

HMICFRS Value for Money Profile 2017

Nottinghamshire Police

compared with all forces in England & Wales

*The forces in the most similar group can be identified
in the charts in this section by using the key below*

- a** Nottinghamshire
- b** Kent
- c** Bedfordshire
- d** Lancashire
- e** Essex
- f** South Yorkshire
- g** Leicestershire
- h** Hertfordshire

Contents

3 Introduction

8 Section One – Costs, workforce and demand/performance

Income and expenditure

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 9 Overview | 14 Financing |
| 10 Spend by category | 15 Earned income |
| 11 Workforce costs - Officers | 16 Funding trends |
| 12 Workforce costs - Police staff & PCSOs | 17 Total expenditure by function |
| 13 Non-staff costs | |

Net revenue expenditure by function:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 18 Summary | 31 Public protection |
| 19 Local policing | 33 Investigations |
| 21 Dealing with the public | 35 Investigative support |
| 23 Criminal justice arrangements | 37 Support functions |
| 25 Road policing | 40 Criminal Justice costs |
| 27 Operational support | |
| 29 Intelligence | |

Workforce

- | | |
|---|--|
| 41 Summary | 45 Leavers |
| 42 Officers/PCSOs by rank | 46 Joiners |
| 43 Officers/staff by back office function | 47 Sickness and recuperative/restricted duty |
| 44 Workforce numbers by function | 48 Officers' length of service |

Demand/performance

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 49 Crime trends | 53 Emergency incidents |
| 50 Crime per visible officers | 54 Priority incidents |
| 51 Crime outcome per visible officers | 55 All incidents |
| 52 999 calls | |

56 Section Two – Offences and outcomes

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 60 Crimes (excluding fraud) | 76 Crime against children |
| 62 Victim-based offences | 78 Outcome percentage |
| 64 Violence against the person | 80 Charged/Summoned |
| 66 Sexual offences | 81 Out-of-court (formal) |
| 68 Robbery | 82 Out-of-court (informal) |
| 70 Theft offences | 83 Suspect Identified - No Action Taken |
| 72 Criminal damage and arson | 84 Investigation complete – no suspect identified |
| 74 Other crimes against society | 85 Not yet assigned an outcome |

86 Annexes 1-4

95 Outliers

Introduction

These value for money profiles bring together information which HMICFRS uses to inspect each force in England and Wales. This information covers police spending across all types of activity - both national and local - and includes a range of indicators of police performance, including crime rates.

Forces have much in common. They often provide a response to similar types of crimes and incidents. This means they carry out many similar functions. Similarities make it easier to compare forces, and the profiles are specifically designed for this purpose – to highlight where there are important differences in costs or performance.

However, no two forces are exactly alike, so the task is to make the comparisons as fair as possible, given the constraints of using national data. We must also distinguish between costs which are within a force's control and those which are not. For example, national pay rates for police officers or the demographics of the force area are both outside the force's control.

To focus attention on areas which are both comparable and over which managers have some direct control, we consider several factors in the way information is presented. These are described below:

Most similar groups

While each force area has different types of population, some force areas have populations with similar demographics and are therefore more likely to have similar problems. The Home Office has "clustered" these forces into most similar groups or MSGs. Consequently, the profiles show comparisons between forces in the same MSG where this is relevant. It is important to bear in mind that these MSGs are based on social and urban demographic profiles which are associated with crime levels.

Collaboration

More forces – particularly neighbouring forces - are collaborating to provide common functions across their areas. The financial arrangements for these collaborations vary and are not dissimilar to those associated with forces with regional responsibilities. Forces involved in collaborations are the hardest to compare and interpretation of this information requires caution.

In general, the net expenditure figures provided as part of the collaboration work between forces is more accurate, as the data collection form asks forces to record their income against relevant expenditure. By contrast, workforce numbers can give a false impression - in particular where the function is being provided entirely by a lead force – since the lead force might show all the staff

involved in the collaboration within their totals, even though they are providing services to other forces.

National and regional policing functions

Many forces have national responsibilities for which they receive separate Home Office funding, for example on counter-terrorism. In addition, some forces are responsible for regional functions with varied sources of funding. These additional responsibilities can make a substantial difference to the way a force is presented in the profiles. We have attempted to take account of these factors in two ways.

First, in each force the cost and funding of national policing functions are shown separately from local policing expenditure. Second, we attempt to show the net cost to the force of regional functions. This can be harder to achieve because funding can be a mixture of income sources. If all the relevant income is not correctly attributed to the lead force of the regional unit, the net cost to the lead force will be reported as more expensive than is the case. In a large force, this may not stand out as significant but for smaller forces with responsibilities beyond their force area this can make a major difference. HMICFRS and Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy aim to improve how this information is collected and presented in next year's profiles.

The detailed information included in the profiles means that hundreds of differences are highlighted for each force. Most differences will not raise concerns and may be due to inconsistencies in the data (see data quality section below), but some will be significant. Aside from highlighting on the bar charts your force and the relevant most similar forces, we use three methods to help the user identify the most important areas for attention:

- the use of chevrons (<<) to highlight outliers in the comparisons (see below for the criteria we apply),
- by showing the impact of differences, such as the additional cost of expenditure being higher than the average force, the additional number of offences as a result of higher than average crime rates.
- by providing a list of all the outliers identified in the profiles – on the last page.

The profiles have done their job if they enable managers, inspectors, PCCs, Deputy Mayors and others interested parties to ask the right questions in the right areas indicated by the analysis. The profiles do not provide the answers to these questions and jumping to conclusions should be avoided. Further investigation or inspection is needed to arrive at the right conclusions and make the right decisions. High costs are not necessarily a sign of poor value for money and the cheapest is not always the best.

Data quality

Data quality is an important limitation to the correct interpretation of the data. HMICFRS applies a systematic and well developed approach to validating the data working with the Home Office, CIPFA and forces. However, data quality needs to be balanced by practical limitations, in particular the need to publish and the other priorities placed on analytical staff in forces. Furthermore, differences in recording systems mean that some forces must shoehorn their data into national categories. Inevitably some forces take more care in carrying out this tricky task than others.

In this section we draw your attention to two important data quality issues.

Crime data integrity

In 2014 HMICFRS completed an inspection into the way police forces in England and Wales record crime data. This report identified serious concerns about the crime recording process and HMICFRS has since undertaken a programme of inspecting crime data recording across police forces in England and Wales. In response to the findings of both the 2014 report and our follow up inspections, many forces have or are in the process of improving their crime recording practices.

These improvements have clearly affected the recorded crime trends shown in the profiles. The effect is likely to vary by force and type of crime.

Quality of incident data

The quality of incident data provided by some forces has been of concern for some years because of implausibly large year on year fluctuations. Forces which provide such data are asked to check and re-submit their data to the Home Office.

More recently we have been able to compare this incident data with operational command and control data provided by forces involved in HMICFRS's big data project. This has revealed that some forces have not complied with the national definitions which require the exclusion of non-incident calls, such as 'admin' calls from their incident count; while others have included 'scheduled' calls within the 'priority' calls category.

We hope to address this issue next year, in the meantime, treat obvious outlier data from some forces with caution. However, some incident data is less affected by these problems: emergency incident data is more consistent than the priority incident data, which should be treated with extreme caution.

Changes we have made to some pages

To improve comparability we have made two minor changes to the analysis and presentation in this year's profile. Page 16 in last year's profile presented total funding trends and compared each force's funding trends with their MSG's funding trends. Page 41 in last year's profiles compared total staffing levels by type of staff. Both produce a flawed comparison because they do not take into account the mix of national and local funding or staffing. To avoid the wrong conclusions being drawn, we have removed information showing MSG funding trends. Workforce numbers recorded against national functions are removed from the totals, so that only local policing workforce numbers are compared.

As Police and Crime Commissioners do not fall under the inspection remit of the HMICFRS, we have also removed the page comparing NRE spend on PCC/local policing bodies.

Where does this information come from?

Data is from the police submitted to the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) through the Police Objective Analysis (POA) or to the Home Office through the Annual Data Requirement (ADR).

Please note, that the data used within the profiles are sourced from data available at the time of publication and may have subsequently been amended and updated.

Have there been any changes in definitions?

There have not been any major changes to the POA definitions and categories. However, two new sub-categories have been added to the Public Protection category, “Joint Teams” for forces who operate joint child and adult protection teams, and “Public Protection Command Team and Support Overheads” has been added to bring in line with other categories.

Under the category of Operational Support, the sub-categories “Events” and “Civil Contingencies” have been merged.

For the second year, the profiles include data covering outcomes associated with recorded crime. The profiles present the data on principal outcomes for each crime category.

Feedback

Many forces worked with us throughout the development of the VfM profiles, and we are grateful to those that provided us with feedback and comments. HMICFRS is always keen to hear from users on how the profiles can be improved. If you have any suggestions, or any analysis which you think might be useful to include, please contact lawrenceroymorris33@hmic.gsi.gov.uk or HMICProfiles@hmic.gsi.gov.uk

How do I use the profiles?

Most of the data are presented as bar charts so you can see how your force compares with others. Your force is highlighted in black with forces in your ‘most similar group’ (MSG) shown in teal. MSG forces share similar demographics. More details about MSG forces can be found on page 7. Finally, a horizontal line runs across each bar chart representing the average value across all forces in England and Wales (excluding the Metropolitan Police Service and City of London Police) unless stated otherwise.

The profiles are presented as ‘logic trees’ with the data broken down progressively from left to right. By following the branches of the logic tree, you can identify the reason(s) for differences between your force and others. To illustrate, in the example given on page 6 a force could be spending more on police officers because there are more of them (officers per head of population), or because they are more expensive (cost per officer), or because it is spending more on overtime. Most pages also include tables which lay out the main data presented in the charts as well as some additional comparisons. Typically, from left to right they show:

- a short description of the relevant volumes (e.g. staff numbers/total costs/numbers of crimes)
- a ratio for comparison (e.g. staff per head of population)
- the average costs per volumes
- the ‘difference’ which shows the absolute cost of the difference between a force and an “expected value”. Expected values are what would be expected of the force should they be reflective of either the national or MSG average. The difference will then show:
 - o for costs shows how much more, or less, it is costing your force than the average;
 - o for crimes/outcomes shows how many more, or fewer, crimes/outcomes your force is recording as a result of the difference from the average; and
 - o for workforce shows how much larger, or smaller, your force's workforce is as a result of the difference from the average.
- chevrons (<<) against the data highlight whether your force is an outlier for this item (whether the force is in the top or bottom 10 percent of forces and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population).

An illustrative example is shown on the following page

Guidance page - How to read the profiles

How much do officers in the force cost compared with others? How much overtime do they receive?

1. The profiles use 'logic trees' to break each policing function down (from left to right) into component parts. For each breakdown, you can see how the force (labelled 'a') compares to other forces in its most similar group of forces (labelled 'b - f'), as well as all forces in England and Wales.



2. The force (a) has some of the highest officer costs per head of population nationally...


Officer costs	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
All pay exc. overtime	127.7	99.0	121.0	16.0	3.7
Overtime	2.2	3.0	3.4	-0.4	-0.7
Total	129.8	102.0	124.4	15.5	3.0

Officer overtime as a % of total salary costs	% sal	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Total	1.7%	3.0%	2.9%	-0.9	-0.8

Number of officers and cost per officer		Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTE per 1,000 population	2.54	1.93	2.40	17.2	3.8
Cost per FTE (£000s)	50.3	51.3	50.4	-1.4	-0.1

* Absolute cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all/MSG forces.


4. This chart shows a breakdown of the previous branch of the logic tree, the bottom charts revealing that overtime has little bearing on high officer costs.




3. ...equating to a difference of £15.5m when compared to the national (all) average.

5. The force spends little (as a proportion) on overtime.

N.B Outliers are highlighted with blue chevrons, and represent the values that are in the highest and lowest 10% of values across all force and, where appropriate, have a value of more than £1 per head.



6. The force has more officers per 1,000 population than the national average, equating to a difference in cost of £17.2m (see table).



7. The cost of individual officers in the force is relatively low.

Explanatory notes and caveats

What is the purpose of the most similar group (MSG) comparison?

The MSG was designed to offer a fairer comparison of levels of crime between forces as they group forces with similar demographics. While MSG comparisons do not take account of the fact that some areas have higher costs than others; they are used here to compare costs since forces in a high crime MSG (such as large urban forces) are likely to have greater resources such as more officers, staff and PCSOs. While most forces share similar demographics with the rest of their group, there are a few that are less closely aligned (the Metropolitan Police Service, Dyfed-Powys Police, Surrey Police and City of London Police). Apart from City of London Police, the remaining forces are still included with a most similar group, but their appearance as an outlier means they should be treated with caution. MSGs were last updated for the 2013 VfM profiles using data from the 2011 Census; this grouping remains the most recent update.

What checks have been applied to the data?

The data presented in the profiles are subject to a systematic checking process:

- The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) applies arithmetic and reconciliation checks to the financial data from forces.
 - Each force is asked to check its statistical outliers (where its costs are significantly different from average and/or from its return for the previous year).
 - Each force receives a draft profile to check the figures before publication.
- Each year forces identify anomalies or inconsistencies which HMICFRS attempts to resolve. Forces are able to resubmit data to correct any errors.

Which workforce figures are used?

The profiles include staff numbers drawn from two data sets: the Home Office annual data return (ADR), which is a snapshot at 31 March each year of full-time equivalent staff in post and the Police Objective Analysis (POA) which counts the average, budgeted, full-time equivalent staff for the financial year. Given the differences between the two, these figures in some cases will not align completely. In general, the profiles use POA budgeted staff numbers to make detailed financial comparisons between forces. However, POA is a relatively recent invention and, prior to 2011/12, it was not validated by HMICFRS. Consequently, it cannot provide a series long enough to show changing trends over time. In contrast, ADR has been validated over several years so is used to present trends on police officers, PCSO and police staff numbers. It is also used where equivalent data are not available from POA.

Which population figures are used?

The profiles use mid-2016 population estimates, which are the latest available from the ONS. Please note that the ONS police recorded crime data publication, 12 months to 31 March 2017 (published in July 2017) used mid-2015 population estimates so numbers will not match exactly.

Which crime figures are used?

The VfM profiles include the crime statistics published by the ONS in for the data for the 12 months to 31 March 2017. The Home Office introduced a new framework to measure outcomes associated with crimes in 2013. Data covering outcomes associated with crimes recorded in the 12 months to 31 March 2017 for all forces are published by the Home Office and updated on 19 October 2017.

How are averages calculated?

Unless stated otherwise, the simple average of all forces and MSG forces are used. Except for their own profiles, City of London Police and the Metropolitan Police Service are omitted from the averages and the charts because they are outliers in most categories.

What rule is used to highlight outliers?

The difference is highlighted if the indicator puts the force in the top or bottom 10 percent of forces and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population.

Where can I find further contextual information to help me understand the data?

Further contextual information can be provided by HMICFRS, for example the definitions used by CIPFA in constructing the POA dataset.

Section one – Costs, workforce and demand/performance

This section looks at how a force deploys its workforce and the associated costs, for the headline categories of activities within the Police Objective Analysis (POA). POA subcategory information on costs is also presented.

POA estimates are used for all cost and workforce data unless stated otherwise. These data are force estimates for 2017/18 collated by CIPFA. Any updates to the data made after this time will not be reflected in the profile. Home Office Annual Data Requirement (ADR) data are used where relevant and POA data are not available. Examples include officers by rank, sickness rates, recuperative and restricted/adjusted duty rates, officers' length of service and leavers/joiners.

With the exception of special constables, workforce data comprises full-time equivalent (FTE) figures. In POA estimates these are calculated as the number of staff budgeted for each staff type. Police workforce figures published by the Home Office are based on those in-post as of 31 March each year. The two sets of figures are not, therefore, directly comparable.

Key to the data and calculations

- Net revenue expenditure: The profiles use a different calculation for net revenue expenditure to the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA); it is calculated as total expenditure (GRE) minus earned income to show the total cost of policing to the taxpayer.
- Earned income: Where earned income is referred to, this covers partnership income, sales fees charges and rents, special police services, reimbursed income and interest.
- Averages: All averages in this section (unless otherwise stated) are simple, unweighted England and Wales averages, including the force in question. As the Metropolitan Police Service and City of London Police data distort the chart scales, they have been excluded from all charts and averages except for those in their own profiles.
- Difference to most similar group (MSG) / All force: Differences are presented as absolute cost of difference. They are calculated using the most appropriate method for the data presented and explained in footnotes. An example calculation is as follows: (Force cost per head minus MSG cost per head) multiplied by force population = absolute cost of difference from the MSG.

- Police officer spend as % of gross expenditure: The profiles show the proportion of spend on officers (including overtime) by function. Calculation is as follows: (Police officer salary + Police officer overtime) / Gross Revenue Expenditure (GRE) = police officer spend as % of GRE.
- National policing: To more accurately compare forces, national policing functions (such as counter terrorism/special branch) are not included in totals of spend and workforce (unless stated otherwise).
- Operational frontline, frontline support and business support: POA data is mapped onto these categories. Since counter-terrorism/special branch is a national policing function, we do not include this as a frontline role (for the reason given above). Due to this, and the previously described differences between the ADR and POA workforce data, the totals and proportions may not match those published elsewhere. The list of POA categories and their classifications are given in annex 3 and 4.

Please note that, throughout the profiles, rounding may cause apparent discrepancies between totals and the sums of the parts.

How to use this section

Users may wish to focus on those areas where the force is an outlier, i.e. where the force is different from the average. Outliers are highlighted with blue chevrons and indicate that the force falls within the highest or lowest 10 percent of forces and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population. Alternatively users may wish to examine where the force of interest is positioned relative to other forces they think are similarly performing or where they expect that force to be.

Users should consider exploring the reasons for any differences by looking at the force as a whole, using relevant local knowledge. Workforce levels should also be considered in the context of workforce modernisation, collaboration efforts and the outsourcing of services. Please note that in some cases, charts are not given for all breakdowns.

Throughout the profiles the chart scales vary and as a result the differences shown may not be as significant as they first appear.

Income and expenditure - Overview


How much does the force spend compared with others on workforce and non staff costs? How much does it earn in income?

Cost per head of population


The profiles calculate net revenue expenditure (NRE) as total expenditure minus earned income to show the total cost of policing to the taxpayer. Note that this is different from NRE as reported in the raw POA data.

To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions (such as counter-terrorism/special branch) are excluded from the data analysis and charts.

NRE (excluding national functions) per head




Workforce costs per head (PO, PCSO, PS only)




Non-staff costs per head




Earned income per head




Police officer costs per head (inc OT)



Police staff costs per head (inc OT)



PCSO costs per head (inc OT)



Population	1,136k					
	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	97.2	85.6	94.4	89.7	-10.1	-4.8
Police staff	40.5	35.7	40.1	40.5	-5.0	-5.5
PCSOs	6.7	5.9	6.2	5.0	-0.3	1.0
Workforce	144.4	127.1	140.7	135.3	-15.4	-9.3
Non-staff costs	55.0	48.4	45.3	38.1	3.5	11.7
Earned income	-6.8	-6.0	-8.1	-8.5	2.4	2.8
NRE exc nat.pol.	192.5	169.5	177.9	164.9	-9.5	5.2
National policing**	0.8	0.7	4.6	5.5	-4.5	-5.5 <<
NRE inc nat. pol.	193.3	170.1	182.5	170.4	-14.0	-0.3

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

(force cost per head - MSG cost per head) * force population = absolute cost of difference

** Note that national policing has been included in the table only for reference so that the totals reconcile to the financing totals later in this section.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - Spend by category

What proportion of spend is on front line policing or in business support compared with others?


Proportion of net revenue expenditure

Police workforce roles are split into three categories: operational front line, frontline support and business support. The front line is further broken down into visible and non-visible roles (see Annex 3 & 4 for a breakdown by POA category). These charts show the proportion of NRE spend in each category. To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions are excluded.

Collaboration and partnership can artificially inflate or reduce the number of workforce FTE in a particular force. To avoid this distortion, costs of the workforce are used here to better represent how forces prioritise their resources.


Note that in *PEEL: Police efficiency 2015 (October 2015)* HMIC define frontline support as *operational support*. Since this is the name of a POA category, *frontline support* is used here to avoid confusion.

NRE (excluding national functions)




	NRE £m	Force breakdown	Averages		MSG Diff**
			All	MSG	£m
Visible	54.7	30.8%	36.9%	36.1%	-9.3
Non-visible	70.8	39.9%	33.0%	35.3%	8.2
Operational front line	125.6	70.7%	69.9%	71.4%	-1.1
Frontline support	13.4	7.6%	8.9%	8.7%	-1.9
Business support	38.6	21.7%	21.1%	20.0%	3.0
Other*	15.0				
Total (NRE)	192.5	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	


% Visible operational front line




% Non-visible operational front line



% Frontline support



% Business support



* Functions classified as *Other* do not fit into any of the three categories. They include costs associated with the PCC and central costs such as capital financing and pension costs.

** Cost of the difference between the forces planned spending and expected spending based on the MSG average proportions

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - Workforce costs - Officers






How much do officers in the force cost compared with others? How much of the extra cost comes from having more officers and how much is because they spend more on their officers? How much overtime do they receive?

Cost per head of population

Police officer costs are split into salary and overtime (OT). OT costs are also shown as a percentage of the overall salary costs (including OT).

Collaboration and partnership can artificially inflate or reduce the number of workforce in a particular force to avoid this distortion costs of the workforce are used here to better represent how forces prioritise their resources.

To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions are excluded.



FTE police officers 1,747 (exc national policing functions)

Officer costs	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Cost (Salary) exc. overtime	94.0	82.8	91.5	86.8	-10.0	-4.6
Overtime	3.2	2.8	2.9	3.0	-0.1	-0.2
Total	97.2	85.6	94.4	89.7	-10.1	-4.8

Officer overtime as a % total officer cost	% salary	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Total	3.3%	3.1%	3.3%	0.2	0.0

Number of officers and cost per officer	Force	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTE per 1,000 population	1.54	1.75	1.66	-13.0	-7.2
Cost** per FTE (£000s)	53.8	52.4	52.5	2.4	2.3

* Cost of the difference between the forces planned spending and expected spending based on the MSG average proportions

** Cost excludes overtime.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - Workforce costs - Police staff and police community support officers (PCSOs)

How much do police staff and PCSOs cost in the force compared with other forces?

Cost per head of population

National policing functions have been excluded to improve comparability between forces.

Collaboration and partnership can artificially inflate or reduce the number of workforce in a particular force to avoid this distortion costs of the workforce are used here to better represent how forces prioritise their resources.




Police staff

Police staff FTE 1,155 (exc national policing functions)

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police staff cost	40.5	35.7	40.1	40.5	-5.0	-5.5

Including overtime costs

	Force	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTEs per 1,000 populat	1.0	1.2	1.2	-5.7	-6.8
Cost** per FTE (£000s)	35.1	34.8	34.2	0.3	1.0






PCSOs

PCSOs FTE 197 (exc national policing functions)

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
PCSO cost	6.7	5.9	6.2	5.0	-0.3	1.0

Including overtime costs

	Force	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTEs per 1,000 pop	0.2	0.2	0.2	-0.6	0.6
Cost** per FTE (£000s)	34.0	32.8	32.9	0.2	0.2



* Cost of the difference between the forces planned spending and expected spending based on the MSG average proportions

** Cost includes overtime.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - Non-staff costs

Apart from on the workforce, where else is the force spending money compared with other forces?


Non-staff costs as a percentage of workforce costs

Non-staff costs are broken down into specific types of running costs.

As non-staff costs are largely dependent on the size of the workforce, they are presented here as a proportion of the workforce costs to improve comparability.

For the same reason of improved comparability between forces, national policing functions are excluded.







Note that collaboration, outsourcing and partnership arrangements will affect the data for some forces.



Force workforce costs		£144m				
	£m	% of w'force costs	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Supplies and services**	15.8	10.9%	11.8%	11.7%	-1.2	-1.1
Force collaboration payments	11.7	8.1%	5.4%	2.6%	3.9	8.0
Premises related expenses	6.0	4.2%	5.0%	4.1%	-1.2	0.1
Transport related expenses	5.7	3.9%	2.3%	2.4%	2.3	2.2 <<
Restructure, training and conference	0.9	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	0.2	0.0
Other employee expenses***	5.3	3.7%	2.5%	2.6%	1.6	1.5
PCC outsource/collab/commission	5.0	3.5%				
Non-staff costs	50.4	34.9%	29.7%	26.2%	7.5	12.6 <<
Capital financing	4.5	3.1%	2.9%	1.9%	0.4	1.7
Total non-staff costs	55.0	38.1%	32.6%	28.1%	7.9	14.3
forces planned spending and expected						

** Includes third party payments excluding collaboration.

*** Including temporary and agency staff, injury and ill health costs.



Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - Financing








How much money does the local policing body receive in funding compared with others and from where? What is the level of council tax in the force and how does that compare with others?

Funding per head of population

Central funding is broken down into formula-based funding*, and government grants that are not formula based. Local funding is comprised of council tax, and use of reserves.

The total funding on this page includes the specific funding received by forces for national policing functions. Some forces will receive national policing funding on behalf of other forces, the grants received for these national policing functions are shown separately to allow the reader to compare the financing of local policing.

To show a typical council tax payment in the force, Band D tax rates are provided (from CIPFA estimates).



Population	1,136k				
	£m	£/head	Averages		
			MSG	All	Diff** £m
Formula funding*	124.2	109.3	102.8	104.5	5.5
Legacy council tax grants	9.7	8.5	7.2	6.6	2.2
National policing grants	0.0	0.0	4.5	3.5	-4.0
Other specific grants	3.2	2.8	2.5	4.4	-1.8
Central funding	137.1	120.7	117.0	119.0	1.9
Council tax	56.5	49.7	51.6	61.2	-13.1
Reserves	-0.2	-0.2	1.8	2.2	-2.8
Local funding	56.2	49.5	53.4	63.5	-15.9
Total funding	193.3	170.1	170.4	182.5	-14.0

* Sum of police grant, non-domestic rates and revenue support grant.

** Absolute cost to the force of the difference in income to the average income per head of all forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Band D tax rate	Averages	
	All	MSG
£183.4	£182.9	£165.8

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - Earned income

How much income does the force earn compared with others and from where does it receive it?







Income per head of population

Earned income is removed from Gross Revenue Expenditure (GRE) in order to calculate NRE and does not include government grants.

To improve comparability between forces national policing functions have been excluded.

Different operating models across forces for collaboration and partnership between forces, and other agencies, give a range in levels of income under the headings of partnerships and reimbursed income.

Some forces have high earned income related to special functions such as policing large events (sports, festivals etc.).



Population		1,136k					
		Averages		Diff* £m			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	
Reimbursed income							
- From collaboration	0.2	0.1	2.5	2.1	-2.7	-2.2	
- Other	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.0	-0.9	-1.1	
Sales, fees, charges and rents	2.7	2.4	2.9	2.8	-0.5	-0.4	
Special police services	0.2	0.2	0.9	1.3	-0.8	-1.3	
Partnership income	3.6	3.2	1.0	1.1	2.5	2.4	<<
Interest	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.1	-0.1	
Total earned income	6.8	6.0	8.1	8.5	-2.4	-2.8	

* Absolute cost of the difference in income to the average income per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - Funding trends

How has the local policing body's income changed over time?

Funding trends per head

Please note these figures are not adjusted for inflation. The change overtime is therefore a nominal and not a real change.


Please note that the figures on this page are inclusive of specific government grants for national policing functions, therefore they represent all publicly funded income received by a force. A breakdown of the grants received by the force are presented on page 13. Note that change over time for reserves has not been given due to negative and positive values cancelling each other out and therefore misrepresenting the actual change in reserves. Furthermore, please note that estimates of reserves are unreliable as they often bare little relationship compared with actual levels off reserves and should be treated with caution.

The Band D council tax rates are from CIPFA estimates.

Note that value for previous years have been adjusted using mid-2016 pop figures.

Force £ per head	2013/14 estimate	2014/15 estimate	2015/16 estimate	2016/17 estimate	2017/18 estimate	Percentage Change 13/14-17/18
Central funding*	125.7	119.7	113.6	113.8	112.1	-11%
National policing grants	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a
Legacy council tax grants	1.1	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	
Council tax	50.1	44.5	46.7	47.9	49.7	-1%
Reserves	-1.5	1.8	1.4	0.0	-0.2	
Total funding	175.5	174.4	170.3	170.3	170.1	-3%

Band D tax rate	£169.7	£173.0	£176.4	£179.9	£183.4
All Average	£168.6	£171.8	£174.6	£178.4	£182.9



*Central funding does not include council tax freeze grant. Where this is received by a force, this is included in the legacy council tax grants.

Source: POA Estimates 2013/14 to 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - Total expenditure (NRE) by function

How does the force apportion its spend across the different functions compared with other forces? How has this changed since last year?

Population	1,136k
------------	--------

	Budgeted spend £m	Spend per head £		Diff from*		% of total**		% spent on Officers***	
		Force	MSG Av	MSG £m	Last year	Force	MSG Av	Force	MSG Av
Neighbourhood policing	16.4	14.4	27.9	-15.4	-4.1	8.9%	17.5%	57.1%	76.3%
Incident (response) management	27.4	24.1	15.5	9.8	-4.1	14.9%	9.7%	98.3%	62.0%
Local investigation/prisoner processing	19.3	16.9	12.6	4.9	2.8	10.5%	7.9%	84.4%	91.7%
Other local policing	5.0	4.4	5.5	-1.2	0.2	2.7%	3.4%	81.9%	70.4%
Local policing	68.0	59.8	61.5	-1.9	-5.2	37.0%	38.5%	83.3%	86.8%
Dealing with the public	13.7	12.1	10.7	1.5	1.3	7.5%	6.7%	26.8%	16.4%
Road policing	1.3	1.2	3.3	-2.4	0.2	0.7%	2.0%	39.2%	64.9%
Operational support	8.5	7.5	6.7	0.9	1.1	4.7%	4.2%	81.3%	81.7%
Intelligence	9.0	7.9	7.0	1.1	-0.2	4.9%	4.4%	55.5%	54.2%
Public protection	11.7	10.3	11.6	-1.5	1.4	6.4%	7.2%	82.7%	74.6%
Investigations [exc local investigation)	10.5	9.2	7.8	1.6	-0.5	5.7%	4.9%	57.6%	63.4%
Investigative support	4.5	4.0	4.2	-0.2	0.0	2.5%	2.6%	3.7%	1.7%
Custody	6.9	6.0	5.3	0.9	1.1	3.7%	3.3%	44.6%	46.8%
Other criminal justice arrangements	4.1	3.6	4.3	-0.7	-0.6	2.2%	2.7%	5.7%	1.3%
Criminal justice arrangements	11.0	9.7	9.5	0.1	0.5	6.0%	6.0%	27.7%	22.9%
ICT	11.4	10.0	8.3	1.9	2.2	6.2%	5.2%	1.4%	1.1%
Human resources	3.2	2.8	2.1	0.8	-0.2	1.7%	1.3%	0.0%	3.8%
Training	2.2	2.0	3.1	-1.3	-0.3	1.2%	1.9%	14.1%	40.2%
Other support functions	22.6	19.9	19.8	0.1	-0.1	12.3%	12.4%	11.2%	15.3%
Support functions	39.3	34.6	33.4	1.4	1.5	21.4%	20.9%	7.1%	10.5%
Police and Crime Commissioner	6.1	5.3							
Total exc national policing and central costs	183.6	161.6	159.8	2.1	0.1	100.0%	100.0%	49.5%	52.1%
National policing	0.8	0.7							
Central costs	8.9	7.8							
Total	193.3	170.1							

Note that expenditure under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within headline category 'local policing' not 'investigation' as in POA

* The difference in spend per head and last year values have been adjusted with mid-2016 population figures.

** Percentage of total budgeted spend (excluding on national policing and central costs) by function.

*** Cost of police officers per function as % of total gross expenditure by function.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17 and 2017/18


Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Summary

What does the force spend across the different functions compared with others?

The charts on this page show spend per head by function.

National policing functions have been excluded to improve comparability between forces. Note that collaboration/outsourcing arrangements will affect costs for certain forces.




Population	1,136k					
	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Local policing**	68.0	59.8	65.9	61.5	-6.8	-1.9
Dealing with the public	13.7	12.1	11.4	10.7	0.8	1.5
Criminal justice arrangements	11.0	9.7	11.1	9.5	-1.7	0.1
Road policing	1.3	1.2	3.7	3.3	-2.9	-2.4
Operational support***	8.5	7.5	7.6	6.7	0.0	0.9
Intelligence	9.0	7.9	7.3	7.0	0.8	1.1
Public protection	11.7	10.3	10.1	11.6	0.2	-1.5
Investigations	10.5	9.2	7.7	7.8	1.7	1.6
Investigative support	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.2	-0.6	-0.2
Support functions	39.3	34.6	37.6	33.4	-3.4	1.4
PCC/Local Policing Body	6.1	5.3				
Tot. exc national pol. & central costs	183.6	161.6	171.3	159.8	-11.0	2.1

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Note that spend under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within headline category 'local policing' and not 'investigation' as in POA.

*** Note that this refers to the POA category, not the description of frontline support used within the HMIC report PEEL: Police efficiency 2015 (October 2015).

Source: POA estimates 2017/18










Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Local policing (including local investigation/prisoner processing)

What does the force spend on the different areas within local policing compared with others?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

As some force's operating models either combined the roles of neighbourhood policing and incident (response) management, or cannot distinguish between staff in either role, a chart showing the combined costs are presented here to ensure comparability across forces.



Population	1,136k										
			Averages		Diff* £m		Officer cost**				
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	MSG			
Neighbourhood policing	16.4	14.4	23.0	27.9	-9.8	-15.4	57%	76%			
Incident (response) management	27.4	24.1	25.0	15.5	-1.0	9.8	98%	62%			
Local investigation/prisoner processing***	19.3	16.9	12.8	12.6	4.7	4.9	84%	92%			
Specialist community liaison	2.6	2.2	3.5	3.5	-1.4	-1.4	81%	61%			
Command team & support overheads	2.4	2.1	1.6	2.0	0.6	0.1	83%	77%			
Local policing	68.0	59.8	65.9	61.5	-6.8	-1.9	83%	87%			
Total exc local investigation	48.7	42.9	53.1	48.9	-11.6	-6.8	83%	85%			

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Officer cost as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.

*** Workforce for 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' headline category, not 'investigation' as in POA.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18






Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Local policing (including local investigation/prisoner processing) - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within local policing compared with others?

The charts on this page show spend per head.


Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Workforce	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	1,094	0.96	1.10	1.03	-158	-80
PCSOs	197	0.17	0.19	0.15	-16	24
Police staff	107	0.09	0.07	0.07	26	24

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	57.5	50.7	56.6	53.8	-6.8	-3.5
PCSOs	6.7	5.9	6.1	4.9	-0.3	1.1
Police staff	3.6	3.2	2.3	2.3	1.0	1.0
Non-staff costs	1.3	1.2	1.5	1.2	-0.4	-0.1
Earned income	-1.2	-1.0	-0.7	-0.6	-0.3	-0.4
Total cost	68.0	59.8	65.9	61.5	-6.8	-1.9

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£53k	£51k	£52k	1.3	0.6
PCSOs	£34k	£33k	£32k	0.3	0.4
Staff	£34k	£33k	£31k	0.1	0.2



* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18




Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Dealing with the public

How does the force spend its money within dealing with the public compared with others?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population	1,136k							
	Averages				Diff* £m		Officer cost**	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	MSG
Central communications unit	12.0	10.5	9.9	9.6	0.7	1.0	26%	17%
Local call centres/front desk	1.1	1.0	1.2	0.9	-0.3	0.1	27%	3%
Command team and support	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	35%	58%
Dealing with the public	13.7	12.1	11.4	10.7	0.8	1.5	27%	16%

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Officer cost as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18






Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Dealing with the public - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within dealing with the public compared with others?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Workforce	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	62	0.05	0.04	0.03	21	29
Police staff and PCSOs	265	0.23	0.24	0.26	-10	-28

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	3.7	3.3	2.1	1.8	1.3	1.7
Police staff and PCSOs	9.8	8.6	8.7	8.8	-0.1	-0.3
Non-staff costs	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.1	-0.3	0.3
Earned income	-0.2	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2
Total cost	13.7	12.1	11.4	10.7	0.8	1.5

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£60k	£60k	£63k	0.0	-0.2
Police staff and PCSOs	£37k	£36k	£34k	0.3	0.7

* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire







Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Criminal justice arrangements

What does the force spend on the different areas within criminal justice arrangements compared with others?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population 1,136k

	Averages				Diff* £m		Officer cost**	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	MSG
Custody	6.9	6.0	5.1	4.6	1.0	1.7	45%	47%
Police doctors / nurses and surgeons	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.7	-1.1	-0.8	n/a	0%
Total custody subtotal	6.9	6.0	6.1	5.3	-0.1	0.9	45%	41%
Criminal justice	1.8	1.6	2.5	2.1	-1.1	-0.7	0%	3%
Police national computer	0.8	0.7	1.0	0.9	-0.4	-0.3	0%	0%
Criminal records bureau	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.3	-0.5	-0.4	0%	0%
Property officer / stores	1.3	1.1	0.3	0.4	0.9	0.9	23%	6%
Fixed penalty scheme	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2	-0.3	-0.2	n/a	0%
Coroner assistance	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	-0.3	-0.1	n/a	3%
Command team and support	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0	1%	30%
Other criminal justice arrangements subtotal	2.3	2.1	2.5	2.1	-0.5	-0.1		
Criminal justice arrangements	11.0	9.7	11.1	9.5	-1.7	0.1	28%	23%

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Officer cost as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18






Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Criminal justice arrangements - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within criminal justice arrangements compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Workforce	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	49	0.04	0.05	0.04	-2	7
Police staff and PCSOs	201	0.18	0.18	0.18	-7	-5

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	3.4	3.0	2.9	2.3	0.1	0.7
Police staff and PCSOs	5.9	5.2	5.5	5.2	-0.3	0.0
Non-staff costs	2.8	2.5	3.5	2.6	-1.1	-0.1
Earned income	-1.2	-1.0	-0.7	-0.6	-0.4	-0.4
Total cost	11.0	9.7	11.1	9.5	-1.7	0.1

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£69k	£63k	£64k	0.3	0.3
Police staff and PCSOs	£30k	£30k	£29k	-0.1	0.1

* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire




Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Road policing

What does the force spend on the different areas within road policing compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing may affect costs for certain forces.



Population											
1,136k											
		Averages				Diff* £m		Officer cost**			
		£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	MSG		
Traffic units		1.5	1.3	4.0	3.6	-3.1	-2.6	<<	86%	87%	
Command team and support		0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0		11%	37%	
Casualty reduction partnership		-0.2	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3	0.2	0.2		0%	16%	
All other road policing subtotal		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		-	-	
Road policing		1.3	1.2	3.7	3.3	-2.9	-2.4	<<	39%	65%	

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Officer cost as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire






Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Road policing - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within road policing compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration, outsourcing and other partnership arrangements will affect costs and earned income for some forces.

Earned income will include driver awareness courses and Casualty Reduction Partnerships.



Workforce	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	23	0.02	0.07	0.06	-58	-46
Police staff and PCSOs	46	0.04	0.03	0.03	14	9

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	1.3	1.1	3.9	3.3	-3.1	-2.4
Police staff and PCSOs	1.3	1.1	0.8	0.9	0.3	0.2
Non-staff costs	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.7	-0.2	-0.2
Earned income	-1.9	-1.7	-1.8	-1.6	0.1	-0.1
Total cost	1.3	1.2	3.7	3.3	-2.9	-2.4

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£55k	£54k	£54k	0.0	0.0
Police staff and PCSOs	£28k	£30k	£29k	-0.1	0.0

* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire






Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Operational support

What does the force spend on the different areas within operational support compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs. Operational support used here is the POA category, not the workforce descriptor used in HMICFRS' PEEL: Police efficiency 2015 (October 2015)

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population	1,136k		Averages		Diff* £m		Officer cost**	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	MSG
Firearms unit	3.5	3.1	3.5	2.9	-0.5	0.2	95%	95%
Dogs section	1.0	0.9	1.1	0.8	-0.2	0.1	92%	88%
Advanced public order	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.0	0.2	0.3	98%	84%
Air operations	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.6	-0.2	-0.1	20%	8%
Civil contingencies and events	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.3	80%	70%
Command team and support	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	48%	67%
Other functions	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	-0.2	-0.3		
Operational support	8.5	7.5	7.6	6.7	0.0	0.9	81%	82%

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Officer cost as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18






Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Operational support - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within operational support compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Workforce	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	122	0.11	0.12	0.12	-17	-12
Police staff and PCSOs	14	0.01	0.01	0.01	1	4

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	7.1	6.3	6.9	6.6	-0.7	-0.4
Police staff and PCSOs	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1
Non-staff costs	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.1	-0.4	-0.1
Earned income	-0.2	-0.2	-1.0	-1.3	1.0	1.3
Total cost	8.5	7.5	7.6	6.7	0.0	0.9

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£58k	£57k	£56k	0.2	0.3
Police staff and PCSOs	£37k	£36k	£45k	0.0	-0.1

* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18




Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Intelligence

What does the force spend on the different areas within intelligence compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population	1,136k
-------------------	--------

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m		Officer cost**	
			All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	MSG
Intelligence gathering	4.9	4.3	3.4	3.5	1.1	0.9	47%	63%
Intelligence analysis / threat assessments	3.6	3.2	3.6	3.2	-0.5	-0.1	64%	40%
Command team and support	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	79%	61%
Intelligence	9.0	7.9	7.3	7.0	0.8	1.1	55%	54%

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Officer cost as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18






Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Intelligence - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within intelligence compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Workforce	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	87	0.08	0.07	0.07	3	7
Police staff and PCSOs	84	0.07	0.08	0.08	-2	-1

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	5.2	4.5	4.2	4.0	0.4	0.6
Police staff and PCSOs	3.0	2.6	2.5	2.6	0.1	0.0
Non-staff costs	1.2	1.0	1.1	0.9	-0.1	0.2
Earned income	-0.3	-0.2	-0.5	-0.4	0.4	0.2
Total cost	9.0	7.9	7.3	7.0	0.8	1.1

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£59k	£57k	£57k	0.2	0.2
Police staff and PCSOs	£35k	£33k	£34k	0.2	0.1

* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18








Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Public protection

What does the force spend on the different areas within public protection compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population		1,136k									
				Averages		Diff* £m		Officer cost**			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	MSG			
All vulnerable persons	11.7	10.3	9.6	11.2	0.8	-1.1	83%	75%			
Child protection	4.5	4.0	2.0	2.9	2.3	1.3	82%	74%			
Adult protection	3.7	3.2	2.9	4.0	0.3	-0.9	83%	59%			
Joint teams	3.5	3.1	4.7	4.3	-1.9	-1.4	83%	48%			
Witness protection	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	n/a	0%			
Command team and support	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	-0.4	-0.4	n/a	33%			
Public protection	11.7	10.3	10.1	11.6	0.2	-1.5	83%	75%			

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Officer cost as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18





Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Public protection - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within investigations compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Workforce	FTE/ 1,000		Averages		Diff* FTE	
	FTE	pop	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	177	0.16	0.15	0.16	10	-8
Police staff and PCSOs	52	0.05	0.06	0.07	-13	-30

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	9.8	8.6	8.0	8.9	0.7	-0.3
Police staff and PCSOs	1.6	1.5	1.8	2.3	-0.3	-0.9
Non-staff costs	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.6	-0.2	-0.3
Earned income	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.1
Total cost	11.7	10.3	10.1	11.6	0.2	-1.5

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£55k	£55k	£54k	0.2	0.2
Police staff and PCSOs	£32k	£31k	£32k	0.1	0.0

* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18








Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigations (excluding local investigation/prisoner processing)

What does the force spend on the different areas within investigations compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that spend on local investigation/prisoner processing is classified under 'local policing' headline category. Collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population 1,136k

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m		Officer cost**	
			All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	MSG
Major investigations unit	2.5	2.2	2.8	2.7	-0.7	-0.5	60%	60%
Serious and organised crime unit	5.5	4.8	2.3	2.3	2.8	2.8	50%	76%
Economic crime	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.1	-0.2	-0.3	64%	52%
Command team and support overheads	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	82%	64%
Specialist investigation units	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	-0.2	-0.4	n/a	35%
Cyber crime	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	-0.1	-0.1	66%	58%
Investigations	10.5	9.2	7.7	7.8	1.7	1.6	58%	63%

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Officer cost as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18






Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigations (excluding local investigation/prisoner processing) - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within investigations compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Workforce	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	92	0.08	0.09	0.09	-6	-9
PCSOs	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Police staff	38	0.03	0.05	0.06	-15	-28

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	6.2	5.4	5.3	5.3	0.1	0.1
Police staff and PCSOs	1.3	1.1	1.6	2.1	-0.6	-1.0
Non-staff costs	3.2	2.9	1.4	1.0	1.7	2.1
Earned income	-0.2	-0.2	-0.6	-0.6	0.5	0.5
Total cost	10.5	9.2	7.7	7.8	1.7	1.6

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£67k	£62k	£60k	0.5	0.6
Police staff and PCSOs	£34k	£35k	£35k	0.0	-0.1

* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire





Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigative support

What does the force spend on the different areas within investigative support compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population	1,136k		Averages		Diff* £m		Officer cost**	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	MSG
Scenes of crime officers	1.1	0.9	1.4	1.2	-0.6	-0.4	0%	0%
External forensic costs	2.6	2.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	<<	0%
Other forensic services	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	-1.2	-1.1	<<	3%
Fingerprint/internal forensic	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	-0.5	-0.5	n/a	0%
Photographic image recovery	0.9	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.6	18%	5%
Command team and support	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	-0.2	-0.1	12%	5%
Investigative support	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.2	-0.6	-0.2	4%	2%

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

** Officer cost as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18






Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigative support - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within investigative support compared with other force?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Workforce	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	3	0.00	0.00	0.00	-1	1
Police staff and PCSOs	43	0.04	0.07	0.06	-34	-26

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	0.17	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1
Police staff and PCSOs	1.76	1.6	2.6	2.3	-1.2	-0.9
Non-staff costs	2.62	2.3	2.0	2.0	0.3	0.4
Earned income	0.00	0.0	-0.3	-0.2	0.4	0.2
Total cost	4.55	4.0	4.5	4.2	-0.6	-0.2

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£55k	£53k	£50k	0.0	0.0
Police staff and PCSOs	£41k	£39k	£38k	0.1	0.1

* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire









Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Support functions

What does the force spend on the different areas within support functions compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that all other support functions are not presented in a chart.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population 1,136k

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff £m*	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
ICT	11.4	10.0	9.7	8.3	0.3	1.9
Estates / central building	6.7	5.9	7.9	6.3	-2.4	-0.5 <<
Fleet services	5.7	5.1	3.0	2.8	2.3	2.6 <<
Training	2.2	2.0	3.6	3.1	-1.8	-1.3 <<
Performance review	1.6	1.4	2.4	2.1	-1.1	-0.8
Administration support	2.4	2.1	2.2	1.9	-0.2	0.2
Human resources	3.2	2.8	2.2	2.1	0.7	0.8
Professional standards	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.5	-0.1	-0.2
Finance	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.1	-0.2	-0.1
All other support functions	3.6	3.2	4.0	4.1	-1.0	-1.0
Support functions	39.3	34.6	37.6	33.4	-3.4	1.4

* Absolute cost to the force of the difference between the force's spend per head and the average spend per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18


Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Support functions - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within support functions compared with other forces?

The charts on this page show spend per head.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.







Workforce	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	39	0.03	0.06	0.05	-32	-23
Police staff and PCSOs	294	0.26	0.36	0.36	-117	-116

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	2.9	2.6	4.2	3.7	-1.9	-1.3
Police staff and PCSOs	11.0	9.7	12.9	12.9	-3.6	-3.6
Non-staff costs	26.8	23.6	22.3	18.9	1.5	5.4
Earned income	-1.4	-1.2	-1.8	-2.1	0.6	1.0
Total cost	39.3	34.6	37.6	33.4	-3.4	1.4

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£74k	£67k	£69k	0.3	0.2
Police staff and PCSOs	£37k	£36k	£36k	0.5	0.5

* Absolute difference in the number of staff/officers (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.



Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Support functions - Use of resources

What does the force spend on the different areas within support functions compared with other forces?

These charts provide a detailed breakdown of support service functions as a cost per FTE and a percentage of total NRE.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.

POA 2017/18 estimates

(including national policing functions)

Total FTE*	3,168
Officer FTE	1,806
Total NRE (£m)	193.3






*Officers, police staff and PCSOs

	Cost £m	per FTE	All Avg	Diff** £m
ICT	11.4	£3,586	£3,090	1.6
Estates	6.7	£2,104	£2,497	-1.2
Training	2.2	£700	£1,122	-1.3
Human resources	3.2	£1,003	£704	0.9
Finance	1.1	£349	£371	-0.1






	% NRE	All Avg	Diff** £m
ICT	5.9%	5.3%	1.0
Estates	3.4%	4.3%	-1.7
Training	1.1%	2.0%	-1.6
Human resources	1.6%	1.2%	0.8
Finance	0.6%	0.6%	-0.1

** Absolute cost to the force of the difference in spend to the average spend per head or proportion of all forces.

Cost per FTE



Percent NRE



Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Income and expenditure - Criminal justice costs



How much does the force spend per charge compared with others? What is the size of its workforce that deals with criminal justice?

These charts show the NRE cost of the criminal justice sub category (as opposed to criminal justice arrangements headline category) per 100 charges.

FTE within the criminal justice function is then shown per 100 charges.

Note that charges data is from 2016/17 whereas FTE and cost figures are from 2017/18 estimates.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Charges		11,892			
	Force	Per 100 charges	Averages		MSG Diff
			All	MSG	
Criminal justice FTE	96	0.8	1.0	1.0	-29 *
Criminal justice cost	£1.8m	£15k	£29k	£26k	-£1.4m **

* Absolute difference in the number of workforce (FTE) compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of MSG forces.

** Absolute cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18 (costs/FTE) and Home Office Crime Statistics 2016/17 (charges)

Nottinghamshire







Workforce - Summary (excluding national policing)

How large is the force's workforce relative to it's population compared with other forces? How many officers, staff, PCSOs and special constables do they employ per 1,000 population?

Figures in the charts give the total number of FTEs (or head count for special constables) per 1,000 population. All data is from POA. Special constables data is average head count across the year.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing arrangements will have an effect on the staffing FTE for a force. For example a lead force in a collaboration may report all staff within their FTE rather than split across the forces taking part in the collaboration. For this reason NRE spend may give a more comparable indicator of a forces priorities and resourcing.

Please note, national policing functions are excluded from these totals.



Population	1,136k
------------	--------

	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	All Avg	Diff* FTE	% of total workforce Force	Avg
Police officers	1,747	1.54	1.75	-241	56%	56%
PCSOs	197	0.17	0.19	-18	6%	6%
Sub-total	1,945	1.71	1.94	-260	63%	63%
Police staff	1,155	1.02	1.16	-164	37%	37%
Total	3,100	2.73	3.10	-424	100%	100%
Special constables **	240	0.21	0.22	-13		

* Absolute difference in the number of workforce compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all forces.

** Headcount

Source: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire




Workforce - Officers/PCSOs by rank

How are officers in the force split amongst the ranks compared with other forces? What is the supervisory ratio of sergeants to constables (and PCSOs) compared with others?

Charts show the proportion of the total officer/PCSO workforce at each rank. The chart for superintendents includes chief superintendents, and the chart for inspectors includes chief inspectors. National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) are officers above the rank of chief superintendents.

Two further charts show numbers of constables (and PCSOs) per sergeant giving an indication of the average supervision requirement for each sergeant.



Note that this is ADR data for all officers and so totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.



% of total officers/PCSOs			
Officers and PCSOs	FTE	%	All Avg
NPCC ranks	2	0.1%	0.2%
Chief superintendents	6	0.3%	0.2%
Superintendents	15	0.7%	0.7%
Chief inspectors	33	1.6%	1.3%
Inspectors	111	5.5%	4.4%
Sergeants	329	16.3%	14.4%
Constables	1,341	66.7%	69.7%
PCSOs	175	8.7%	9.0%
Force total	2,012	100.0%	100.0%

Supervision ratio		
	Force	All Avg
Constables per sergeant	4.1	4.9
Constables and PCSOs per sergeant	4.6	5.5

Supervision ratio



Source: ADR 502 March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Workforce - Officers/staff by back office function


In functions where officers and staff can fulfil similar roles, what proportion of these functions are made up of police staff compared with other forces? How has that changed in the last five years?

HMICFRS split police workforce roles into three categories using the ADR601 functions: operational front line (including visible and non-visible), frontline support* and business support.

ADR601 categories are mapped to the POA data for use here. For consistency to elsewhere in the profile, counter terrorism/special branch (a national policing function) has been removed from the front line. Due to this, and the fact that ADR601 data deals with officers in post as of 31 March whereas POA data is of budgeted posts for the whole financial year, proportions will not necessarily match to other published figures. Annex 4 shows a list of POA functions and their classification.

Note that PCSOs are not included here as they, almost exclusively, work in visible frontline roles.

* In PEEL Police efficiency 2015, HMICFRS define this role as operational support. Since this is the name of a POA category, frontline support is used here to avoid confusion.



	2012/13 Estimates					2017/18 Estimates					Percentage point change in % roles fulfilled by staff **	
	Police officers	Police Staff	% Staff	All Avg	Diff* FTE Off	Police officers	Police Staff	% Staff	All Avg	Diff* FTE Off	Force	All avg
Criminal justice	2	71	97%	89%	-6	0	96	100%	92%	-8	2.7	2.6
Local call centres / front desk	51	83	62%	92%	41	5	30	86%	99%	5	23.9	6.5
Intelligence analysis	85	41	33%	62%	37	41	30	42%	64%	15	9.7	2.3
Intelligence gathering	42	8	17%	26%	5	40	51	56%	35%	-19	39.4	8.8
Scenes of crime officers	0	60	100%	95%	-3	0	23	100%	99%	0	0.0	4.1
Central communications unit	0	250	100%	83%	-44	54	225	81%	83%	6	-19.3	0.3
Custody	53	72	58%	44%	-18	44	58	57%	45%	-12	-0.7	1.6
Training	15	32	68%	46%	-11	6	18	76%	47%	-7	8.0	1.1
Human resources	0	67	100%	98%	-2	0	47	100%	98%	-1	0.0	0.3
Administration support	0	53	100%	97%	-1	10	35	77%	97%	9	-23.1	0.3
Total (of above functions)	249	738	75%	72%	0	200	614	75%	76%	-22	0.6	3.5

* Absolute difference in the number of officers (FTE) if the force had the average proportion of staff (FTE) of all forces.

** 'n/a' indicates zero officers or staff in some years

Source: POA estimates 2017/18 & 2012/13

Nottinghamshire

Workforce - Workforce numbers by function

What are the numbers of police officers, staff and PCSOs across various functions? How has this changed since last year?

Population	1,136k			
	Workforce FTE 2017/18	Workforce FTE 2016/17	Diff from last year, FTE	% change from last year
Neighbourhood policing	366	456	-91	-20%
Incident (response) management	546	650	-105	-16%
Local investigation / prisoner support*	379	320	59	18%
Other local policing	108	135	-27	-20%
Local policing	1,398	1,562	-163	-10%
Public protection	228	208	20	10%
Investigations exc local investigations	130	173	-43	-25%
Dealing with the public	327	332	-5	-2%
Operational support	136	128	7	6%
Intelligence	171	197	-26	-13%
Investigative support	46	57	-10	-18%
Road policing	69	76	-7	-10%
Custody	102	118	-16	-13%
Other criminal justice arrangements	148	150	-2	-1%
Criminal justice arrangements	250	268	-18	-7%
Information communication technology (ICT)	58	64	-6	-9%
Human resources	47	59	-12	-20%
Finance	16	17	0	-3%
Other support functions	212	287	-75	-26%
Support functions	333	426	-93	-22%
Police and Crime Commissioner	12	13	-1	-7%
Total exc national policing and central costs	3,100	3,440	-340	-10%
Central costs	0	0	0	
National policing	69	60	9	15%
Total	3,168	3,500	-331	-9%

* Note that workforce under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' headline category not 'investigation'.

Source: POA estimates 2017/18, 2016/17

Nottinghamshire

Workforce - Leavers

What proportion of the workforce left the force last year and how does that compare with other forces?






These charts show the number and percentage of the workforce (FTEs) that left the force between 31 March 2016 and 2017 (using 31 March 2016 totals figures to calculate percentage of workforce).

Officers are broken down into those who transferred or left the service. We have costed the salary impact of the workforce leaving the service to give context.

Note that PCSOs leaving forces may return as police officers.

Note that ADR data is used and workforce totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.

Note that data for some forces may not match published data sources due to data resubmissions.



	Strength*	Leavers	% w'force	All Avg	Salary** £m
Police officers	1,973				
Leaving force		159	8.0%	7.1%	8.5
Transfers		29	1.5%	0.8%	1.6
Officers exc transfers		130	6.6%	6.3%	7.0
PCSOs	214	33	15.4%	16.1%	1.1
Police staff	1,119	161	14.4%	11.5%	5.7
Force total	3,307	324	9.8%	8.7%	13.8

* as at 31 March 2016

** Salary calculated using leaver FTE multiplied by average officer/staff/PCSO cost excluding overtime (POA data).

Source (leavers): ADR531 (31 March 2017). Source (strength): ADR502 (as at 31 March 2016). Source (salary): POA estimates 2017/18






Nottinghamshire

Workforce - Joiners

What proportion of the workforce joined the force last year and how does that compare with others?

These charts show the number and percentage of the workforce (FTEs) that joined the force between 31 March 2016 and 2017 using 31 March 2016 as the baseline.

Note that ADR data is used and totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.



	Strength*	Joiners	% w'force	All Avg	Salary** £m
Police officers	1,973				
Officers exc transfers		21	1.1%	5.6%	1.1
Transfers		9	0.4%	1.1%	0.5
Joining force		30	1.5%	6.8%	1.6
PCSOs	214	0	0.0%	13.7%	0.0
Police staff	1,119	107	9.6%	12.9%	3.8
Overall	3,307	137	4.1%	9.3%	5.4

* as at 31 March 2016

** Salary calculated using joiner FTE multiplied by average officer/staff/PCSO cost excluding overtime (POA data).

Source (joiners): ADR521 (31 March 2017). Source (strength): ADR502 (as at 31 March 2016). Source (officer/staff/PCSO cost): POA estimates 2017/18.

Nottinghamshire

Workforce - Sickness and recuperative/restricted duty

What proportion of the force's workforce are absent due to sickness and what proportion of officers are on restricted/recuperative duty? How do these proportions compare with other forces?

These charts show sickness as a proportion of the workforce broken down into short and medium term (28 days and less) and long term (more than 28 days).

Officers on restricted duties (i.e. officers who, because of a disability or other factors, are unable to undertake the full range of operational duties) and recuperative duties (officers returning to work in a phased way after injury or illness) are included separately.


Note that gaps towards the left of some charts indicate that data is not available or has not been included; zero absence levels have been excluded as it is likely to be due to data inaccuracies.

Note that ADR data is used and workforce totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.


	Strength	FTE	% of total	All Avg
Officers	1,837			
Long-term sickness		37	2.0%	2.0%
Short/medium sickness		37	2.0%	1.9%
PCSOs	175			
Long-term sickness		2	0.9%	1.6%
Short/medium sickness		3	1.7%	2.6%
Staff	1,052			
Long-term sickness		16	1.5%	1.7%
Short/medium sickness		32	3.0%	2.0%

	Strength	Head count	% of total	All Avg
Officers	1,837			
Restricted/adjusted duty		49	2.7%	3.2%
Recuperative duty		24	1.3%	4.1%


Long-term sickness




Short and medium term sickness




PCSOs




PCSOs




Staff




Staff



Police officers on restricted/adjusted duty



Police officers on recuperative duty



Note that ADR 554 figures (restricted and recuperative duty) are headcount not FTE.

Source: ADR 502 (strength); 552 (short-term sickness); 551 (long-term sickness); and 554 (recuperative/restricted duty) - as at 31 March 2017


Nottinghamshire

Workforce - Officers' length of service

What is the age profile of officers in the force compared with other forces? How many officers are projected to retire over the next few years and what are the estimated savings from them doing so?


The projected number of retirees is shown for officers with 25-30 years' service.* The estimated saving of them retiring is also provided, calculated from the average cost of a police officer. This does not take into account replacements. Data is given as headcount.

All officers



March 2017 headcount	196	221	452	404	285	328	Total
							1,886

Projected retirement - projected number of officers who will reach 30 years of service within the next six years



March 2017 headcount	9	64	70	66	60	59	Total
Salary cost**	£0.5m	£3.4m	£3.8m	£3.6m	£3.2m	£3.2m	£17.6m
							328

* Please note that typically officers cannot retire until they have completed 30 years service. The above chart shows the current number of officers who currently have 25 years or more of service, broken down by the year they are expected to reach 30 years of service.

** Headcount multiplied by average salary cost per FTE excluding overtime.

Source (officer head count): ADR582 (as at 31 March 2017); Source (salary): POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Demand - Crime trends



How is the number of crimes and charges per officer changing over time in the force and how does this compare with others?

Total crime (excluding fraud) is included but not broken down into the different crime-types to ensure there is sufficient data to show a robust series.


Note that PCSOs are not included and officer/staff numbers are given in FTEs. This data is from ADR (as at 31 March) and so will not match the POA data (estimates) given elsewhere.

Note that recorded crime data on this page represents all offences excluding fraud. The figures will differ from those displayed in section two off this profile where offences with the outcome is "action taken by another body/agency", outcome 20 are excluded.

The trends for this force chart has been plotted as indices to enable comparison of the change over time in each series.



	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
Police officers	2,319	2,168	2,095	2,158	2,102	1,973	1,837
Police staff	1,538	1,272	1,238	1,330	1,268	1,119	1,052
All crime excl fraud	83,384	76,727	68,146	68,519	72,447	72,345	81,200
Charges*	14,843	13,901	11,661	12,421	14,356	13,256	11,892
Crimes/officer	36.0	35.4	32.5	31.8	34.5	36.7	44.2
All average	30.9	31.0	28.9	29.0	30.2	33.9	37.9
Charges*/officer	6.4	6.4	5.6	5.8	6.8	6.7	6.5
All average	5.4	5.4	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.1	4.9



*Total charges recorded during the period. Note the charges in section two refer to the number of outcomes for only those offences which were recorded during the period so may differ in volume.

Source: ADR 502 March 2017; Home Office (charges) / ONS Crime statistics 2016/17.




Nottinghamshire

Demand - Recorded crimes per visible officers

How does the number of crimes per visible police officer in the force compare with others?

While police officers are not just dealing with crime, the numbers of offences per visible police officer gives some indication of how the measurable crime workload for this force's visible officers compares with other forces.

Note that PCSOs are not included. Visible roles are defined in Annex 4.



Visible police officers	894
-------------------------	-----

Recorded crime	Force	Per vis. officer	Averages		MSG Diff*
			All	MSG	
Victim-based	70,849	79.3	58.6	66.5	12.7
Other crimes against society	9,273	10.4	7.7	7.6	2.8
Offences (exc fraud)	80,122	89.6	66.4	74.1	15.5

* Absolute difference in the number of offences per visible officer compared to if force had the MSG average number of crimes.

Sources: POA estimates 2017/18 ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17.

Nottinghamshire






Demand - Crime outcomes per visible officer

How does the force respond to crimes compared with others?

What are the number of offences with suspect identified, action taken and charges per visible police officer?

Please refer to 'Offences and outcomes introduction' section for the definition of 'suspect identified' and 'action taken'.

This page includes aggregated figures for both victim-based crime and other crimes against society.



Visible police officers	894
Offences (exc fraud)	80,122

	Force	Per vis. officer	MSG Avg	MSG Diff*
Charged/summonsed	10,565	11.8	8.2	3.7
Not charged	4,082	4.6	4.3	0.3
Action taken	14,647	16.4	12.4	4.0
No action	18,971	21.2	20.0	1.3
Suspect identified	33,618	37.6	32.4	5.2

* Absolute difference in the number of outcomes per visible officer compared to if force had the MSG average.

Sources: *Detections: Home Office Outcome Statistics 2016/17*, *Visible officers: POA estimates 2017/18 Crime data: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17*.

Nottinghamshire


Demand - 999 calls

What is the level of demands on the force from 999 calls compared with other forces? How much does dealing with these calls cost compared with others and what is the level of workforce required to deal with them?

Costs and workforce levels are calculated for central communications units (CCU) and also for CCU and front desk combined to account for differences in force structure.

Note that

- for consistency with elsewhere in this section, the horizontal lines in the bar charts represent the average of all forces, not the MSG average.
- staff in CCU and front desk perform a range of functions and may spend differing amounts of their time dealing with emergency calls.
- Collaboration/outourcing will affect costs for certain forces.






Population	1,136k
999 Calls received*	182,973

Central communications unit only	
FTE workforce	278
Gross cost	£12.0m

	Force	MSG Avg	All Avg
FTE per 1,000 pop	0.25	0.25	0.24
Calls per FTE	657	508	761
Calls per 1000 pop	161	131	131
Cost per call	£65	£58	£79

Central communications unit only



LIN = Lincolnshire

CLE = Cleveland




Central communications unit and front desk

FTE workforce	314
Gross cost	£13.1m

	Force	MSG Avg	All Avg
FTE per 1,000 pop	0.28	0.28	0.27
Calls per FTE	583	451	674
Calls per 1,000 pop	161	131	131
Cost per call	£72	£64	£89

* Absolute difference in number of FTEs/999 calls compared to if force matched average of MSG forces

Central communications unit and front desk



WMD=West Midlands

Diff*	
MSG	All
-8	3
-92	42
34,309	33,637

* Note data for Dorset covers only 10 months of the year to 31 March 2017 and so will not be directly comparable

Sources: Calls: ADR 410 2016/17, Cost and workforce: POA estimates 2017/18

Nottinghamshire

Demand - Emergency incidents

What is the level of emergency calls in the force compared with others? How have these levels changed?








An emergency response occurs when the police call handler assesses that there is a degree of importance or urgency associated with the incident and an emergency response is required.

All police forces record incidents in accordance with the provisions of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). These figures are not subject to the same level of quality assurance as recorded crime data.

Incident counts should be interpreted only as incidents recorded by the police, and may under estimate the true level of incidents.

Incidents are separated into anti-social behaviour (ASB) incidents, crimes (notifiable, classified command and control) incidents and other command and control (C&C) incidents.

The charts on the right side of the page show the percentage change in each type of incident over the past 12 months.



Population 1,136k

	Force	Incidents per 1,000 pop	Averages	
			All	MSG
Crime incidents	11,462	10	10	10
ASB incidents	5,710	5	4	6
Other C&C incidents	27,831	24	32	33
Total emergency incidents	45,003	40	47	49

Differences*		Change in emergency incidents		
All	MSG	Force	All	MSG
99	118	12%	10%	15%
854	-1,085	-5%	1%	33%
-8,926	-9,381	4%	33%	10%
-7,974	-10,347	5%	0%	13%

* Absolute difference in the number of incidents compared to if the force had the average number per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: ADR 342 2016/17

Nottinghamshire

Demand - Priority incidents

What is the level of priority calls in the force compared with others? How have these levels changed?







A priority response occurs when the police call handler assesses that there is a degree of importance or urgency associated with the incident but an emergency response is not required.

All police forces record incidents in accordance with the provisions of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). These figures are not subject to the same level of quality assurance as recorded crime data.

Incident counts should be interpreted only as incidents recorded by the police, and may under estimate the true level of incidents.

Incidents are separated into anti-social behaviour (ASB) incidents, crimes (notifiable, classified command and control) incidents and other command and control (C&C) incidents.

The charts on the right side of the page show the percentage change in each type of incident over the past 12 months.



Population 1,136k

	Force	Incidents per 1,000 pop	Averages		Differences*		Change in priority incidents		
			All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	All	MSG
Crime incidents	14,414	13	14	10	-1,389	3,439	1%	4%	-3%
ASB incidents	12,271	11	11	8	-98	3,170	-27%	-6%	-7%
Other C&C incidents	26,990	24	44	33	-22,916	-10,124	-3%	0%	-2%
Total priority incidents	53,675	47	69	50	-24,403	-3,516	-9%	0%	-3%

* Absolute difference in the number of incidents compared to if the force had the average number per head of all/MSG forces.

Where no data were supplied by a force, differences to all/MSG forces, and changes from the previous year have not been included

Source: ADR 342 2016/17

Nottinghamshire

Demand - All incidents

How has the categorisation of incidents changed over time and how does the most recent year compare to the MSG?

All police forces record incidents in accordance with the provisions of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). These figures are not subject to the same level of quality assurance as recorded crime data.


Incident counts should be interpreted only as incidents recorded by the police, and may underestimate the true level of incidents.

Large changes between years may be due to the force changing their internal recording categories

Scheduled category are appointments where a contact does not require an immediate or priority response but still requires police attendance, it will result in a scheduled response.

Resolution without deployment can occur where the needs of the caller can be adequately met through provision of advice, information, helpdesk or telephone investigation function or signposting to another lead agency/service.

Breakdown of all incidents per 1,000 population



	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2016/17 MSG	Diff %
Emergency	55	42	38	40	49	-19%
Priority	71	62	52	47	50	-6%
Scheduled	61	50	29	23	45	-48%
Resolved (w/o deployment)	47	65	86	105	91	16%
Total	233	219	205	215	235	-8%

Source: ADR 342 2013/14 to 2016/17

Nottinghamshire

Section two – offences and outcomes

This section uses the ONS published data on police recorded crime alongside Home Office data on outcome types.

The following pages present the volumes and changes in recorded crime for top-level crime categories. They also focus on the resulting outcomes from offences recorded over the 12 months to 31 March 2017, presenting the proportion of recorded crimes where a suspect was identified and where action was taken.

These categories taken from Home Office outcome framework and are summarised as follows:

- **Suspect Identified** is defined as an outcome where an offender is identified enabling actions such as a charge, formal or informal sanction or an offence to be taken into consideration by the court. Also included are outcomes where a suspect is identified but evidential difficulties prevent prosecution or prosecution is not in the public interest.
- **Action Taken** defined as an outcome where an offender receives a charge or summons, an out-of-court formal outcome, an out-of-court informal outcome or who asks the offence to be taken into consideration.

Further analysis on pages 80 to 85 provides the volume of key outcomes for more detailed crime categories and presents the difference from the expected volume of that outcome based on the England and Wales average. Users may want to question why there are differences from the expected volumes, why a force might have higher than expected outcomes for some crimes, or lower than expected outcomes in others.

Definitions of offences in each crime category can be found in annex 1. This publication uses the outcomes groups on page 59 below to analyse outcomes. How these groups map to the Home Office outcome types and full definitions can be found in annex 2.

Also to Note

- Outcome 20 "action undertaken by another body/agency" was introduced from April 2015. As this outcome does not relate to police activity, offences with this outcome have been excluded from pages 60 to 85 of the profiles. These outcomes account for 0.8% of total offences. For this reason some overall offence figures may appear different to the offences stated in section 1 and those published by the Home Office and HMICFRS' PEEL reports.
- Pages 60-85 report on the outcomes for offences recorded during the period to 31 March 2017 and will differ from page 49 data on charges, which presents all charges recorded during the period, even if the offence to which it relates was not recorded in the period.
- On pages 80-85 England and Wales percent of outcomes is not provided for broad offence categories (violence against person, sexual offences etc) as the profile of component offence subcategories will differ by forces and comparison would be unreliable.
- Changes over time for crimes are measured against a baseline of 2015/16.
- Crimes against children are included in overall crime data.
- Fraud is excluded from all crime to make comparisons between forces more meaningful. Fraud offences are now recorded by the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau.
- For recorded crime and outcomes, MSG (simple, unweighted) averages are used. With the exception of pages 80 to 85, horizontal lines in the plots show the MSG.
- Outcomes data for Avon and Somerset has been removed from these profiles due to concerns around accuracy caused by issues reconciling data on Home Office Systems. They continue to work with the Home Office to resolve these issues.
- Outcomes data for Suffolk are not available. They are working with the Home Office to resolve this.

- Due to an issue in the original publication of the outcomes data for the year to 31 March 2017, published in July 2017, the Home Office have reissued the open data tables for this period in October 2017. The value for money profiles use the open data tables for the year to 31 March 2017 as published in October 2017.
Figures may therefore differ from the Home Office publication referring to the outcomes data for the year ending 31 March 2017 as well as the ONS publication on recorded crimes figures for the year ending 31 March 2017. The Home Office regularly update the crimes and outcomes data so users should always refer to open data tables for the most up to data.
- This year's profiles use the outcomes data for the year to 31 March 2017 published in October, whereas the VFM profiles in 2016 use the outcomes data for the year to 31 March 2016, published in July. Subsequently there is a larger time lag in this data between the recording period and extraction from the administrative database in this publication than in previous years VFM profiles. The larger time lag results in additional time for investigations to be advanced and therefore to record an outcome against offences. This is particularly relevant for those offences where an outcome has yet to be recorded. Therefore any time series using the year ending March may not be appropriate in this case.

□

Section two - Offences and outcomes

Introduction

The offences described in this section are presented as a crime tree as shown below. The tree distinguishes between victim based crimes and other crimes against society where there is no victim but a criminal offence has been committed. Fraud is shown separately with a dotted line because a practical and reliable method for collecting force-level data has not been developed. Nevertheless, this profile provides the latest ONS information.


The ONS crime tree



Note: Definitions of offences in each category can be found in Annex 1.

Crime committed against children


This year, the profiles include a section on crime committed against children and the resulting outcomes. This includes crimes where the victims are specifically stated as children or victims are highly likely to be children (see crime tree below) There are other crime categories that may include child victims, but it is not possible to distinguish between adult and child victims (e.g. theft). These categories are not included in this section. Although not a perfect measure, these crimes give a good indication of the scale of crimes committed specifically against children within the force.



Note: Definitions of offences in each category can be found in Annex 1.

Outcome terminology

The Home Office introduced a new way of classifying the results of police investigations in April 2013. New classifications called 'outcomes' are associated with all recorded crimes, providing a more detailed picture of how the police deal with investigations. The following outcome groups are used in this section:



Note



Definitions of outcome types in each category can be found in Annex 2.

Outcome 20 "action undertaken by another body/agency" was introduced from April 2015. As this outcome does not relate to police activity, offences with this outcome have been excluded from pages 60 to 85 of the profiles. These outcomes account for 0.8% of total offences. For this reason some overall offence figures may appear different to the offences stated in section 1 and those published by the Home Office and HMICFRS' PEEL reports.

Offences and outcomes - Crimes - Recorded offences

What is the recorded offence rate for crimes (excluding fraud) in the force and how does this compare with other forces?

How does the recorded offence rate compare with last year and how does the change compare with others?



Fraud				
Offences	per 1,000 pop***	MSG Avg	Difference	
4,221	3.72	3.99	-311	

Fraud


Fraud data are experimental statistics published as part of ONS crime statistics and are in the testing phase and not yet fully developed.

The figures presented here for police force areas are based on victims' address information. This is in contrast with how other crimes are recorded, which is based on where the offence took place (in the case of fraud is often hard to define).

Offences where the victim's police force area is unknown relate to cases where it has not been possible to attribute offences to a police force area, for example, due to missing address information, or where the offence occurred outside the UK. There were 34,206 such unknown offences nationally.

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17, 2015/16

Recorded offence rate



Population 1,136k

	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
2016/17					
Victim-based crime	70,849	62.4	62.7	-430	-1%
Other crimes against society	9,273	8.2	7.0	1,295	16%
Crime (excl fraud)**	80,122	70.5	69.8	864	1%



	Offences	% change**	
2015/16		Force	MSG Avg
Victim-based crime	64,206	10%	11%
Other crimes against society	7,054	31%	27%
Crime (excl fraud)	71,260	12%	12%

* Absolute and proportional differences in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

**Percentage change from 2015/16 to 2016/17

*** Please note that this figure will differ from that presented on page 49 as offences with outcome 21 have been excluded

Percent change from 2015/16



Nottinghamshire


Offences and outcomes - Crimes (excluding fraud) - Outcome

What are the outcomes for crimes (excluding fraud) and how does this compare with others?


The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2016/17 that have a resulting outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Other crimes against society include those with no identifiable victim, such as drug offences.


Percentage with suspect identified




Percentage with suspect identified




Percentage with action taken



Percentage with suspect identified



Percentage with action taken




	Total offences	Suspect identified			Action taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Victim-based crime	70,849	27,968	39%	41%	11,299	16%	14%
Other crimes against society	9,273	5,650	61%	73%	3,348	36%	40%
Crimes (excl fraud)	80,122	33,618	42%	44%	14,647	18%	17%

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Victim-based crime - Recorded offences

What is the recorded offence rate for victim-based crime in the force and how does this compare with others?



Population	1,136k				
	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
2016/17					
Violence against the person	21,216	18.7	18.5	145	1%
Sexual offences	2,391	2.1	1.8	314	15%
Robbery	874	0.8	0.7	44	5%
Theft offences	35,694	31.4	31.7	-333	-1%
Criminal damage and arson	10,674	9.4	9.9	-601	-5%
Victim-based crime	70,849	62.4	62.7	-430	-1%






	Offences	% change**	
2015/16		Force	MSG Avg
Violence against the person	17,033	25%	22%
Sexual offences	1,952	22%	13%
Robbery	906	-4%	24%
Theft offences	33,686	6%	8%
Criminal damage and arson	10,629	0%	3%
Victim-based crime	64,206	10%	11%

* Absolute and proportional differences in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower recorded offence rate than the MSG average.






**Percentage change from 2015/16 to 2016/17

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17, 2015/16

Recorded offence rate



Percent change from 2015/16




Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Victim-based crime - Outcome






What are the outcomes for victim-based crime and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2016/17 that have a resulting outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.








Offences	Suspect identified				Action taken			
	Force	%	MSG Avg*		Force	%	MSG Avg*	
Violence against the person	21,216	16,001	75%	77%	4,898	23%	20%	
Sexual offences	2,391	1,041	44%	62%	183	8%	9%	
Robbery	874	365	42%	45%	140	16%	15%	
Theft offences	35,694	7,746	22%	23%	4,721	13%	12%	
Criminal damage and arson	10,674	2,815	26%	27%	1,357	13%	11%	
Victim-based crime	70,849	27,968	39%	41%	11,299	16%	14%	

Percentage with suspect identified



Percentage with action taken




Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire


Offences and outcomes - Violence against the person - Recorded offences

What is the recorded offence rate for violence against the person in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate compare with last year?




As homicide numbers are so small, care should be taken when making comparisons between forces. For this reason, a plot has not been included for homicide.



Recorded offence rate



Percent change from 2015/16



Population	1,136k				
2016/17	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Homicide	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Violence with injury	10,348	9.1	7.7	1,544	18%
Violence without injury	10,858	9.6	10.8	-1,398	-11%
Violence against the person	21,216	18.7	18.5	145	1%

2015/16	Offences	% change**	
		Force	MSG Avg
Homicide	10	0%	18%
Violence with injury	9,743	6%	13%
Violence without injury	7,280	49%	31%
Violence against the person	17,033	25%	22%

* Absolute and proportional differences in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

**Percentage change from 2015/16 to 2016/17

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17, 2015/16


Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Violence against the person - Outcome


What are the outcomes for violence against the person and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2016/17 that have a resulting outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.




As homicide numbers are so small, care should be taken when making comparisons between forces. For this reason, a plot has not been included for homicide.



Percentage with suspect identified



Percentage with action taken



	Offences	Suspect identified			Action taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Homicide	10	5	n/a	n/a	4	n/a	n/a
Violence with injury	10,348	7,840	76%	76%	2,797	27%	23%
Violence without injury	10,858	8,156	75%	78%	2,097	19%	17%
Violence against the person	21,216	16,001	75%	77%	4,898	23%	20%





Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Sexual offences - Recorded offences

What is the recorded offence rate for sexual offences in the force and how does this compare with other forces? How does the rate for sexual offences change compared to last year and how does it compare with other forces?

Note that due to the complex nature of these crimes, particularly rape, care should be taken when comparing crime rates across forces as there are many factors which can affect the level of recorded crime. For example, victims being encouraged to report historical crimes or cultural differences.



Population		1,136k			
2016/17	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Rape	848	0.7	0.65	110	15%
Other sexual offences	1,543	1.4	1.18	204	15%
Sexual offences	2,391	2.1	1.83	314	15%

		% change**	
2015/16	Offences	Force	MSG Avg
Rape	768	10%	14%
Other sexual offences	1,184	30%	12%
Sexual offences	1,952	22%	13%

* Absolute and proportional differences in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

**Percentage change from 2015/16 to 2016/17


Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17, 2015/16

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Sexual offences - Outcome

What are the outcomes for sexual offences and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2016/17 that have a resulting outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from page 56) for definitions.





Offences	Suspect identified				Action taken			
	Force	%	MSG	Avg	Force	%	MSG	Avg
Rape	848	422	50%	65%	46	5%	5%	
Other sexual offences	1,543	619	40%	60%	137	9%	11%	
Sexual offences	2,391	1,041	44%	62%	183	8%	9%	

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Offences and outcomes - Robbery - Recorded offences

What is the recorded offence rate for robbery in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate for robbery change compared with last year and how does this compare with others?



Population		1,136k	
------------	--	--------	--

	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
2016/17					
Robbery	874	0.8	0.7	44	5%

	Offences	% change**	
		Force	MSG Avg
2015/16			
Robbery	906	-4%	24%


* Absolute and proportional differences in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

**Percentage change from 2015/16 to 2016/17
Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17, 2015/16

Offences and outcomes - Robbery - Outcome

What are the outcomes for robbery and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2016/17 that have a resulting outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from page 56) for definitions.




		Suspect identified			Action taken		
Offences		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Robbery	874	365	42%	45%	140	16%	15%

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Offences and outcomes - Theft offences - Recorded offences

What is the recorded offence rate for theft offences in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate compare with last year?



Population		1,136k			
2016/17	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Burglary	7,889	6.9	7.4	-568	-7%
Vehicle offences	6,940	6.1	7.3	-1,328	-16%
Bicycle theft	1,721	1.5	1.3	228	15%
Theft from the person	922	0.8	0.8	-39	-4%
Shoplifting	8,492	7.5	6.6	963	13%
All other theft offences	9,730	8.6	8.2	410	4%
Theft offences	35,694	31.4	31.7	-333	-1%







2015/16	Offences	% change **	
		Force	MSG Avg
Burglary	7,887	0%	5%
Vehicle offences	6,924	0%	8%
Bicycle theft	1,926	-11%	5%
Theft from the person	1,090	-15%	1%
Shoplifting	7,675	11%	12%
All other theft offences	8,184	19%	10%
Theft offences	33,686	6%	8%

* Absolute and proportional differences in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower recorded offence rate than the MSG average.






**Percentage change from 2015/16 to 2016/17

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17, 2015/16

Recorded offence rate



Percent change from 2015/16




Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Theft offences - Outcome

What are the outcomes for theft offences and how does this compare with other forces?






The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2016/17 that have a resulting outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Percentage with suspect identified









Offences	Suspect identified				Action taken			
	Force	%	MSG	Avg	Force	%	MSG	Avg
Burglary	7,889	997	13%	13%	501	6%	6%	6%
Vehicle offences	6,940	608	9%	9%	271	4%	4%	4%
Bicycle theft	1,721	125	7%	10%	54	3%	3%	3%
Theft from the person	922	107	12%	14%	15	2%	3%	3%
Shoplifting	8,492	4,064	48%	52%	3,368	40%	39%	39%
All other theft offences	9,730	1,845	19%	23%	512	5%	6%	6%
Theft offences	35,694	7,746	22%	23%	4,721	13%	12%	12%

Percentage with suspect identified



Percentage with action taken




Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Criminal damage and arson - Recorded offences

What is the recorded offence rate for criminal damage and arson in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate change compared with last year and how does this compare with others?



Population	1,136k
------------	--------

	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
2016/17					
Criminal damage	10,245	9.0	9.5	-595	-5%
Arson	429	0.4	0.4	-6	-1%
Criminal damage and arson	10,674	9.4	9.9	-601	-5%

	Offences	% change **	
2015/16		Force	MSG Avg
Criminal damage	10,202	0%	3%
Arson	427	0%	7%
Criminal damage and arson	10,629	0%	3%

* Absolute and proportional differences in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

**Percentage change from 2015/16 to 2016/17


Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17, 2015/16

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Criminal Damage and Arson - Outcome

What are the outcomes for criminal damage and arson and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2016/17 that have a resulting outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from page 56) for definitions.




		Suspect identified			Action taken		
Offences		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Criminal damage	10,245	2,746	27%	27%	1,330	13%	11%
Arson	429	69	16%	20%	27	6%	7%
Criminal damage and arson	10,674	2,815	26%	27%	1,357	13%	11%

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Offences and outcomes - Other crimes against society - Recorded offences

What is the recorded offence rate for other crimes against society in the force and how does this compare with others? How do the rates compare with last year?






Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17, 2015/16

Nottinghamshire

Outcomes - Other crimes against society

What are the outcomes for other crimes against society and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2016/17 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.




	Total offences	Suspect identified			Action taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Trafficking of drugs	670	392	59%	76%	321	48%	65%
Possession of drugs	2,120	1,673	79%	88%	1,452	68%	79%
Public order offences	4,271	2,330	55%	69%	938	22%	24%
Possession of weapons	777	536	69%	83%	320	41%	61%
Misc crimes against society	1,435	719	50%	65%	317	22%	28%
Other crimes against society	9,273	5,650	61%	73%	3,348	36%	40%

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Offences and outcomes - Crime against children - Recorded offences

What is the recorded offence rate for crime against children in the force and how does this compare with others and with last year?

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be shown as "n/a".






Population - Child under 16		206k			
	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
2016/17					
Rape	263	1.3	1.1	44	20%
Sexual offences / abuse	630	3.1	2.6	95	18%
Cruelty / other	267	1.3	0.5	170	176%
Crime against children	1,160	5.6	4.1	309	36%

	Offences	% change **	
		Force	MSG Avg
2015/16			
Rape	279	-6%	4%
Sexual offences / abuse	483	30%	12%
Cruelty / other	150	78%	3%
Crime against children	912	27%	9%



* Absolute and proportional differences in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

**Percentage change from 2015/16 to 2016/17

Recorded offence rate



Percent change from 2015/16



Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2016/17, 2015/16








Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Crime against children - Outcome

What are the outcomes for crime against children and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2016/17 that have a resulting outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be shown as "n/a".



	Offences	Suspect identified			Action taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Rape	263	87	33%	57%	15	6%	6%
Sexual offences / abuse	630	96	15%	53%	16	3%	9%
Cruelty / other	267	122	46%	54%	42	16%	24%
Crime against children	1,160	305	26%	57%	73	6%	10%

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017








Offences and outcomes - Outcome percentage - Victim-based crime

What proportion of offences result in each outcome for victim-based crime and how does this compare with other forces?

Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Note that

- Out of court (formal) includes caution and penalty notices for disorder.
- Out of court (informal) includes cannabis/khat warning and community resolution.
- Suspect identified - no action includes evidential difficulties (victim supports action and victim does not support action) and prosecution prevented or not in the public interest.



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Outcome percentage - Other crimes against society

What proportion of offences result in each outcome for crimes against society and how does this compare with the other forces?



Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Crimes against society include those with no identifiable victim, such as drug offences.

Note that

- Out of court (formal) includes caution and penalty notices for disorder.
- Out of court (informal) includes cannabis/khat warning and community resolution.

A full breakdown of outcomes is available from page 80.



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Charged/summonsed



What proportion of offences result in charges/summons and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the charge rates for all crime types compared with the England and Wales force average.

The first chart shows the proportion of all offences where the outcome was a charge or summons.

The actual percentage expected chart shows the force's actual charges compared with what would be expected if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. The expected value for the force would show as 100% if it were performing in line with all forces, so if the force's value is above 100%, this indicates that more offences are resulting in charges/summons for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	10	4	40%	59%	6	-2
Violence with injury	10,348	2,010	19%	17%	1,763	247
Violence without injury	10,858	1,464	13%	12%	1,286	178
Violence against the person	21,216	3,478	16%		3,054	424
Rape	848	44	5%	6%	53	-9
Other sexual offences	1,543	117	8%	10%	156	-39
Sexual offences	2,391	161	7%		209	-48
Robbery	874	139	16%	15%	134	5
Burglary	7,889	467	6%	6%	456	11
Vehicle offences	6,940	254	4%	4%	243	11
Theft from the person	922	10	1%	2%	20	-10
Bicycle theft	1,721	45	3%	2%	39	6
Shoplifting	8,492	2,489	29%	27%	2,334	155
Other theft offences	9,730	307	3%	3%	328	-21
Theft offences	35,694	3,572	10%		3,420	152
Criminal damage	10,245	826	8%	6%	659	167
Arson	429	19	4%	5%	22	-3
Criminal damage & arson	10,674	845	8%		681	164
Victim-based crime	70,849	8,195	12%	11%	7,498	697
Trafficking of drugs	670	284	42%	50%	337	-53
Possession of drugs	2,120	793	37%	32%	681	112
Possession of weapons offences	777	290	37%	46%	354	-64
Public order offences	4,271	750	18%	16%	681	69
Miscellaneous crimes	1,435	253	18%	25%	352	-99
Other crimes against society	9,273	2,370	26%		2,406	-36
Total	80,122	10,565	13%		9,902	663



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Out-of-court (formal)



What proportion of offences result in out-of-court (formal) outcomes and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of out of court (formal) outcomes for all crime types compared with the England and Wales force average.

The first chart shows the proportion of all offences where there was an out of court (formal) outcome.

The actual percentage expected chart shows the force's actual out of court (formal) outcomes compared with what would be expected if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. The expected value for the force would show as 100% if it were performing in line with all forces, so if the force's value is above 100%, this indicates that more offences are resulting in out of court (formal) outcomes for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	10	0	0%	0%	0	0
Violence with injury	10,348	336	3%	4%	400	-64
Violence without injury	10,858	208	2%	3%	288	-80
Violence against the person	21,216	544	3%		688	-144
Rape	848	2	0%	0%	0	2
Other sexual offences	1,543	13	1%	1%	20	-7
Sexual offences	2,391	15	1%		20	-5
Robbery	874	1	0%	0%	2	-1
Burglary	7,889	17	0%	0%	19	-2
Vehicle offences	6,940	10	0%	0%	15	-5
Theft from the person	922	0	0%	0%	2	-2
Bicycle theft	1,721	4	0%	0%	5	-1
Shoplifting	8,492	209	2%	4%	360	-151
Other theft offences	9,730	39	0%	1%	79	-40
Theft offences	35,694	279	1%		480	-201
Criminal damage	10,245	157	2%	2%	206	-49
Arson	429	4	1%	1%	3	1
Criminal damage & arson	10,674	161	2%	2%	210	-49
Victim-based crime	70,849	1,000	1%	2%	1,401	-401
Trafficking of drugs	670	30	4%	10%	70	-40
Possession of drugs	2,120	292	14%	20%	430	-138
Possession of weapons offences	777	24	3%	8%	62	-38
Public order offences	4,271	77	2%	3%	149	-72
Miscellaneous crimes	1,435	53	4%	2%	33	20
Other crimes against society	9,273	476	5%		742	-266
Total	80,122	1,476	2%		2,143	-667



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Out-of-court (informal)



What proportion of offences result in out-of-court (informal) outcomes and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of out of court (informal) outcomes for all crime types compared with the England and Wales force average.

The first chart shows the proportion of all offences where there was an out of court (informal) outcome.

The actual percentage expected chart shows the force's actual out of court (informal) outcomes compared with what would be expected if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. The expected value for the force would show as 100% if it were performing in line with all forces, so if the force's value is above 100%, this indicates that more offences are resulting in out of court (informal) outcomes for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	10	0	0%	0%	0	0
Violence with injury	10,348	451	4%	4%	448	3
Violence without injury	10,858	424	4%	3%	372	52
Violence against the person	21,216	875	4%		821	54
Rape	848	0	0%	0%	0	-0
Other sexual offences	1,543	7	0%	1%	13	-6
Sexual offences	2,391	7	0%		13	-6
Robbery	874	0	0%	0%	3	-3
Burglary	7,889	14	0%	0%	20	-6
Vehicle offences	6,940	5	0%	0%	14	-9
Theft from the person	922	5	1%	1%	5	-0
Bicycle theft	1,721	5	0%	1%	13	-8
Shoplifting	8,492	653	8%	8%	648	5
Other theft offences	9,730	134	1%	2%	158	-24
Theft offences	35,694	816	2%		857	-41
Criminal damage	10,245	304	3%	3%	321	-17
Arson	429	4	1%	1%	6	-2
Criminal damage & arson	10,674	308	3%	3%	327	-19
Victim-based crime	70,849	2,006	3%	3%	2,020	-14
Trafficking of drugs	670	7	1%	2%	11	-4
Possession of drugs	2,120	367	17%	32%	674	-307
Possession of weapons offences	777	6	1%	4%	31	-25
Public order offences	4,271	111	3%	3%	144	-33
Miscellaneous crimes	1,435	11	1%	2%	29	-18
Other crimes against society	9,273	502	5%		888	-386
Total	80,122	2,508	3%		2,909	-401



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Suspect identified - no action taken



What proportion of offences have not had any action taken and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of offences for which a suspect has been identified but no action has been taken for all crime types compared with the England and Wales force average.

The first chart shows the proportion of all offences where a suspect has been identified but no action had been taken.

The actual percentage expected chart shows the force's actual offences where a suspect has been identified but no action had been taken compared with what would be expected if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. The expected value for the force would show as 100% if it were performing in line with all forces, so if the force's value is above 100%, this indicates that more offences are resulting in a suspect being identified but no action taken for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	10	1	10%	10%	1	-0
Violence with injury	10,348	5,043	49%	55%	5,642	-599
Violence without injury	10,858	6,059	56%	63%	6,864	-805
Violence against the person	21,216	11,103	52%		12,507	-1,404
Rape	848	376	44%	60%	506	-130
Other sexual offences	1,543	482	31%	52%	796	-314
Sexual offences	2,391	858	36%		1,302	-444
Robbery	874	225	26%	26%	225	0
Burglary	7,889	496	6%	8%	597	-101
Vehicle offences	6,940	337	5%	6%	405	-68
Theft from the person	922	92	10%	10%	94	-2
Bicycle theft	1,721	71	4%	7%	114	-43
Shoplifting	8,492	696	8%	14%	1,153	-457
Other theft offences	9,730	1,333	14%	18%	1,709	-376
Theft offences	35,694	3,025	8%		4,072	-1,047
Criminal damage	10,245	1,416	14%	17%	1,726	-310
Arson	429	42	10%	13%	55	-13
Criminal damage & arson	10,674	1,458	14%		1,781	-323
Victim-based crime	70,849	16,669	24%	28%	19,887	-3,218
Trafficking of drugs	670	71	11%	12%	80	-9
Possession of drugs	2,120	221	10%	9%	199	22
Possession of weapons offences	777	216	28%	27%	209	7
Public order offences	4,271	1,392	33%	46%	1,982	-590
Miscellaneous crimes	1,435	402	28%	43%	610	-208
Other crimes against society	9,273	2,302	25%		3,080	-778
Total	80,122	18,971	24%		22,963	-3,992



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Investigation complete – no suspect identified



What proportion of offences result in no suspect being identified and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of offences for which have no suspect identified for all crime types compared with the England and Wales force average.

The first chart shows the proportion of all offences where no suspect has been identified.

The actual percentage expected chart shows the force's actual offences where no suspect has been identified compared with what would be expected if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. The expected value for the force would show as 100% if it were performing in line with all forces, so if the force's value is above 100%, this indicates that more offences are resulting in no suspect being identified for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	10	0	0%	1%	0	-0
Violence with injury	10,348	1,355	13%	15%	1,516	-161
Violence without injury	10,858	1,481	14%	13%	1,446	35
Violence against the person	21,216	2,836	13%		2,962	-126
Rape	848	44	5%	7%	57	-13
Other sexual offences	1,543	168	11%	18%	282	-114
Sexual offences	2,391	212	9%		340	-128
Robbery	874	367	42%	51%	448	-81
Burglary	7,889	6,417	81%	81%	6,398	19
Vehicle offences	6,940	6,198	89%	87%	6,012	186
Theft from the person	922	776	84%	83%	770	6
Bicycle theft	1,721	1,561	91%	88%	1,509	52
Shoplifting	8,492	4,229	50%	43%	3,615	614
Other theft offences	9,730	7,526	77%	73%	7,057	469
Theft offences	35,694	26,707	75%		25,360	1,347
Criminal damage	10,245	7,115	69%	69%	7,032	83
Arson	429	307	72%	75%	322	-15
Criminal damage & arson	10,674	7,422	70%		7,354	68
Victim-based crime	70,849	37,544	53%	51%	36,464	1,080
Trafficking of drugs	670	15	2%	6%	41	-26
Possession of drugs	2,120	17	1%	1%	16	1
Possession of weapons offences	777	53	7%	8%	62	-9
Public order offences	4,271	562	13%	26%	1,100	-538
Miscellaneous crimes	1,435	95	7%	16%	230	-135
Other crimes against society	9,273	742	8%		1,449	-707
Total	80,122	38,286	48%		37,921	365



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

Offences and outcomes - Not yet assigned an outcome

What is the difference between recorded crime and the number of outcomes assigned in the period?

The table below show the number of offences which have not yet been assigned an outcome within the period. The figure below is a sum of
1) offences for which the investigation has not reached a point to assign an outcome, and
2) any differences between total outcomes and total offences recorded due to forces submitting crime and outcomes data, or the data being extracted, at different times. This may occasionally result in a negative number being displayed for some crime types.

Figures are presented here to illustrate to some degree the level of recorded crime for which the outcome is not known at this time but are indicative only. Inferences should not be drawn about forces' performance from this table.

	Offences	Outcomes	% of offences
Homicide	10	5	50.0%
Violence with injury	10,348	1,153	11.1%
Violence without injury	10,858	1,221	11.2%
Violence against the person	21,216	2,379	11.2%
Rape	848	382	45.0%
Other sexual offences	1,543	756	49.0%
Sexual offences	2,391	1,138	47.6%
Robbery	874	142	16.2%
Burglary	7,889	475	6.0%
Vehicle offences	6,940	134	1.9%
Theft from the person	922	39	4.2%
Bicycle theft	1,721	35	2.0%
Shoplifting	8,492	199	2.3%
Other theft offences	9,730	359	3.7%
Theft offences	35,694	1,241	3.5%
Criminal damage	10,245	384	3.7%
Arson	429	53	12.4%
Criminal damage & arson	10,674	437	4.1%
Victim-based crime	70,849	5,337	7.5%
Trafficking of drugs	670	263	39.3%
Possession of drugs	2,120	430	20.3%
Possession of weapons offences	777	188	24.2%
Public order offences	4,271	1,379	32.3%
Miscellaneous crimes	1,435	621	43.3%
Other crimes against society	9,273	2,881	31.1%
Total	80,122	8,218	10.3%

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017

Nottinghamshire

HMIC Value for Money Profile 2017 - Annexes 1 - 4

	page
Annex 1 - Crime codes	87
Annex 2 - Outcome types	91
Annex 3 - POA categories	93
Annex 4 - Coding of POA categories	94

Annex 1 - Crime Codes

Offences included in each category

1. Victim-based crime

1.1. Violence against the person

1.1.1. Homicide

- 1 Murder
- 4.1 Manslaughter

- 4.10 Corporate manslaughter
- 4.2 Infanticide

1.1.2. Violence with injury

- 2 Attempted murder
- 4.3 Intentional destruction of a viable unborn child
- 4.4 Causing death by dangerous driving
- 4.6 Causing death by careless driving under influence of drink or drugs
- 4.7 Causing or allowing death of child or vulnerable person
- 4.8 Causing death by careless or inconsiderate driving
- 4.9 Causing death or serious injury by driving: unlicensed drivers etc.
- 5A Wounding or carrying out an act endangering life (outcomes only)
- 5B Use of substance or object to endanger life (outcomes only)
- 5C Possession of items to endanger life(outcomes only)
- 5D Assault with intent to cause serious harm

- 5E Endangering life
- 6 Endangering railway passengers (outcomes only)
- 7 Endangering life at sea (outcomes only)
- 8F Inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent (outcomes only)
- 8G Actually bodily harm and other injury(outcomes only)
- 8H Racially or religiously aggravated inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent (outcomes only)
- 8J Racially or religiously aggravated actual bodily harm and other injury (outcomes only)
- 8K Poisoning or female genital mutilation (outcomes only)
- 8N Assault with injury
- 8P Racially or religiously aggravated assault with injury
- 37.1 Causing death by aggravated vehicle taking

1.1.3. Violence without injury

- 3A Conspiracy to murder
- 3B Threats to kill
- 8L Harassment
- 8M Racially or religiously aggravated harassment
- 8Q Stalking
- 11 Cruelty to and neglect of children (outcomes only)
- 11A Cruelty to children/young persons
- 12 Abandoning child under two years (outcomes only)

- 13 Child abduction
- 14 Procuring illegal abortion
- 36 Kidnapping
- 104 Assault without injury on a constable
- 105A Assault without injury
- 105B Racially or religiously aggravated assault without injury
- 106 Modern slavery

1.2. Sexual offences

1.2.1. Rape

- 19C Rape of a female aged 16 and over
- 19D Rape of a female child under 16
- 19E Rape of a female child under 13

- 19F Rape of a male aged 16 and over
- 19G Rape of a male child under 16
- 19H Rape of a male child under 13

(cont.)

1.2.2. Other sexual offences		
17A	Sexual assault on a male aged 13 and over	70 Sexual activity etc with a person with a mental disorder
17B	Sexual assault on a male child under 13	71 Abuse of children through sexual exploitation
20A	Sexual assault on a female aged 13 and over	72 Trafficking for sexual exploitation
20B	Sexual assault on a female child under 13	73 Abuse of position of trust of a sexual nature
21	Sexual activity involving a child under 13	88A Sexual grooming
22A	Causing sexual activity without consent	88C Other miscellaneous sexual offences
22B	Sexual activity involving child under 16	88D Unnatural sexual offences
23	Incest or familial sexual offences	88E Exposure and voyeurism
1.3. Robbery		
1.3.1 Robbery of business property		
34A	Robbery of business property	
1.3.2 Robbery of personal property		
34B	Robbery of personal property	
1.4. Theft offences		
1.4.1. Burglary		
1.4.1.1. Domestic burglary		
28A	Burglary in a dwelling	28D Attempted distraction burglary in a dwelling
28B	Attempted burglary in a dwelling	29 Aggravated burglary in a dwelling
28C	Distraction burglary in a dwelling	
1.4.1.2 Non-domestic burglary		
30A	Burglary in a building other than a dwelling	31 Aggravated burglary in a building other than a dwelling
30B	Attempted burglary in a building other than a dwelling	
1.4.2. Vehicle offences		
126	Interfering with a motor vehicle	45 Theft from vehicle
37.2	Aggravated vehicle taking	48 Theft or unauthorised taking of motor vehicle
1.4.3. Theft from the person		
39	Theft from the person	
1.4.4. Bicycle theft		
44	Theft or unauthorised taking of a pedal cycle	
1.4.5. Shoplifting		
46	Shoplifting	
1.4.6. Other theft offences		
35	Blackmail	43 Dishonest use of electricity
40	Theft in a dwelling other than from an automatic machine or meter	47 Theft from automatic machine or meter
41	Theft by an employee	49 Other theft
42	Theft of mail	49A Making off without payment

(cont.)

1.5. Criminal damage and arson			
1.5.1. Criminal damage			
58A	Criminal damage to a dwelling	58F	Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a building other than a dwelling (outcomes only)
58B	Criminal damage to a building other than a dwelling	58G	Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a vehicle (outcomes only)
58C	Criminal damage to a vehicle	58H	Racially or religiously aggravated other criminal damage (outcomes only)
58D	Other criminal damage	58J	Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage
58E	Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a dwelling (outcomes only)		
1.5.2. Arson			
56A	Arson endangering life	56B	Arson not endangering life
2. Other crimes against society			
2.1. Drug offences			
2.1.1. Trafficking of drugs			
92A	Trafficking in controlled drugs		
2.1.2. Possession of drugs			
92C	Other drug offences	92E	Possession of controlled drugs (Cannabis)
92D	Possession of controlled drugs (excl. Cannabis)		
2.2. Possession of weapons offences			
10A	Possession of firearms with intent	10D	Possession of article with blade or point
10B	Possession of firearms offences	81	Other firearms offences
10C	Possession of other weapons	90	Other knives offences
2.3. Public order offences			
9A	Public fear, alarm or distress	63	Treason felony (outcomes only)
9B	Racially or religiously aggravated public fear, alarm or distress	64	Riot (outcomes only)
62	Treason (outcomes only)	65	Violent disorder (outcomes only)
62A	Violent disorder	66	Other offences against the State or public order
2.4. Miscellaneous crimes			
15	Concealing an infant death close to birth	76	Aiding suicide
24	Exploitation of prostitution	78	Immigration Acts (outcomes only)
26	Bigamy	79	Perverting the course of justice
27	Soliciting for the purposes of prostitution	80	Absconding from lawful custody
33	Going equipped for stealing, etc	802	Dangerous driving
33A	Making, supplying or possessing articles for use in fraud	814	Fraud, forgery etc associated with vehicle or driver records
38	Profiting from or concealing knowledge of the proceeds of crime	82	Customs and Revenue offences (outcomes only)
53H	Making or supplying articles for use in fraud (outcomes only)	83	Bail offences
53J	Possession of articles for use in fraud (outcomes only)	84	Trade descriptions etc (outcomes only)
54	Handling stolen goods	85	Health and Safety offences (outcomes only)
59	Threat or possession with intent to commit criminal damage	86	Obscene publications etc
60	Forgery or use of false drug prescription	87	Protection from eviction (outcomes only)
61	Other forgery	89	Adulteration of food (outcomes only)
61A	Possession of false documents	91	Public health offences (outcomes only)
67	Perjury	94	Planning laws (outcomes only)
68	Libel (outcomes only)	95	Disclosure, obstruction, false or misleading statements etc
69	Offender Management Act offences	96	Wildlife
75	Betting, gaming and lotteries (outcomes only)	99	Other notifiable offences

(cont.)

3. Fraud offences

51	Fraud by company director (outcomes only)	53D	Fraud by false representation: other frauds (outcomes only)
52	False accounting (outcomes only)	53E	Fraud by failing to disclose information (outcomes only)
53B	Preserved other fraud and repealed fraud offences (pre Fraud Act 2006) (outcomes only)	53F	Fraud by abuse of position (outcomes only)
53C	Fraud by false representation: cheque, plastic card and online bank accounts (not PSP) (outcomes only)	55	Bankruptcy and insolvency (outcomes only)

* At March 2013 ONS publication crime code 53B was categorised under fraud offences.

Crime committed against children

Offences included in each category

Crime against children

Rape

19D	Rape of a female child under 16
19E	Rape of a female child under 13
19G	Rape of a male child under 16
19H	Rape of a male child under 13

Sexual offences / abuse

17B	Sexual assault on a male child under 13
20B	Sexual assault on a female child under 13
21	Sexual activity involving a child under 13
22B	Sexual activity involving child under 16
71	Abuse of children through sexual exploitation
73	Abuse of position of trust of a sexual nature
88A	Sexual grooming

Cruelty / other

11	Cruelty to and neglect of children (outcomes only)
11A	Cruelty to children/young persons
4.3	Intentional destruction of a viable unborn child
4.7	Causing or allowing death of child or vulnerable person
12	Abandoning child under two years (outcomes only)
13	Child abduction
15	Concealing an infant death close to birth


Other offences against children not included

(It is not possible to distinguish between adult and child victims within these crime types.)

23	Incest or familial sexual offences
86	Obscene publications etc
99	Other notifiable offences

Annex 2 - Outcome types

The outcome groups are used in this section two are noted below with their corresponding outcome type from the Home Office outcome framework.



Note

Definitions of outcome types are on the following page

Outcome 20 "action undertaken by another body/agency" was introduced from April 2015. As this outcome does not relate to police activity, offences with this outcome have been excluded from pages 60 to 85 of the profiles. These outcomes account for 0.8% of total offences. For this reason some overall offence figures may appear different to the offences stated in section 1 and those published by the Home Office and HMICFRS' PEEL reports.

Outcome Types

Outcome 1	Charge / Summons: A person has been charged or summonsed for the crime (irrespective of any subsequent acquittal at Court).
Outcome 2	Caution – youths: A youth offender has been cautioned by the police.
Outcome 3	Caution – adults: An adult offender has been cautioned by the police.
Outcome 4	Taken into Consideration (TIC): The offender admits the crime by way of a formal police interview and asks for it to be taken into consideration by the court. There must be an interview where the suspect has made a clear and reliable admission of the offence and which is corroborated with additional verifiable auditable information connecting the suspect to the crime.
Outcome 5	Offender died: The offender has died before proceeding could be initiated.
Outcome 6	Penalty Notices for Disorder: A Penalty Notice for Disorder (or other relevant notifiable offence) has been lawfully issued under Section 1 – 11 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001.
Outcome 7	Cannabis/Khat Warning: A warning for cannabis or khat possession has been issued in accordance with College of Policing guidance. Note: Khat warnings were introduced from 24 June 2014 and numbers are likely to be small.
Outcome 8	Community Resolution: A Community Resolution (with or without formal (Restorative Justice) has been applied in accordance with College of Policing guidance.
Outcome 9	Not in public interest (CPS): Prosecution not in the public interest (CPS decision). The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) by virtue of their powers under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 decides not to prosecute or authorise any other formal action.
Outcome 10	Not in public interest (Police) (from April 2014): Formal action against the offender is not in the public interest (Police decision).
Outcome 11	Prosecution prevented – suspect under age (from April 2014): Prosecution prevented – named suspect identified but is below the age of criminal responsibility.
Outcome 12	Prosecution prevented – suspect too ill (from April 2014): Prosecution prevented – Named suspect identified but is too ill (physical or mental health) to prosecute.
Outcome 13	Prosecution prevented – victim/key witness dead/too ill (from April 2014): Named suspect identified but victim or key witness is dead or too ill to give evidence.
Outcome 14	Evidential difficulties: suspect not identified; victim does not support further action (from April 2014): Evidential difficulties victim based – named suspect not identified. The crime is confirmed but the victim declines or is unable to support further police action to identify the offender.
Outcome 15	Evidential difficulties (suspect identified; victim supports action) (from April 2014): Evidential difficulties named suspect identified – the crime is confirmed and the victim supports police action but evidential difficulties prevent further action. This includes cases where the suspect has been identified, the victim supports action, the suspect has been circulated as wanted but cannot be traced and the crime is finalised pending further action.
Outcome 16	Evidential difficulties: suspect identified; victim does not support further action (from April 2014): Evidential difficulties victim based – named suspect identified. The victim does not support (or has withdrawn support from) police action.
Outcome 17	Prosecution time limit expired (from April 2014): Suspect identified but prosecution time limit has expired (from April 2014).
Outcome 18	Investigation complete –no suspect identified (from April 2014): The crime has been investigated as far as reasonably possible – case closed pending further investigative opportunities becoming available.
Outcome 19	National Fraud Intelligence Bureau filed (NFIB only) (from April 2014): A crime of fraud has been recorded but has not been allocated for investigation because the assessment process at the NFIB has determined there are insufficient lines of enquiry to warrant such dissemination.
Outcome 20	Action undertaken by another body/agency (from April 2015): Further action resulting from the crime report will be undertaken by another body or agency other than the police, subject to the victim (or person acting on their behalf) being made aware of the action being taken. Note: during 2014/15 (and therefore in this publication), these were included within outcome 18.
Outcome 21	Not in the public interest – suspect identified (from January 2016) Further investigation resulting from the crime report that could provide evidence sufficient to support formal action being taken against the suspect is not in the public interest – police decision.

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2017, as published October 2017

Annex 3 – POA Categories

POA data are split into 12 categories, which sub-divide into headings as follows:

POA estimates are used for all cost and workforce data unless stated otherwise. These data are taken from:

- a. Neighbourhood policing
 - b. Incident (response) management
 - c. Local investigation *
 - d. Specialist community liaison
 - e. Local policing command team and support overheads
- 2) Dealing with the public
- a. Front desk
 - b. Central communications unit
 - c. Dealing with the public command team and support overheads
- 3) Criminal justice arrangements
- a. Custody
 - b. Police doctors/nurses and surgeons
 - c. Criminal justice
 - d. Police national computer
 - e. Criminal record bureau
 - f. Coroner assistance
 - g. Fixed penalty schemes (central ticket office)
 - h. Property officer / stores
 - i. Criminal justice arrangements command team and support overheads
- 4) Road policing
- a. Traffic units
 - b. Traffic wardens / police community support officers - traffic
 - c. Vehicle recovery
 - d. Casualty reduction partnership
 - e. Road policing command team and support overheads
- 9) National policing
- a. Secondments (out of force)
 - b. Counter terrorism / special branch
 - c. NPCC projects / initiatives
 - d. Hosting national services
 - e. Other national policing requirements
- 10) Support functions
- a. Human resources
 - b. Finance
 - c. Legal
 - d. Fleet services
 - e. Estates / central building costs
 - f. Information communication technology
 - g. Professional standards
 - h. Press and media
 - i. Performance review / corporate development
 - j. Procurement
 - k. Training
 - l. Administration support
 - m. Force command
 - n. Support to associations and trade unions
 - o. Social club support and force band
 - p. Insurance / risk management
 - q. Catering

- 5) Operational support
- a. Operational Support Command Team and Support Overheads
 - b. Air operations
 - c. Mounted police
 - d. Specialist terrain
 - e. Dogs section
 - f. Advanced public order
 - g. Airport and ports policing unit
 - h. Firearms unit
 - i. Civil Contingencies and events (*events no longer a separate category*)
- 6) Intelligence
- a. Intelligence command team and support overheads
 - b. Intelligence analysis / threat assessments
 - c. Intelligence gathering
- 7) Investigations
- a. Investigations command team and support overheads
 - b. Major investigation unit
 - c. Economic crime (including regional asset recovery team)
 - d. Specialist investigation units
 - e. Serious and organised crime unit
 - f. Local investigation/ prisoner processing*
 - g. Cyber crime
- 8) Investigative support
- a. Scenes of crime officers
 - b. External forensic costs
 - c. Fingerprint / internal forensic costs
 - d. Photographic image recovery
 - e. Other forensic services
 - f. Investigative support command team and support overheads
- 11) Police & Crime Commissioner
- a. Cost of the democratic process
 - b. Office of Police Crime Commissioner
 - c. Share of any Formal Shared Service Arrangement
 - d. Commissioned services
- 12) Central costs
- a. Revenue contribution to capital
 - b. Capital financing
 - c. Pensions and exit costs
- 13) Public protection
- a. Witness protection
 - b. Child protection
 - c. Adult protection
 - d. Joint teams
 - e. Public protection command team and support overheads

* Local investigation is included under local policing rather than investigations

Annex 4 - Coding of POA categories

Local policing

- V Neighbourhood policing
- V Incident (response) management
- V Specialist community liaison
- V Local command team and support overheads

Dealing with the public

- F Front desk
- F Central communications unit
- F Command team and support overheads

Road policing

- V Traffic units
- V Traffic wardens / PCSOs - traffic
- F Vehicle recovery
- F Casualty reduction partnership
- F Command team and support overheads

Operational support

- F Command team and support overheads
- F Air operations
- V Mounted police
- F Specialist terrain
- V Dogs section
- F Advanced public order
- F Airports and ports policing unit
- V Firearms unit
- O Civil contingencies and events

Intelligence

- O Command team and support overheads
- O Intelligence analysis / threat assessments
- F Intelligence gathering

Public protection

- F Witness protection
- F Child protection
- F Adult protection
- F Joint teams
- F Command team and support overheads

Investigations

- F Command team and support overheads
- F Major investigations unit
- F Economic crime (including regional asset recovery team)
- F Specialist investigation units
- F Serious and organised crime unit
- F Local investigation/ prisoner processing*
- F Cyber crime

Investigative support

- F Scenes of crime officers
- O External forensic costs
- O Fingerprint / internal forensic costs
- O Photographic image recovery
- O Other forensic services
- O Command team and support overheads

Criminal justice arrangements

- F Custody
- F Police doctors / nurses and surgeons
- O Criminal justice
- O Police national computer
- O Criminal records bureau
- O Coroner assistance
- O Fixed penalty schemes (central ticket office)
- B Property officer / stores
- O Command team and support overheads

Support functions

- B Human resources
- B Finance
- B Legal services
- B Fleet services
- B Estates / central building costs
- B Information communication technology
- O Professional standards
- B Press and media
- B Performance review / corporate development
- B Procurement
- B Training
- B Administration support
- O Force command
- B Support to associations and trade unions
- B Social club support and force band
- B Insurance / risk management
- B Catering

Police and Crime Commissioner

- X Cost of the democratic process
- X Cost of police crime commissioner
- X Office of police crime commissioner
- X Other costs

Central costs

- X Revenue contribution to capital
- X Capital financing
- X Pensions and exit costs

National policing

- X Secondments (out of force)
- X Counter terrorism / special branch
- X ACPO projects / initiatives
- X Hosting national services
- X Other national policing requirements

V = Visible operational front line
 F = Non-visible front line
 O = Frontline support
 B = Business support
 X = Excluded (not coded)

* Local investigation is included here under local policing rather than investigations

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 forces and the effect of the difference is greater than £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.

	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff £m
OVERALL COSTS				
National policing	0.8	0.7	4.6	-4.5
Non Staff Costs	£m	% staff cost	Avg	Diff £m
Transport related expenses	5.7	3.9	2.3	2.3
Non-staff costs	50.4	34.9	29.7	7.5
Earned Income	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff £m
Partnership income	-3.6	-3.2	-1.0	-2.5
COSTS BY OBJECTIVE	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff £m
NRE by objective group				
Road policing	1.3	1.2	3.7	-2.9
Road policing				
Traffic units	1.5	1.3	4.0	-2.6
Road policing	1.3	1.2	3.7	-2.4
Investigations				
Serious and organised crime unit	5.5	4.8	2.3	2.8
Investigative support				
Scenes of crime officers	1.1	0.9	1.4	-0.6
Photographic image recovery	0.9	0.8	0.3	0.6
Support functions				
Estates / central building	6.7	5.9	7.9	-2.4
Fleet services	5.7	5.1	3.0	2.3
Training	2.2	2.0	3.6	-1.8