVER POLICE DEPARTMENT**  
**OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONSTABLE**  
**Planning, Research & Audit Section**

**Date:** [?] [?] [?] [?]

**To:** Sgt. Leslie Stevens  
Planning, Research & Audit Section

**From:** Tim Szkopek-Szkopowski, Planning and Policy Analyst  
Planning, Research & Audit Section

**Subject:** **Impact of CIT Training**

---

**Background**

In October 2009, Constable Rob Feenan of the Training and Recruiting Section requested that the Organizational Planning Unit determine the impact that Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) had on Patrol operations.

CIT was administered to approximately 20 Patrol members at a time. The training sessions were four days and covered an entire patrol block. The training was eight hours in length, after which members returned to regular patrol duties for the remainder of their shift. Concerns have been raised as to the effects of removing such a large number of officers from patrol at a given time.

The training schedule is as follows:

August 31 – September 03: 0700 – 1500 hours

September 28 – October 01: 1600 – 0000 hours

October 18 – October 21: 1600 – 0000 hours

As there were only 12 days on which training occurred, and only eight hours each day, the results found herein must be interpreted carefully. Additionally, due to the relatively small sample size, the data was analysed on the city wide level.

**Methodology**

*Time-Frame Examined*

Data for the hours which Patrol members were off the road for CIT was extracted from the SQL Server. Corresponding weekdays and hours from the following week were used for comparison. The 12 days, during which training occurred, will be referred to as the training days; likewise, the baseline regular patrol days will be referred to as the baseline days.

Differences between the Training days and baseline days came in the form of special events. In the 12 training days there were no holidays; however, there were three Canada Cup Women’s Hockey games which occurred at GM Place. In the 12 baseline days, there was one stat holiday (Labour Day) and there were four Vancouver Canucks games at GM Place.

Despite the differences between the two periods, it was felt that selecting the closest four weekdays to each training period was preferred as a baseline when compared with days more distant from the training period. As calls for service tend to fluctuate on a monthly basis, choosing another time period would result in seasonal variances influencing the analysis. Using the same time period from the year previous would introduce issues such as increased staffing and changes in call load.

### *Response Time*

It is expected that response time will increase when a large number of officers are removed from Patrol. This is due to the fact that their capacity to take calls at any given time would be reduced. Response time was broken down by priority then averaged across the entire city over the two time periods. It was not possible to break down the analysis to the district level as there were too few observations to result in meaningful results.

In order to more accurately assess the impacts on response time, motor vehicle incidents and missing persons calls that were listed as priority 1 were manually changed to priority 2 as in practice, these calls are usually not dealt with the urgency of other priority 1 calls. It is worth noting that missing child calls were left with their default priority.

### *Cancelled Calls*

There is the possibility that if Sergeants knew that they were short staffed, they would alter the service level by cancelling calls that would have otherwise been dealt with. Cancelled calls will be analysed by examining the proportion of total calls for service which were cancelled in the two different periods. Cancelled calls included all calls which were closed as “cancelled call” and had no units dispatched.

## **Results**

### *Calls for Service*

The two periods being compared had some differences in the total number of calls for service. When the training was in progress, there were roughly 13.9% more calls for service when compared with the baseline period.

**Table 1 – Total Calls for Service**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Calls for Service</b>
Baseline	2066
Training	2354
<i>Grand Total</i>	<i>4420</i>

### *Response Time*

The response time for the training period was consistently higher than that of the baseline period for priority 1, 2, and 3 calls. It should be noted that due to the relatively small sample size, the magnitude of the increase may not be very accurate.

**Table 2 – Priority 1 Response Times**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Number of Calls</b>	<b>Response Time</b>
Baseline	102	0:08:14
Training	124	0:08:52
<i>Total</i>	<i>226</i>	<i>7.61% increase</i>

**Table 3 – Priority 2 Response Times**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Number of Calls</b>	<b>Response Time</b>
Baseline	320	0:32:37
Training	322	0:41:55
<i>Total</i>	<i>642</i>	<i>28.52% increase</i>

**Table 4 – Priority 3 Response Times**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Number of Calls</b>	<b>Response Time</b>
Baseline	534	1:23:35
Training	641	1:35:11
<i>Total</i>	<i>1175</i>	<i>13.87% increase</i>

**Cancelled Calls**

There was little difference between the two periods. As the number of calls for service differed between the two periods, the proportions of cancelled calls for service were compared. When looking at the proportion all calls cancelled, regardless of priority, 0.18% fewer calls for service were cancelled during the training period. The following tables show the breakdown by priority. The last row shows the difference in proportions of calls which were cancelled between the two periods.

**Table 5 – Priority 1 Cancelled Calls**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Number of Calls</b>	<b>% Cancelled</b>
Baseline	10	0.48%
Training	12	0.51%
<i>Total</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>0.03% More</i>

**Table 6 – Priority 2 Cancelled Calls**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Number of Calls</b>	<b>% Cancelled</b>
Baseline	90	4.36%
Training	127	5.40%
<i>Total</i>	<i>217</i>	<i>1.04% More</i>

**Table 7 – Priority 3 Cancelled Calls**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Number of Calls</b>	<b>% Cancelled</b>
Baseline	130	6.29%
Training	110	4.67%
<i>Total</i>	<i>240</i>	<i>1.62% Fewer</i>

**Conclusion**

It appears that the CIT given to Patrol members impacted Patrol operations. The increase in response time for priority 1 calls for service does not appear to be significant. Given the small number of observations used to calculate the average response times, this difference could be the result of natural fluctuations. Additionally, it could be expected that priority 1 calls would not suffer the greatest increase in response time as members would focus on attending these calls as quickly as possible to the detriment of other calls for service.

The impact of the CIT on Patrol operations is found in the response times for priority 2 and 3 calls. Both of these priorities saw significant increases in response time. The finding is further supported when examining cancelled calls for service and the total number of calls for service. Calls for service did not see any significant changes between the two periods examined. This would indicate that Sergeants did not change the level of service provided to the public as a result of fewer officers being available. As such, the officer to call ratio was not reduced, and in fact there were more calls for service during the training period, further exacerbating the issue.

At this point in time it can be determined that the CIT likely had a negative impact on Patrol response times; however, due to the short period of time being examined, the extent of the impact cannot be determined with any reliability.

---

Tim Szkopek-Szkopowski, Planning and Policy Analyst  
Planning, Research & Audit Section