

HMIC Summary Value for Money Profile 2013

Derbyshire Constabulary

compared with:

Wiltshire, Kent, Essex, Northamptonshire, Cheshire, Avon & Somerset, Staffordshire and Derbyshire.




Comparisons are one of the most powerful ways of making data about the police service transparent. They expose important differences between forces and enable those without specialist knowledge to ask questions.

HMIC's Value for Money (VfM) profiles provide comparative data on a wide range of policing activities. Rather than showing all of the details, this summary profile is designed to show you how this force differs from other similar forces. Does it spend more or less than the average? How differently does it invest its resources? Does it face greater or fewer demands? How does the crime rate differ?

From these starting points, the full profiles allow you to investigate further those differences identified by this summary. Page references for the full profiles are included and we encourage readers to probe areas further where the information here prompts particular questions. But the full profiles also raise additional questions. Why are some forces spending over four times more per head of population on criminal justice than others? Why does one force have a substantial number of officers working in administrative support, compared to similar forces?


How to use this summary

Bar charts show the percentage difference between your force's income, expenditure, demand etc. (known as the value), and the average for those forces which are most similar to it (known as its peers). The figures to the left or right of the bars are not the values themselves; rather they show the net 'cost' or impact of the variation. For example, they show the number of additional 999 calls a 10% difference to the average rate makes or how many fewer recorded crimes visible officers are dealing with in the force. Two examples are shown below using sample data:



The force's net revenue expenditure per head of population is 25% above the average of its peers. This difference equates to a cost of £32m compared to if the force was spending the average of its peers.

Sample data



The force's level of recorded victim-based crime is 10% lower than the average of its peers. This equates to 1,200 fewer victim-based crimes compared to if the force had the average recorded crime rate of its peers.

In all cases, details of the data used and relevant caveats can be found in the full profiles and the accompanying *Overview of the Summary's Calculations* document (both of which are available from HMIC's website, www.hmic.gov.uk).


On the final page of this summary, we provide a list of all of the categories from the full VfM profile in which the force's spend is an outlier. The force's figures are compared to the spend of other forces. To be flagged as an outlier, the spend must be one of the highest 10% or lowest 10% of any force, and must be at least £1 per head of population.

Income and expenditure in Derbyshire

Force's estimated expenditure and income in 2013/14

1. How does the force's income and expenditure compare with peers?

The chart below shows how the force's income and expenditure per head of population compares with the average of its peer group of forces:




For more information on the data used here, please see page 9 of the VfM profile.

* When considered next to areas of expenditure, below average income can be considered as a net cost to the force compared to other forces. Similarly, above average income can be considered as a net saving to the force compared to elsewhere.

2. Where is the force spending money compared with peers?


The chart below shows how the proportion of the force's spend across frontline, frontline support and business support functions compares with the average of its peer group of forces:



For more information on the data used here, please see page 10 of the VfM profile.

3. How is the local policing body funded compared with peers?

The chart below shows how the local policing body's funding per head of population compares with the average of its peer group of forces:




For more information on the data used here, please see page 14 of the VfM profile.

Demand in Derbyshire

Demands on the force in 2012/13

4. Is the force experiencing higher demand than peers?


The chart below shows how the number of 999 calls received and emergency and priority incidents recorded by the force per head of population compares with its peer group of forces:



For more information on the data used here, please see pages 55 to 56 of the VfM profile. Note that these categories do not cover all of the demands on the force.

5. Are the force's police officers dealing with more crimes compared with peers?

The chart below shows how the number of recorded crimes and charges per visible officer in the force compares with the average of its peer group of forces:




For more information on the data used here, please see pages 53 to 54 of the VfM profile.

Crime in Derbyshire

Crimes and outcomes recorded in the force in 2012/13

6. How does the level of recorded crime in the force compare with peers?


The chart below shows how the number of recorded crimes per head of population in the force compares with the average of its peer group of forces:



For more information on the data used here (including a break down by crime type), please see pages 60 to 81 of the VfM profile.

7. How do the investigative outcomes in the force compare with peers?

The chart below compares formal investigative outcomes per crime for crimes (excl fraud) in the force with the average of its peer group of forces, taking into account differences in the mix of crime between forces. Please note that use of community resolutions by some forces will affect the comparability of sanction detection rates:



For more information on the data used here, please see pages 61 and 86 to 87 of the VfM profile.

Outliers

This page provides the areas in which the force is an outlier in costs. The force's figures are compared to the spend of other forces. To be flagged as an outlier, the spend must be one of the highest 10% or lowest 10% of any force, and must be at least £1 per head of population. The difference (Diff) calculations are the net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all forces.

OVERALL COSTS

| | £m | £/head | Avg | Diff £m | | £m | £/head | Avg | Diff £m |
|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|----------------------------------|------|--------|------|---------|
| Police staff | 32.3 | 31.6 | 38.6 | -7.1 | Intelligence gathering | 1.9 | 1.9 | 3.7 | -1.8 |
| PCSOs | 5.1 | 5.0 | 7.5 | -2.5 | Support functions | | | | |
| National policing | 9.8 | 9.6 | 3.8 | 6.0 | Administration support | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.4 | -1.0 |
| | | | | | All other support functions | 2.9 | 2.8 | 4.0 | -1.2 |
| Staffing | FTE (POA) | FTE/1000 | Avg | Diff £m | National policing | | | | |
| PCSOs | 181.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | -2.1 | Counter terrorism/special branch | 9.8 | 9.6 | 3.2 | 6.5 |
| Pay | | £000/FTE | Avg | Diff £m | National policing | 9.8 | 9.6 | 3.8 | 6.0 |
| Police staff | | 30.7 | 32.9 | -2.3 | Specific grants | -9.1 | -9.0 | -3.0 | -6.1 |
| Non Staff Costs | £m | % staff cost | Avg | Diff £m | | | | | |
| Force collaboration payments | 6.1 | 4.5 | 1.5 | 4.1 | | | | | |
| Earned Income | £m | £/head | Avg | Diff £m | | | | | |
| Sales, fees, charges and rents | -4.5 | -4.4 | -2.2 | -2.2 | | | | | |
| COSTS BY OBJECTIVE | £m | £/head | Avg | Diff £m | | | | | |
| NRE by objective group | | | | | | | | | |
| Dealing with the public | 9.2 | 9.0 | 11.3 | -2.3 | | | | | |
| Local policing | | | | | | | | | |
| Neighbourhood policing | 13.0 | 12.7 | 25.2 | -12.7 | | | | | |
| Dealing with the public | | | | | | | | | |
| Central communications unit | 4.3 | 4.2 | 7.6 | -3.5 | | | | | |
| Local call centres/front desk | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.2 | -1.2 | | | | | |
| Dealing with the public | 9.2 | 9.0 | 11.3 | -2.3 | | | | | |
| Criminal justice | | | | | | | | | |
| Custody | 3.8 | 3.8 | 5.1 | -1.4 | | | | | |
| Custody subtotal | 5.3 | 5.2 | 6.8 | -1.6 | | | | | |
| Intelligence | | | | | | | | | |