CIPFA PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATION 3 FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT CASE STUDY EXAMINATION JUNE 2003

MALTSHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY

TUTORIAL GUIDE

1 General Comments

- (a) It is important that candidates answer all the questions as set.
- (b) Where illustrative figures or information are asked for in a question, or their use is implied in the data, then they must be shown in the candidate's answer.
- (c) Evasion of the terms of the question on the grounds that the situation depicted in the Case Study is unlikely to have arisen or occurred, or is improbable in concept, should be penalised.
- (d) Working papers submitted with answers should be scrutinised and used to test the candidates' line of argument in unfinished work and as a guide to the method by which the candidates have utilised their acquired knowledge to deal with the various aspects of the case study.
- (e) Detailed calculations are set out in the appropriate attached appendices. It must be emphasised that these are not 'model answer' figures but are based upon what are judged to be the 'best' assumptions made in answering the question. Candidates should not therefore be judged on whether they got the figures 'right', but on how they reached their figures and how reasonable are their assumptions and arguments.

2 Synopsis of Case

Maltshire is the largest and one of the most rural of the ten shires that comprise the fictional Northern European island of Wisky. Barleytown, its capital city, provides headquarters for both Maltshire Council and the Maltshire Police Authority (MPA), which has responsibility for all law and order matters within the shire. The MPA, created in 1993 as a result of the reorganisation of the forces in Wisky, is divided into 4 Police Divisions and operates a fleet of 700 vehicles, which are serviced and maintained through five MPA-operated vehicle workshops. There is a sixth workshop, unused since 1993 and currently let to a local golf club for storage purposes.

The recently appointed Chief Constable (CC) and Assistant Chief Officer (Finance) are keen to bring best practice and a more commercial approach to the MPA. In addition, the CC is concerned about the allocation of spending and is eager to see resources transferred from support services to front line policing. One early step is to create a VFM and Projects Section within the audit operation and the candidate takes on the role of the VFM and Projects Officer.

The Fleet Management operation is one of the areas identified for VFM study. This not only reflects the significant size of its gross budget, but also operational concerns. There is felt to be over-capacity in the five workshops and the Chief Constable is eager to close one in order to generate revenue savings. In addition, there is dissatisfaction with the quality of some of the work carried out in the workshops, the number of subsequent breakdowns, the amount and timing of recharges, and the lack of formal service standards and a customer focused approach.

The candidate is required to carry out a review of the vehicle workshops, determine which should be closed and draft a report to the Chief Constable on the implications of this. The Workshop Quality Workgroup, established to resolve the service, quality and recharging related matters, has called for a further short report on these wider issues. Finally the golf club lease on the sixth workshop has ended and the candidate is required to consider the various options available on this, as well as potential audit implications thrown up by the workshop review.

The case material also gives candidates full opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of the case material, their ability to apply management knowledge and their skill at communicating relevant information clearly and tactfully.

3. Question 1

Aims

- (a) To test candidates' understanding of the case material and particularly the potential audit issues raised by some of the content;
- (b) To test their ability to recognize and comment upon the potential audit issues requiring investigation at the Elgin Workshop;
- (c) To test their ability to analyse and evaluate the issues and costs relating to the Aberfeldy Workshop;
- (d) To test their ability under severe time pressure to prepare a briefing note on these issues for the ACO (Finance).

Assessment

- (a) Identification of and comment upon the potential audit issues requiring investigation at Elgin Workshop (60%) (12 marks)
 - □ Comment upon the "monthly visits" by James Grant to see Tel Lisker, the manager at 24 Elgin Workshop, querying -
 - the purpose of these visits
 - the possibility that this relates to the Golf Club income
 - whether this money is being paid in
 - if so, how and where is it being coded;
 - □ Comment about the lack of knowledge/paperwork re the Aberfeldy lease (are there others?) and the involvement of the former Chief Constable (was this official?)
 - □ A note that confidential information is being leaked (letters from James Grant and Fiddick Factors) from Elgin workshop?
 - □ A note that the letter from the Health & Safety Manager is not conclusive in itself and comment that Health & Safety breaches have risk management implications which in turn have financial consequences -
 - fire risk unsafe storage of parts, smoking near petrol, use of mobiles near pumps
 - accident risk unsafe storage of parts, car support, safety clothing, faulty hose;
 - □ A note that there is a clear lack of health and safety awareness/compliance and the need for further training in this area;
 - □ Comment that, in terms of staffing, there is further evidence in the letter from the Health and Safety Manager of overcapacity, excessive non-productive time and poor workload planning;
 - □ Examination of the cost of spares at Elgin Workshop and the purchase records
 - calculation of the cost of spares per vehicle and per service for Elgin Workshop
 - comparison of this with the unit costs for the workshops as a whole
 - comparison with the unit costs for the workshops as a whole, net of Elgin costs
 - conclusion that the costs are very high comparatively
 - comment that an untidy workshop makes stock control difficult; 20
 - a note that spares are being purchased on a frequent basis from a non-contract 26 supplier, usually at higher costs
 - comment that some of the spares purchased (rear bumper and front wing) do not 26 relate to routine maintenance
 - a note of the comments made by the Shire Council Health and Safety Officer
 - specific reference to the wing being fitted to a very old car
 - comment upon the letter from Fiddick Factors and the reference to "my contacts" 17
 - a query whether Glen Morangie, a director at Fiddick Factors, and Glyn 17,20 Morangie, Stores Officer at Elgin Workshop are related and, if so, whether this has been declared to the MPA;

20,26

19,29

- □ Examination of the fuel issue costs at Elgin Workshop
 - calculation of the cost of fuel per vehicle and per service (as a proxy for mileage) for Elgin Workshop
 - comparison of this with the unit costs for the workshops as a whole
 - comparison with the unit costs for the workshops as a whole, net of Elgin costs
 - conclusion that the costs are very high comparatively
 - a note of the comments made by the Shire Council Health and Safety Officer
 - a query about why petrol is being put into plastic containers;
- Examination of the water usage costs at Elgin Workshop
 - calculation of the cost of water per vehicle and per service for Elgin Workshop
 - comparison of this with the unit costs for the workshops as a whole
 - comparison with the unit costs for the workshops as a whole, net of Elgin costs
 - conclusion that the costs are very high comparatively
 - a note of the offer made to Ed Radour on his visit
 - a note of the comments made by the Maltshire Council Health and Safety Officer
 - a query about the lorry being steam-cleaned police vehicle?
- □ Overall conclusion that, whilst there is no absolute proof of wrongdoing or of who might be involved, there are certainly strong grounds for further investigations on the basis of the analysis carried out.
- **<u>NOTE</u>** For suggested calculations see Appendix 1A, but note comments in 1(e) above
- (b) Analysis and evaluation of the issues and costs relating to the Aberfeldy workshop. (25%) (5 marks)
 - □ A note that the Aberfeldy Workshop was closed at the last police reorganization in (i),6 1993;
 - □ Comment that it is still used for two weeks a year for police training exercises; 24
 - □ A note of the options to be considered
 - advertise the lease and let at market rent 29
 - issue a new lease on new terms to the Highland Park Golf Club 24
 - sell the property;
 - □ Calculation and comparison of the revenue effects of each;
 - □ Conclusion and recommendation that a renewed lease with the Golf Club is probably the best option as it
 - generates the best income stream
 - maintains the workshop's use for police training.
 - □ Comment that the lease arrangement needs to be formalized with a proper agreement and contract drawn up.
- **<u>NOTE</u>** For suggested calculations see Appendix 1B, but note comments in 1(e) above
- (c) Presentation, format, tact and general readability. (15%) (3 marks)

PAGE
18
6
28
13
6
28
18
6

* Total workshops excluding Elgin

		Aberfeldy	PAGE
1. Lease of Aberfeldy			
Current rent	£125 per month	1,500	24
Options			
Option 1 – Golf Club	£250 per month	3,000	24
Option 2 – Market rent	120 sq mtres @ £20	2,400	6,29
Option 3 – Sell (£45,000)	Interest @ 4%	1,800	19,29

Aims

- (a) To test candidates' ability to understand, collate, analyse and evaluate a considerable volume of financial and non-financial data;
- (b) To test candidates' ability to analyse and critically appraise the workflow demands in comparison with available resources at the five vehicle workshops, in order to identify the amount and location of spare capacity;
- (c) To test candidates' ability to consider the rationalisation options as regards the operation of the remaining workshops, to calculate potential savings and to comment upon the wider implications of those proposals;
- (d) To test candidates' ability to consider the management, operational and accounting implications of closing one of the workshops and the actions required in preparation for this once a final decision has been made;
- (e) To test candidates' ability to produce a well-structured and meaningful major report addressing all these issues for the Chief Constable.

Assessment

- (a) Background to the report and production of projected outturn figures for 2003 analysed across the five workshops as well as Central Fleet Management. (20%) (8 marks)
 - General background to the report and identification of the main objectives
 - attribution of the workshops budget over the five workshops
 - identification of which workshop should be closed
 - consideration of how this will be achieved and its implications
 - □ Projected outturn figures for 2003 analysed across the five workshops and central Fleet Management through collation of the figures for -

• staffing costs	10
• premises costs	13
 supplies and other costs 	18
 capital charges 	19
 general overheads; 	5
A comparison of the projected outturn with the original budget for 2003;	5

- \Box A note that this produces a budget saving of £14,000;
- □ An explanation that this reflects lower than expected inflation and savings on some premises heads as well as a more accurate estimate of expenditure on spares and consumables.

NOTE For suggested points see Appendix 2A, but note comments in 1(e) above.

- (b) Through an analysis of work-flows at the five workshops and a comparison with available resources in terms of direct hours, identification of spare capacity in each of the workshops. (20%) (8 marks)
 - \Box A note of the annual work hours per employee (52 weeks at 37¹/₂ hours per week); 21
 - □ Calculation of direct hours for foremen and mechanics (annual work hours at 40% 21 and 60% respectively);
 - □ Calculation of the direct hours available in each of the five workshops;
 - A statement of the direct hours required based upon prior years' analysis;
 28
 - □ A comparison of direct hours available and direct hours required;
 - □ A statement of the surplus direct hours in each workshop.
- **<u>NOTE</u>** For suggested calculations see Appendix 2B, but note comments in 1(e) above.

- (c) Consideration of the options for closure and the likely savings to be achieved together with evaluation of the wider issues involved in closing one of the workshops. (30%) (12 marks)
 - □ A comment that there are two candidates for closure on the basis of the surplus direct hours criterion Dronach and Elgin;
 - A comparison of the financial and non-financial factors affecting the two options;
 - □ Calculation of the net savings from both options
 - a note of the direct hours requirement from both closure options and how these would be met by other workshops and the transfer of mechanics-
 - Elgin closure offset by spare capacity at Dronach & calculation of the shortfall
 - Dronach closure offset by spare capacity at Elgin and Cadam
 - calculation of net saving in terms of number of mechanics for both workshops
 - calculation of net staff savings through closure at both workshops
 - calculation of the net premises running cost savings achieved through closure
 - a note of the rent saving on Dronach
 - a note that supplies/other costs will be unaffected by either closure
 - a note of the saving on capital charges as a result of the sale of Elgin
 - a note of the 2003 one-off costs of the closures and how these will be met
 - a note of the potential capital receipt from the sale of Elgin;
 - □ Summary figures showing that
 - the closure of Dronach produces higher ongoing revenue cost savings and has less impact through one-off costs
 - the closure of Dronach avoids the lease review in 2004 and a likely significant increase in rent
 - the closure and sale of Elgin produces a large capital receipt;
 - Examination of non-financial considerations
 - Elgin is the most modern workshop with the capacity to take additional work 20
 - it is the closest to HQ where the largest proportion of vehicles are based
 - it is the most economic in terms of premises and maintenance costs
 - Dronach is not owned by the MPA, its rent is not cheap and this is subject to 12,20 periodic rent reviews
 - it is the smallest of the workshops with the lowest workload (productive hours) 6,28
 - its closure allows utilisation of the spare capacity at Cadam and produces the 16 better staffing fit
 - it has a poor reputation for quality of work;
 - □ Conclusion that
 - the better option is to close Dronach and utilise the spare capacity at Cadam and Elgin
 - a figure of £10,000 will need to be found in 2003 to meet this, but it can be found out of the projected outturn saving
 - this option does not meet the target saving of £250,000 set for 2004, even when the ongoing projected outturn saving is taken into account;
 - □ Consideration of other saving options
 - Spare capacity in excess of 200 hours use of part time mechanics?
 - review workshop operations and try to increase the direct hour percentages (leading to longer term staff reductions?)
 - review purchasing policy for spares and consumables (central purchasing, stricter purchase control?)
 - review central overheads in the light of the closure;
 - where is the income for the sixth workshop?
- **NOTE** For suggested calculations see Appendix 2C, but note comments in 1(e) above

9,15,28

- Consideration of the management (staffing, facilities, operations) and accounting (d) implications of closing the recommended workshop and a note of the actions required of the Fleet Manager in these respects as preparation for 31 December 2003 and the new structure. (20%) (8 marks)
 - Consideration of staff-related issues -
 - immediate discussions with Personnel to develop a communication and implementation action plan for the workshop rationalisation
 - continuation of the policy of not making any further permanent appointments • pending implementation
 - early discussions with the staff, their representatives and union officials about the planned changes and the staff reductions
 - offer of one to one staff meetings re transfers, early retirements etc.
 - regular ongoing communication throughout the process
 - a review of current staffing to identify posts filled on a temporary basis, early retirement possibilities, transfer options and the need for redundancies

Page

- if redundancies are likely, determination of a redundancy strategy to reflect any existing policy
- to avoid too great an effect on staff morale, early determination of, and • communication on, how the staff rationalisation will be achieved
- offer of staff counselling, if required •
- issue of formal letters to those affected to meet statutory requirements;
- □ Consideration of property related issues and actions
 - early discussion with the Facilities Officer re the property implications of the proposed closure and to ensure minimum disruption
 - if Dronach, confirmation of the lease position as regards termination notice and any other conditions
 - if Elgin, get approval and plan for sale
 - action plan for -•
 - preparatory work/improvements at the receiving site(s)
 - removal of stores and small equipment to the receiving site(s)
 - issue of orders for removal of larger fixed equipment and reinstallation at the receiving site(s)
 - emptying and removal (?) of underground fuel tank at the closure site _
 - meter readings and discontinuation of supplies at the closure site
 - renewal or updating of relevant equipment maintenance contracts
 - updating of inventories and stock records;
- Liaison with key uniformed personnel and the senior police officers responsible for the North and West Divisions
 - to discuss operational implications of closing one of the three workshops in their • areas
 - to re-allocate vehicles to the two remaining workshops in accordance with the • resources available
 - allocation of store contents in accordance with this;
- Consideration of accounting and costing issues -
 - implement new budget basis for 2004 •
 - review coding and costing structure for post-implementation ٠
 - ensure that Fleet staff are fully aware of these
 - ensure payments and charges are correctly coded from January 2004
 - liaise with the Shire Council Payroll Section to ensure that staff costs/pensions • are correctly allocated from January 2004.
- Presentation, format, readability and general logic of approach/argument (10%) (4 marks). (e)

									PAG
	Total	Central	Workshops	Burgie	Cadam	Dronach	Elgin	Farclas	
		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Projected outturn 2003									
Staffing									
Administration	117,300	117,300		0	0	0	0	0	10
Workshop Managers	124,700	C		25,300	24,400	25,300	26,100	23,600	10
Supervisors	96,200	C		19,700	20,400	18,500	19,100	18,500	10
Stores Officers	78,000	C	,	15,400	14,900	15,900	16,400	15,400	10
Mechanics	500,300	C	· · ·	92,400	92,400	93,000	130,100	92,400	10
Training	6,000	1,000		1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	10
	922,500	118,300	804,200	153,800	153,100	153,700	192,700	150,900	
Premises									
Building Maintenance	42,400	C	42,400	11,000	10,800	11,100	3,400	6,100	13
Cleaning	6,600	C	,	1,700	1,300	1,100	1,300	1,200	13
Energy	45,250	C	45,250	9,850	7,500	11,600	7,600	8,700	13
Water (metered)	10,100	C	10,100	1,300	1,400	1,100	5,100	1,200	13
Rates	65,150	C	65,150	15,850	15,000	10,500	16,500	7,300	13
Rent	35,000	C	35,000	0	0	35,000	0	0	13
	204,500	C	204,500	39,700	36,000	70,400	33,900	24,500	
Supplies & Other									
Equipment Maintenance	22,700	800	21,900	3,900	4,200	3,600	4,700	5,500	18
Spares & Consumables	525,000	C	525,000	103,300	89,200	91,500	141,600	99,400	18
Petrol	2,500,000	C	2,500,000	475,000	450,000	425,000	675,000	475,000	18
Office Expenses	5,800	3,900	1,900	300	400	300	600	300	18
	3,053,500	4,700	3,048,800	582,500	543,800	520,400	821,900	580,200	
Capital Charges									
Charges	60,000	C	60,000	14,000	13,500	0	17,000	15,500	19
Direct/Indirect Expenditure	4,240,500	123,000	4,117,500	790,000	746,400	744,500	1,065,500	771,100	
Central Overheads ¹									
Admin Buildings-Central	9,000								5,18
Corporate Services	7,000								5,18
Propty Insurance-W/shops	18,000								5,18
Shire Services	11,500								5,18
	45,500								
Total Expenditure	4,286,000								
Budget Comparison 2003									
Original Budget	4,300,000								5
Projected outturn	4,286,000								
Saving	14,000								

 $^{^1}$ Candidates who have allocated central overheads over Central and the 5 workshops here should not be penalized. See Question 3 Appendix 3B for the figures

				Workshops	Burgie	Cadam	Dronach	Elgin	Farclas	PAGE
1. Workshop Capacity										
Hours per annum	=	37½ x 52	= 1,950							21
Direct Hours Basis										
Supervisors	@	40%	= 780							21
Mechanics	@	60%	= 1,170							21
Staff										
Supervisors		No.		5	1	1	1	1	1	10
Mechanics		No.		27	5	5	5	7	5	10
Direct Hours										
Supervisors		No.		3,900	780	780	780	780	780	
Mechanics		No.		31,590	5,850	5,850	5,850	8,190	5,850	
				35,490	6,630	6,630	6,630	8,970	6,630	
2. Workshop Demand Direct Hours worked										
Maintenance		No.		27,381	6,006	5,553	4,340	5,421	6,061	28
Breakdowns		No.		942	192	78	321	206	145	28
Tyres/Exhausts		No.		777	159	168	132	151	167	28
,				29,100	6,357	5,799	4,793	5,778	6,373	
3. Workshop Compariso Surplus (Deficit) Direct				6,390	273	831	1,837	3,192	257	

					Dronach	Elgin	PA
. Direct Hours Requirer	nents						
Current requirement	<u>inentis</u>			No.	4,793	5,778	28
Met from spare capacity	_				,	- ,	
Cadam	831 less co	ontingenc	v	No.	631	0	16
Dronach	1,837 less	-		No.	0	1,637	16
Elgin	3,192 less	-	-	No.	2,992	0	16
6	_,	8			3,623	1,637	
Shortfall				No.	1,170	4,141	
Additional/transferred med	chanics	N	Э.	No.	1	4	
(@ 1,170 days each)			irrent	No.	5	7	
(C 1,170 augs each)			et saving	110.	4	3	
		1 1	A saving				
Closure Savings 2004					£	£	
Staffing Workshop Manager	1	@	25,000		25,000	25,000	25
Foreman	1	@	19,300		19,300	19,300	25
Storeman	1	@	15,600		15,600	15,600	25
Mechanics	Net 4 & 3		18,500		74,000	55,500	25
Weenanies	100 + 00 5	e	10,500		133,900	115,400	25
Premises					155,700	115,400	
Building Maintenance			100%		11,100	3,400	13
Cleaning	•		100%		1,100	1,300	13
Energy			75%		8,700	5,700	13
Water (metered)					0	0	13
Rates			100%		10,500	16,500	13
Rent			100%		35,000	0	13
itent			10070		66,400	26,900	10
Supplies & Other							
Equipment Maintenar			•		0	0	14
Spares & Consumable	s		•		0	0	14
Office Expenses			•		0	0	14
					0	0	14
Capital Charges					0	17,000	5,1
Gross Saving					200,300	159,300	
. Other One-off Costs/S	avings						
Revenue costs							
Removals/works					5,000	10,000	27
Redundancy/pensions					2,000	2,000	21
Staff relocation payme	ents				3,000	4,000	21
					10,000	16,000	
OTES The lease on Dron	ach workshor	o is comi	ng up for rev	view in 2004 and	l is expected to increase		12
significantly			-0 "P 101 101		Presed to mereuse	-	12

There would be a potential capital receipt of £350,000 for the MPA from the sale of Elgin.

5. Question 3

- (a) To test candidates' ability to discuss and evaluate a number of quality-related issues and to make recommendations to improve client satisfaction;
- (b) To test candidates' understanding of statistical techniques in assessing the significance of the relative performances by the workshops on servicing quality;
- (c) To test candidates' ability to review current pricing structures with a view to producing a revised basis which better reflects actual costs to users;
- (d) To test candidates' ability to consider and propose other means of monitoring and improving client satisfaction.
- (e) To examine candidates' competence in drafting a short report for discussion by the MPA's Workshop Quality Workgroup (WQW) that covers all these issues.

Assessment

- (a) Brief introduction, identification of the main areas to be covered and statistical analysis of breakdown figures for the five workshops. (35%) (14 marks)
 - Brief introduction and a note of the quality-related concerns to be covered
 - the incidence and significance of vehicle breakdowns
 - the charging for vehicle maintenance and fleet management services
 - other client satisfaction issues;
 - □ A note of the sampling exercise undertaken for a number of vehicles in each of the 28 workshops and a table setting out the results;
 - □ A note that the number of breakdowns found in the Dronach and Elgin workshops is 28 higher than elsewhere;
 - □ A chi-squared test to ascertain whether there is any clear evidence statistically that the number of breakdowns is influenced by the workshop servicing the vehicles;
 - □ Conclusion that at the 5% significance level, there is evidence of association between the number of breakdowns and the workshop servicing the vehicles;
 - □ A proportion test of significance to ascertain whether the breakdown results at Dronach workshop are significantly out of line with the regional comparator;
 - □ Conclusion that this test does show the Dronach workshop to have a higher breakdown rate at the 95% significance level;
 - □ Consideration of any factors which might account for these results
 - the amount of time spent on each vehicle
 - the quality of the work undertaken
 - \Box Calculation of the amount of time spent on each service at each of the five workshops 28 and the average;
 - □ Conclusion that Dronach spends less time on each service than other workshops;
 - A note that there are currently no measures of quality of work in place.
- **<u>NOTE</u>** For suggested calculations see Appendix 3A, but note comments in 1(e) above.

- (b) Consideration of improved recharge methodologies for the costs of the Fleet Management operation and production of a proposed structure. (35%) (14 marks)
 - □ Consideration of how to attribute the four overhead categories over central Fleet and the five workshops
 - staff numbers
 - floor areas
 - number of vehicles
 - number of vehicles weighted for mileage
 - maintenance hours (proxy for mileage)
 - one basis for all or separate;
 - □ Conclusion that, whilst not particularly significant in cost terms, the four overheads are different and need individual treatment;
 - Determination of a basis for each
 - central premises a clear charge to central Fleet Management 13
 - central services mainly related to central Fleet Management, so charge there 18
 - property insurance relates to workshops, so allocate on floor area basis
 - Shire services largely personnel/payroll related, so allocate across Fleet 18 Management and workshops on the basis of staff numbers;
 - □ Attribution of the 2003 overhead costs over the 2003 projected outturn base costs for central Fleet Management and the individual workshops on the above bases;
 - □ Determination of a basis for charging out central Fleet Management costs and 27 conclusion that these are best attributed as a largely fixed cost on a per vehicle basis;
 - □ Calculation of the central Fleet Management cost per vehicle;
 - □ Consideration of fuel and spare/consumable issues and conclusion that these are best 27 charged out on the basis of actual cost plus a handling oncost of 2% and 10% respectively;
 - □ Calculation of the recharges generated on this basis for each of the five workshops;
 - □ Calculation of the residual costs to be recovered for each of the five workshops and overall;
 - □ Acknowledgement of the basis agreed for charging out residual workshop costs 27 recovery through a charge per direct labour hour;
 - □ Calculation of the resultant charge per hour for the individual workshops and workshops overall;
 - □ A note of the significant variances between hourly costs at the five workshops;
 - □ As a result, recommendation that, for 2003 at least, the hourly charge-out rate should be that for the workshops taken together £35 per hour;
 - □ Comparison of this with the regional comparator figure and comment that this is well above the £30 average;
- 23

- □ Better candidates might comment that the provisional 2004 figure (whichever closure is accepted) will be below the regional comparator figure and comment that the composite rate approach could be reviewed for 2004, when the charge-out rate will be both lower and more uniform across the workshops as a result of the rationalization from 1 January 2004.
- **<u>NOTE</u>** For suggested calculations see Appendix 3B, but note comments in 1(e) above.

- (c) Consideration of service and quality issues surrounding the workshop and Fleet Management operations, and recommendations to improve the current situation and improve client satisfaction. (20%) (8 marks)
 - □ Introduction of a formal vehicle booking-in system to ensure an even service workflow for the workshops and to avoid vehicles being delayed in workshops as a result of workflow peaks;
 - □ Agreement and formalisation with clients of core performance levels (SLAs), covering
 - maintenance service coverage
 - time allocations
 - service standards
 - charging basis
 - complaint and arbitration arrangements;
 - □ The introduction of monthly internal invoices for clients (petrol, spares, fixed charge and hourly charged direct work) with sufficient details to support the charges levied;
 - □ The requirement for clients to check these and, subject to the resolution of any queries, to approve the charge within a specified period;
 - □ Introduction of a more client focused post-service approach including a report of service findings on each vehicle -
 - tick list of work done and notes on findings
 - notes on potential future work (early warning re brakes, exhausts, tyres etc.)
 - □ Introduction of a short post-service client questionnaire asking for some assessment of the quality of work undertaken;
 - The recording of relevant performance-related statistics (number of breakdowns etc.);
 - □ The establishment of relevant performance indicators and comparisons with peer group figures, where appropriate;
 - □ The introduction of annual broader-based client satisfaction questionnaires;
 - □ In the longer term, the introduction of more formal quality initiatives and standards
 - Motor Federations
 - ISO standards and registration
 - Training standards
 - TQM
 - IIP etc..

(d) Presentation, format, tact and general readability. (10%) (4 marks)

Breakdown Analysis Observed sample results (O _i) Breakdowns No breakdowns Overall weightings Breakdowns No breakdowns Chi-squared Test H ₀ = no association H ₁ = association Expected sample results (E ₁)* Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x of $\chi^2 = \Sigma (O_1 - E_1)^2 / E_1$ (O ₁ - E ₁) ² / E ₁ Breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns Sigma Provide State (O ₁ - E ₁) ² / E ₁ = Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables χ^2 (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance levels and the servicing workshop.	overall % 9.593163 4	-	Burgie 2 28 30 30 30 27.00 30.00 27.00 30.00 0.333333 0.037037	Cadam 1 29 30 30 27.00 30.00 1.333333 0.148148	Dronach 8 27 35 35 35 31.50 35.00 5.785714 0.642857	Elgin 4 33 37 37 3.70 33.30 37.00 0.024324 0.002703	Farclas 1 27 28 2.80 25.20 28.00 1.157143 0.128571	W/shops 16 144 160 10.0% 90.0%	PA 28 28 28
Observed sample results (O _i) Breakdowns No breakdowns Overall weightings Breakdowns No breakdowns Chi-squared Test H ₀ = no association H ₁ = association Expected sample results (E ₁)* Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x o $\chi^2 = \Sigma (O_1 - E_1)^2 / E_1$ $(O_1 - E_1)^2 / E_1$ Breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns	9.593163	-	28 30 3.00 27.00 30.00 0.333333	29 30 3.00 27.00 30.00 1.333333	27 35 3.50 31.50 35.00 5.785714	33 37 3.70 33.30 37.00 0.024324	27 28 2.80 25.20 28.00 1.157143	144 160 10.0%	28
Breakdowns No breakdowns Overall weightings Breakdowns No breakdowns $\frac{Chi-squared Test}{H_0 = no association} H_1 = associationH_1 = associationExpected sample results (E_1)*BreakdownsNo breakdowns* Sample size for workshop x o\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{2} (O_1 - E_i)^2 / E_iBreakdownsNo breakdownsNo breakdowns$	9.593163	-	28 30 3.00 27.00 30.00 0.333333	29 30 3.00 27.00 30.00 1.333333	27 35 3.50 31.50 35.00 5.785714	33 37 3.70 33.30 37.00 0.024324	27 28 2.80 25.20 28.00 1.157143	144 160 10.0%	28
No breakdowns Overall weightings Breakdowns No breakdowns Chi-squared Test H ₀ = no association H ₁ = association Expected sample results (E ₁)* Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x o $\chi^2 = \Sigma (O_1 - E_1)^2 / E_1$ ($O_1 - E_1$) ² / E_1 Breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns $\Sigma (O_1 - E_1)^2 / E_1 =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables $\chi^2 (0.05)(v=4) =$ Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance level	9.593163	-	28 30 3.00 27.00 30.00 0.333333	29 30 3.00 27.00 30.00 1.333333	27 35 3.50 31.50 35.00 5.785714	33 37 3.70 33.30 37.00 0.024324	27 28 2.80 25.20 28.00 1.157143	144 160 10.0%	28
Overall weightings Breakdowns No breakdowns Chi-squared Test H ₀ = no association H ₁ = association Expected sample results (E ₁)* Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x o $\chi^2 = \Sigma (O_1 - E_1)^2 / E_1$ $(O_1 - E_1)^2 / E_1$ Breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns $\Sigma (O_1 - E_1)^2 / E_1 =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables $\chi^2 (0.05)(v=4) =$ Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance level	9.593163	-	30 3.00 27.00 30.00 0.333333	30 3.00 27.00 30.00 1.333333	35 3.50 31.50 35.00 5.785714	37 3.70 33.30 37.00 0.024324	28 2.80 25.20 28.00 1.157143	160 10.0%	
Breakdowns No breakdowns Chi-squared Test $H_0 = no$ association $H_1 = association$ Expected sample results $(E_1)^*$ Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x o $\chi^2 = \Sigma (O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I$ $(O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I$ Breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns $\Sigma (O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables $\chi^2 (0.05)(v=4) =$ Reject H_0 at the 5% significance level	9.593163	-	3.00 27.00 30.00 0.333333	3.00 27.00 30.00 1.333333	3.50 31.50 35.00 5.785714	3.70 33.30 37.00 0.024324	2.80 25.20 28.00 1.157143	10.0%	28
Breakdowns No breakdowns Chi-squared Test $H_0 = no$ association $H_1 = association$ Expected sample results $(E_1)^*$ Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x o $\chi^2 = \Sigma (O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I$ $(O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I$ Breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns $\Sigma (O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables $\chi^2 (0.05)(v=4) =$ Reject H_0 at the 5% significance level	9.593163		27.00 30.00 0.333333	27.00 30.00 1.333333	31.50 35.00 5.785714	33.30 37.00 0.024324	25.20 28.00 1.157143		
No breakdowns Chi-squared Test $H_0 = no$ association $H_1 = association$ Expected sample results $(E_1)^*$ Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x o $\chi^2 = \Sigma (O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I$ $(O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I$ Breakdowns No breakdowns No breakdowns $\Sigma (O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables $\chi^2 (0.05)(v=4) =$ Reject H_0 at the 5% significance level	9.593163		27.00 30.00 0.333333	27.00 30.00 1.333333	31.50 35.00 5.785714	33.30 37.00 0.024324	25.20 28.00 1.157143		
$\frac{\text{Chi-squared Test}}{H_0 = \text{no association}}$ $H_1 = \text{association}$ Expected sample results (E ₁)* Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x o $\chi^2 = \sum_{\text{(OI - EI)}^2/E_I} (O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I$ (O _I - E _I) ² /E _I Breakdowns No breakdowns $\sum_{\text{(OI - EI)}^2/E_I = \text{Degrees of freedom (v)} = (r-1) \times (c-1)$ From tables χ^2 (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance levels	9.593163	-	27.00 30.00 0.333333	27.00 30.00 1.333333	31.50 35.00 5.785714	33.30 37.00 0.024324	25.20 28.00 1.157143	90.0%	
$\begin{split} H_0 &= \text{no association} \\ H_1 &= \text{association} \\ \text{Expected sample results (E_1)*} \\ \text{Break downs} \\ \text{No break downs} \\ * \text{ Sample size for workshop x o} \\ \chi^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{2} (O_i - E_i)^2 / E_i \\ (O_i - E_i)^2 / E_i \\ \text{Break downs} \\ \text{No break downs} \\ \text{No break downs} \\ \sum_{i=1}^{2} (O_i - E_i)^2 / E_i = \\ \text{Degrees of freedom (v)} = \\ (r-1) \times (c-1) \\ \text{From tables } \chi^2 (0.05)(v=4) = \\ \text{Reject } H_0 \text{ at the 5\% significance level} \end{split}$	9.593163	-	27.00 30.00 0.333333	27.00 30.00 1.333333	31.50 35.00 5.785714	33.30 37.00 0.024324	25.20 28.00 1.157143		
$\begin{split} H_0 &= \text{no association} \\ H_1 &= \text{association} \\ \text{Expected sample results (E_1)*} \\ \text{Break downs} \\ \text{No break downs} \\ * \text{ Sample size for workshop x o} \\ \chi^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{2} (O_i - E_i)^2 / E_i \\ (O_i - E_i)^2 / E_i \\ \text{Break downs} \\ \text{No break downs} \\ \text{No break downs} \\ \sum_{i=1}^{2} (O_i - E_i)^2 / E_i = \\ \text{Degrees of freedom (v)} = \\ (r-1) \times (c-1) \\ \text{From tables } \chi^2 (0.05)(v=4) = \\ \text{Reject } H_0 \text{ at the 5\% significance level} \end{split}$	9.593163		27.00 30.00 0.333333	27.00 30.00 1.333333	31.50 35.00 5.785714	33.30 37.00 0.024324	25.20 28.00 1.157143		
$\begin{split} H_{1} &= \text{association} \\ \text{Expected sample results } (E_{1})^{*} \\ &\text{Break downs} \\ &\text{No break downs} \\ &* \text{Sample size for workshop x o} \\ \chi^{2} &= \sum_{i} (O_{I} - E_{i})^{2} / E_{I} \\ &\text{Oracle of } (O_{I} - E_{I})^{2} / E_{I} \\ &\text{Break downs} \\ &\text{No break downs} \\ \hline \Sigma (O_{I} - E_{I})^{2} / E_{I} = \\ &\text{Degrees of freedom } (v) = \\ &(r-1) \times (c-1) \\ &\text{From tables } \chi^{2} (0.05)(v=4) = \\ &\text{Reject } H_{0} \text{ at the 5\% significance level} \end{split}$	9.593163		27.00 30.00 0.333333	27.00 30.00 1.333333	31.50 35.00 5.785714	33.30 37.00 0.024324	25.20 28.00 1.157143		
Expected sample results $(E_1)^*$ Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x of $\chi^2 = \Sigma (O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I$ $(O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I$ Breakdowns No breakdowns $\Sigma (O_I - E_I)^2 / E_I =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables $\chi^2 (0.05)(v=4) =$ Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance level	9.593163	-	27.00 30.00 0.333333	27.00 30.00 1.333333	31.50 35.00 5.785714	33.30 37.00 0.024324	25.20 28.00 1.157143		
Breakdowns No breakdowns * Sample size for workshop x o $\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (O_I - E_i)^2 / E_i$ Breakdowns No breakdowns $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (O_I - E_i)^2 / E_i =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables χ^2 (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance levels	9.593163	-	27.00 30.00 0.333333	27.00 30.00 1.333333	31.50 35.00 5.785714	33.30 37.00 0.024324	25.20 28.00 1.157143		
* Sample size for workshop x o $\chi^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (O_{I} - E_{i})^{2} / E_{I}$ Breakdowns No breakdowns $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (O_{I} - E_{i})^{2} / E_{I} =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables χ^{2} (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance levels	9.593163	_	30.00 0.333333	30.00	35.00 5.785714	37.00 0.024324	28.00		
$\chi^{2} = \sum_{I} (O_{I} - E_{I})^{2} / E_{I}$ Breakdowns No breakdowns $\sum_{I} (O_{I} - E_{I})^{2} / E_{I} =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables χ^{2} (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance level	9.593163	_	0.333333	1.333333	5.785714	0.024324	1.157143		
$(O_{I} - E_{I})^{2} / E_{I}$ Breakdowns No breakdowns $\sum (O_{I} - E_{I})^{2} / E_{I} =$ Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables χ^{2} (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance lev									
Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables χ^2 (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance lev									
Degrees of freedom (v) = (r-1) x (c-1) From tables χ^2 (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance lev									
(r-1) x (c-1) From tables χ^2 (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance lev	4								
From tables χ^2 (0.05)(v=4) = Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance lev	T								
Reject H ₀ at the 5% significance lev									
	9.488								
C 1		ide that th	ere is evidenc	e of association	on between br	eakdown			
Proportion Test of Significance									
Regional rate (test rate) =	10.0000%	(π_{0})							23
$H_0 = p(\pi_1) = \pi_0 (0.10)$									
$H_1 = p(\pi_1) \neq \pi_0 (0.10)$									
• • • • • •	22.8571%								28
$p(Dionach) = p_1 = 0.55 =$	22.037170								20
$\operatorname{Se}_{(p)}^{2} = (\pi_{0}(1 - \pi_{0}))/n =$	0.002571	(0.10(1-0.10)/3	35)					
$Se_{(p)} = v (\pi_0 (1 - \pi_0))/n =$	0.050709								
$Se_{(p)} = v (\pi 0 (1 - \pi 0))/11 =$	01020703								
From tables at 5%, $z =$	1.96								
	$\tau_0 + / (\text{Se x z})$								
		00 + 1 0 4)						
	0.10+/-(0.0507)						
= 0 $= 0$	0.10+/-0.09938	17()							

Actual p = 22.8571%, which is outside the range. Therefore reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the percentage of breakdowns at Dronach workshop does differ significantly from that indicated by the regional figure

4. Analysis of Time per Service	Workshops	Burgie	Cadam	Dronach	Elgin	Farclas	
Analysis							
Service hours	27,381	6,006	5,553	4,340	5,421	6,061	28
No. of services	4,402	938	829	853	874	908	28
Hours per service	6.2	6.4	6.7	5.1	6.2	6.7	

	Tetal	Cantral	Washahama	Duncia	Cadam	Drenesh	Flain	Familas	PAC
l. Overheads – Attribution Ba	Total	Central	Workshops	Burgie	Cadam	Dronach	Elgin	Farclas	
Staff Numbers	46	4	42	8	8	8	10	8	10
Floor Areas (sq mtres)	3,600	0	3,600	850	830	410	920	590	6
Vehicles Basis	700	0	700	136	136	135	156	137	6
0	All to Centra All to Centra								5,13 5,18
-	Across work		or area		£18,000/	3.600 =	£5 per sc	1 mtre	5,13
	Across all by				£11,500		£250 e		5,18
	Total £	Central £	Workshops	Burgie £	Cadam £	Dronach £	Elgin £	Farclas £	
Projected Outturn Costs 20		L	£	L	L	L	L	L	
Staffing	<u>922,500</u>	118,300	804,200	153,800	153,100	153,700	192,700	150,900	10
Premises	922,500 204,500	118,500	204,200 204,500	39,700	36,000	70,400	33,900	24,500	13
Supplies etc.	3,053,500	4,700	3,048,800	582,500	543,800	520,400	821,900	580,200	18
Capital Charges	60,000	4,700 0	60,000	14,000	13,500	0	17,000	15,500	19
Cupital Charges	4,240,500	123,000	4,117,500	790,000	746,400	744,500	1,065,500	771,100	17
Attribution of Overheads									
Revised Costs 2003 Overheads	4,240,500	123,000	4,117,500	790,000	746,400	744,500	1,065,500	771,100	
Central Premises	9.000	9,000							
Central Services	7,000	7,000							
Property Insurance	18,000	7,000	18,000	4,250	4,150	2,050	4,600	2,950	
Shire Services	11,500	1,000	10,500	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,500	2,000	
a	4,286,000	140,000	4,146,000	796,250	752,550	748,550	1,072,600	776,050	
Basis of Charge - Central Fixed charge per vehicle Costs Vehicles Charge per vehicle		140,000 <i>700</i> 200	(Number)						6
<u>Basis of Charge - Fuel</u> Actual cost + 2% oncost									
Costs			2,500,000	475,000	450,000	425,000	675,000	475,000	18
Oncost			50,000	9,500	9,000	8,500	13,500	9,500	27
Costs recovered b			2,550,000	484,500	459,000	433,500	688,500	484,500	
Basis of Charge – Spares/C	<u>Consumables</u>								
Actual cost + 10% oncost Costs			525 000	102 200	200	01 500	141 600	99,400	18
Oncost			525,000	103,300 10,330	89,200 8,920	91,500 9,150	141,600 14,160	99,400 9,940	10
					0.920	9,150	14,100	9,940	
Costs recovered c			52,500 577,500	113,630	98,120	100,650	155,760	109,340	
Costs recovered c Basis of Charge– Residual	<u>Costs</u>						155,760	109,340	
Costs recovered c Basis of Charge – Residual Charge per direct hour	<u>Costs</u>		577,500	113,63(98,120	100,650			
Costs recovered c Basis of Charge – Residual Charge per direct hour Balance of costs (a-b-c)			577,500 1,018,500	113,63(198,12(98,120 195,430	100,650 214,400	228,340	182,210	
Costs recovered c Basis of Charge – Residual Charge per direct hour Balance of costs (a-b-c) Direct hours		(hours)	577,500 1,018,500 29,100	113,63(198,12(<i>6,357</i>	98,120 195,430 <i>5,799</i>	100,650 214,400 <i>4,793</i>	228,340 <i>5</i> ,778	182,210 <i>6,373</i>	
Costs recovered c Basis of Charge – Residual Charge per direct hour Balance of costs (a-b-c)		(hours)	577,500 1,018,500	113,63(198,12(98,120 195,430	100,650 214,400	228,340	182,210	
Costs recovered c Basis of Charge – Residual Charge per direct hour Balance of costs (a-b-c) Direct hours Charge per direct hour Charge per direct hour	((hours)	577,500 1,018,500 29,100 35.00	113,63(198,12(<i>6,357</i>	98,120 195,430 <i>5,799</i>	100,650 214,400 <i>4,793</i>	228,340 <i>5</i> ,778	182,210 <i>6,373</i>	
Costs recovered c Basis of Charge – Residual Charge per direct hour Balance of costs (a-b-c) Direct hours Charge per direct hour Charge per direct hour Charge per direct hour Charge per direct hour Charge per direct hour	((hours)	577,500 1,018,500 29,100 35.00 1,018,500	113,63(198,12(6,357 31.17	98,120 195,430 5,799 33.70	100,650 214,400 <i>4,793</i> 44.73	228,340 <i>5</i> ,778	182,210 <i>6,373</i>	
Costs recovered c Basis of Charge – Residual Charge per direct hour Balance of costs (a-b-c) Direct hours Charge per direct hour Charge per direct hour SOTE - Provisional Charge 20	((hours)	577,500 1,018,500 29,100 35.00 1,018,500	113,63(198,12(<i>6,357</i>	98,120 195,430 5,799 33.70	100,650 214,400 <i>4,793</i> 44.73	228,340 <i>5</i> ,778	182,210 <i>6,373</i>	