

## HMIC Value for Money Profiles 2012

### Thames Valley Police

compared with all forces in England and Wales

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

- a** Thames Valley
- b** Avon & Somerset
- c** Bedfordshire
- d** Dorset
- e** Essex
- f** Hampshire
- g** Hertfordshire
- h** Sussex

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Section One – Workforce and Costs

### Introduction

#### Overall expenditure

11	Expenditure Summary	15	Financing of Expenditure
12	Police officers	16	Earned Income
13	Police Staff and PCSOs	17	Funding Source Trends
14	Non-Staff Costs as % of Workforce Costs		

#### Workforce

18	Workforce Summary	23	Summary net cost by objective/function
19	Police officers by Rank	24	Leavers
20	Workforce Trends + new page	25	Joiners
21	Police Workforce and Crime	26	Sickness & Other Long Term Absence
22	Summary staffing by objective/function	27	Police officers Length of Service

#### Expenditure by objective

28	Workforce By Function	39	Specialist Operations
29	Net Revenue Exp By Function	41	Intelligence
30	Local Policing	43	Investigations
32	Dealing With the Public	45	Investigative Support
34	999 calls	47	Support Functions
35	Attended calls	50	National Policing
36	Criminal Justice Arrangements	52	Potential To Increase Frontline

## Section Two - Offences & Outcomes

### Introduction

#### Recorded offences & sanction detections

55	Long-term trends / ribbon charts	65	Sexual offences
59	All Crimes	67	Stealing
61	Victim based	69	Non Victim Based
63	Violence Against the Person		

#### Changes in recorded offences

71	All Crimes	74	Sexual offences
72	Victim based	75	Stealing
73	Violence Against the Person	76	Non Victim Based

#### Other indicators

77	Changes In Sanction Detections	80	Charges
78	Sanction Detections By Type	81	No-crime
79	Changes In Detection Types	82	Overall Satisfaction

### Appendices

83	Appendix 1 – Crime Codes	92	Forces who return data on restorative justice, or outsource custody
90	Appendix 2 – POA Categories		

## Introduction

How can forces and Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) make the right decisions about improving value for money? While a private sector organisation can point to the 'bottom line' as the rationale for their choices, there is no agreed equation which derives value for money for policing. However, forces do have one key advantage over the private sector: access to detailed information from other similar organisations.

By exploiting the benefits of similarity, forces can reduce complexity. How? By comparing their own costs and performance with those of organisations facing similar conditions. HMIC's value for money profiles are designed for that purpose. They enable local managers and PCCs to ask the right questions, and expose areas where costs are high or performance could be improved. This also makes them integral to HMIC's approach to risk-based inspections.

The profiles are best used as part of a comprehensive performance review system. Many forces are already doing this, using the data contained in the profiles to decide where their attention should best be focused. Those forces have found that challenging costs and performance is never straight forward. There are always a range of plausible reasons that need to be assessed. A sceptical attitude is best. Never let a good story get in the way of the facts!

With these uses in mind, the profiles are designed to be:

- Relevant – using the most useful, nationally available information
- Accurate - as data is subject to a systematic quality assurance process (described below)
- Timely - produced in October each year, when key budget decisions are taken.
- Easy to use - information presented in a structured and logical format. Time saved by viewing several related charts and tables per page (or screen). Profiles can be used as a booklet and present extremely well on iPads or other tablet devices.
- Focused – key differences identified, showing the impact of the difference between force and average. In addition, chevrons highlight the largest differences.
- Unbiased - the facts, without the application of arbitrary weightings
- Balanced - compares relative performance with relative expenditure

Use them as a reference document.

## How to use the profiles

The purpose of the profiles is to help you compare your force with others. Most of the data is presented as bar charts so you can see the range of forces and where your force sits. A horizontal line runs across each bar chart and represents the simple average.

Your force is highlighted in black, but you will also notice some other forces highlighted in a darker blue. This group of forces are considered to be most similar to your force, sharing similar demographic characteristics. For this reason they make for a better comparison than with other forces. They are generally referred to as the MSG or the most similar group.

The bulk of forces fall into defined clusters to form a Group, but there are a few who are less closely clustered. These are the Metropolitan Police, Dyfed-Powys, Surrey and the City of London. These forces are still included within a most similar group, but their appearance as an outlier needs to be treated with more caution.

The MSG was designed to more fairly compare levels of crime between forces, rather than costs. They do not take account of the fact that some areas, such as London, have higher costs than elsewhere. However, they are still useful as a cost comparison as forces in a high crime MSG such as that for large urban forces are likely to have more resources, such as more police officers per head of population.

The profiles are presented in the form of 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 difference between your force and the others. For example, is this force spending more on police officers because there are more of them (officers per population) or because they are more expensive (cost per officer).

The small blue tables on most pages include key numerical data presented in the charts. Often they include a more detailed list of functions and costs. Reading from left to right, the tables include: a short description of the function (or crime type), followed by the volumes (e.g. Staff numbers / costs or numbers of crimes); the ratio for comparison such as your force's cost per head of population and the average costs per head of population (either the "all" England and Wales average or the "Group" MSG average).

To the right of the main table, we show how much more or less it is costing your force as a result of costs being higher or lower than the average. The more detailed financial pages include a further table. This shows whether your force spends disproportionately more than the average on police officers. Taking the call centre function for example, you might question why some forces have disproportionately higher police officer costs compared with the average.

You will notice the appearance of chevrons against some cost of difference calculations. These figures are highlighted if the indicator puts the force in the top or bottom ten percent and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population.

## GUIDANCE PAGE - How to read a profile


### POLICE OFFICERS

2012/13 estimates £ per head of population

These charts break down police officer costs into salary and overtime costs (OT). Police officer overtime costs are also shown as a percentage of the overall salary costs.



1. Logic trees breakdown left to right, comparing force (a) to most similar group (highlighted) as well as all forces in England and Wales.

are also presented.  
Home Office published FTE  
n at 31st March 2012, and so




2. The force has some of the highest officer costs per pop nationally...


4. This chart shows a breakdown of the previous chart, revealing overtime has little bearing on officer costs.



6. The force has more officers per pop than national average and the 3rd highest nationally, equating to a difference in cost of £111.2m (see table).



7. The cost of individual officers in force are relatively low.



3. ...equating to a difference of £105.3m to national average.

	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
Police officers (exc. OT)	376.6	143.2	105.5	99.3 <<
Police overtime	15.1	5.8	3.5	6.1 <<
Total	391.8	149.0	108.9	105.3 <<

PO overtime % salary	% sal	Avg	Diff. £m
National functions	0.4%	0.1%	1.0
Other	3.6%	3.1%	1.9
Total	4.0%	3.3%	2.8

	Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	2.89	111.2 <<
£000/FTE	£49.5k	£51.1k

Budgeted FTE 2012/13 (POA 7,608  
FTE Mar 12 (ADR502) 7,498

5. They are in line with most similar group but £3m above national average.

N.B Outliers are highlighted with red chevrons and fall within the top or bottom 10% of forces, where applicable with a financial value of more than £1 per head.

Source: POA Statistics 2012/13 estimates and ADR502

Borsetshire

## Data quality

HMIC gives every force the opportunity to check their Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) financial estimates data and Home Office management data (excluding crime data which is checked by the Home Office) through a systematic quality assurance process:

- CIPFA apply arithmetic and reconciliation checks
- Each force is asked to check their statistical outliers
- Each force receives a draft profile to check again
- HMIC resolves inconsistencies identified by ourselves and forces

Each year forces identify some anomalies or inconsistencies, which HMIC try hard to resolve. HMIC strongly encourage forces to make the necessary changes, but forces are responsible for the data they have submitted. As a result some anomalies may remain.

There are a number of ways to identify them. First, where significantly higher than average costs in one function are also shown against lower than average costs in another related function. One example is extremely high HR costs compared with extremely low training costs. Second, where costs are surprisingly low or high. Lastly, some urban forces are reporting comparatively low rates of criminal damage and anti social behaviour incidents. This probably reflects differences in the ability of IT systems to capture all the data.

## Validity of comparisons

**Collaboration and contracting out** A few forces have raised concerns about the validity of staff comparisons between forces involved in collaborations and/or contracting out and others. Forces that lead collaboration by providing services to other forces, are concerned that higher staff numbers will reflect badly in their comparisons and distort the MSG averages. Others suggest that the comparison of non staff costs, when some forces are contracting out large parts of their organisation, is less than useful.

While we are aware of these issues, we are not yet convinced of the need to remove the relevant pages. Instead we have included an additional summary expenditure page by function, opposite the summary staffing page. Comparison of the net cost or staffing numbers by function, makes it clear which forces are involved in collaboration with other forces and which with the private sector. The non staff costs page is also retained because it so clearly identifies forces – currently Lincolnshire and Cleveland – who have undertaken large scale initiatives.

To help further with comparisons, an appendix includes a list of forces that have contracted out some or most of their custody function as well as those involved in Private Finance Initiatives (PFI). This provides some context, especially when comparing premises costs where a PFI scheme is involved.

**Earned income vs. government grant** Another concern, identified by North Wales Police, concerns the recording of Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) funding. Most forces have coded CRB funding as earned income while others have coded it as a grant. The POA guidance clearly states that CRB income be coded to grants. The relevant forces have been contacted and asked to submit corrections which are included.

**Use of budgeted and actual staff numbers** The profiles include staff numbers drawn from two data sets: the Home Office annual data return (ADR 502) which is a snapshot on 31st March of full time equivalent staff in post and the police objective analysis which counts the average, budgeted, full time equivalent staff.

In general the profiles use police objective analysis (POA) budgeted staff numbers to make detailed financial comparisons between forces. POA is a relatively recent invention and prior to 2011-12, had not been checked by HMIC. Consequently, it cannot provide a time series long enough to show changing trends. For this purpose the ADR is used because it can display data, which has been checked, over several years. ADR staff numbers are mostly used to present overall staff trends: police officers, PCSOs or police staff. Occasionally they are used to compare measures of police activity between forces.

Although the profiles show the budgeted POA and ADR 502 ftes side by side, there is no expectation that they be the same for two main reasons. First, the POA staff numbers are an average over the following financial year (2012-13), while the ADR is a snapshot at the end of the previous year (March 31st 2012). Second, the POA counts budgeted staff and will therefore include vacant posts, while the ADR counts the actual staff in post. You may notice a large difference between the two data for police staff numbers. This may be due to reductions in staff numbers between the end of one financial year and the start of the next.

**Restorative justice** For a force to submit a count of Restorative justice (RJ) to the Home Office, the only requirement is for the force to have a local policy in place. As there is no definition that would allow comparison, RJs are unlikely to be a National Statistic and are not included in the profiles.

### **New data sets**

**Emergency and priority incidents per population** The data shows how the demands on your force for the two highest priority calls differ from your most similar forces and others. Total emergency and priority incidents<sup>i</sup> are broken down into those related to crime, anti social behaviour (ASB) and other incidents. This data is drawn from force command and control systems and therefore will not include all recorded crimes or incidents.

A striking feature of other EP incidents is that the average exceeds that for the averages of crime and ASB. Further research by HMIC at six forces<sup>ii</sup> has revealed that a handful of categories included in 'other incidents' account for around 50 percent of the total. These invariably include: concerns for welfare (which can include individuals with mental health problems and other vulnerable people, such as the elderly or children), domestic incidents, suspicious circumstances, traffic collisions and ASB classified as nuisance.

---

<sup>i</sup> Lower priorities, scheduled calls, have not been used as these data were found to be unreliable. The main reason is that scheduled calls are not always recorded on command and control systems; often they are recorded on separate systems for appointments.

<sup>ii</sup> The emergency and priority (EP) incident classifications are based on ACPO/NPIA definitions to make the data more comparable (see "National Contact Management Principles and Guidance", ACPO and NPIA, London, 2010). Emergency incidents are defined as aiming to get to victim within 15mins or 20 mins in rural locations. Priority incidents are generally those with an estimated time of arrival of within 60 mins. Some forces do not distinguish between these categories, so they are combined in the charts.

As this data is new we have encountered some minor problems, which we would like to draw to your attention. While some further local checking may be required, we feel the information remains useful for comparative purposes – especially where there are large differences. You may like to check two aspects. First, the incident data includes a small proportion of calls classified as ‘admin’ incidents, for instance when officers use the command and control system as a means of making sure that an urgent task is carried out by others. Admin incidents represent a small proportion, often less than 5 percent. Second, we know of some forces which provided incidents with duplicate incidents included. The percentages are again small, these forces are as follows: Avon and Somerset, Dyfed Powys, Metropolitan Police, Norfolk, North Yorkshire and South Yorkshire.

Lower priority, scheduled calls have not been used as these data were found to be unreliable. The main reason is that scheduled calls are not always recorded on command and control systems, often they are recorded on separate systems for appointments.

**Ribbon charts showing longer term trends, 2001-02 to 2011-12**, for some crimes by force. Four types of crime rates are shown because of their distinctive patterns: violence with injury, vehicle theft (including interference), burglaries (all) and criminal damage.

The purpose of these charts is to examine the trends for your force compared with similar forces set against the rest. If your recent trends differ from the similar forces, and the general pattern, then you should review the likely causes and locations.

A few observations on the main four charts. A general feature is the reduction in the range of crime rates between forces over the period. This suggests that forces are becoming more similar in some respects, although part of this convergence is likely due to changes in recording. For example, the violence with injury chart shows large variations in crime recording, certainly until 2005-06 when the National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS) were being implemented. (2008-09 is the baseline year used in the profiles). It also shows that the introduction of NCRS had little impact on one force.

**No crime rates** – we show four year trends and a comparison with the all force average. The highest no crime rate is for rape.

**Council tax yield** – this chart shows the variation in the yield per head for your force compared with others for £1 change in Council tax.

### **Common queries**

The three most common queries received last year are worth repeating. The first was about the rule applied to highlight particular differences. The difference is highlighted if the indicator puts the force in the top or bottom 10 percent and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population. The other query was about the population base. The profiles adopt the mid year 2010 population estimate to align with Home Office publications especially crime rates. Rather than basing the workforce mix calculations on police officer percentages of the workforce we have used police officer costs as a percentage of gross costs for two reasons. First, it takes better account of comparisons where some forces have contracted out services, such as custody. Second, the costs of police officers vary between forces.

### **A final word...**

Almost without exception forces have made changes to their data. Like last year, several have also raised detailed points and we would especially like to thank those who have taken the trouble to give us feedback. We count within this group two regular contributors: Thames Valley Police and Lancashire, but this year add North Wales, South Wales, Northamptonshire and Northumbria Police as each made important points.

I am always keen to hear from users how the profiles can be improved. If you have any suggestions, or any analysis which you think might be useful to include please contact me: lawrenceroymorris33@hmic.gsi.gov.uk or 0203 513 0517.



## Section One – Workforce and Costs

### INTRODUCTION

This section looks at both how a force deploys its workforce and the associated costs of each of the 12 headline categories within the Police Objective Analysis (POA). POA subcategory information on costs is also presented.

POA 2012/13 estimates are used for all cost and workforce data unless stated otherwise. These data are taken as a snapshot as at 9th October. Any updates to the data which are made after this time will not be reflected in the profile.

Workforce data comprises full-time equivalent (FTE) figures. In POA estimates these are calculated as the number of staff budgeted for each staff type. Within support services, staff levels are less likely to be affected by local demographics and are therefore additionally presented as cost of function as a percentage of total cost.

### Local policing workforce by function

The POA data is initially divided into twelve groups:

- Local policing
- Dealing with the public
- Roads policing
- Specialist operations
- Intelligence
- Investigations
- Investigative support
- Criminal justice
- Support functions
- Police authority
- Central costs
- National policing

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

## Key to the data and calculations

Net revenue expenditure: The profiles use a different calculation for net revenue expenditure to Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA); it is calculated as total expenditure 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, which include the force in question. As the Metropolitan Police and City of London Police data distorts the chart scales, they have been excluded from all force profiles except for their own

Difference to most similar group (MSG) / All force: Differences are calculated on standardised data, as opposed to absolute values. Calculation is as follows: (Force cost per head - MSG cost per head) \* population.

Police officer as % of gross expenditure: We have chosen to show the proportion of spend on officer (and overtime) by function. Calculation is as follows: (Police officer spend + Police officer overtime) / Gross Revenue Expenditure (GRE).

Personel ADR datasets: ADR datasets (other than crime) have been refreshed and run from live data, during week commencing 24th September.

## How to use this section

Users may wish to focus on those charts where the force is an outlier, i.e. where they are significantly different from the average, or where they are particularly high or low. Outliers are highlighted with red chevrons and fall within the top or bottom 10% of forces; where applicable with a financial value of more than £1 per head. They should explore the reasons for any differences by looking at the force as a whole, using relevant local knowledge. Staffing levels should also be considered in the context of workforce modernisation, collaboration efforts and the outsourcing of services.







## EXPENDITURE

### 2012/13 estimates £ per head of population

These charts give an overview of what policing in each force costs per head of population.

NB: the profiles calculate net revenue expenditure as total expenditure minus earned income to show the total cost of policing to the taxpayer.

NB: This is different from net revenue expenditure (NRE) as reported in POA data.



Population 2,253k

	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
Police officers	221.4	98	109	-24.4
Police staff	93.7	42	40	3.8
PCSOs	15.3	7	8	-1.8
Workforce	330.4	147	157	-22.4
Non-staff costs	93.2	41	42	-1.2
Earned income	-20.5	-9	-7	-4.6
Net revenue exp.	403.1	179	191	-28.3
Total exc national	392.5	174	188	-30.4

Source: POA estimates 2012/13






Thames Valley

## POLICE OFFICERS

### 2012/13 estimates £ per head of population

These charts break down police officer costs into salary and overtime costs (OT). Police officer overtime costs are also shown as a percentage of the overall salary costs.

Estimated FTE numbers for the year 2012/13 are also presented. An additional data table compares these with Home Office published FTE figures (ADR502), which are a snapshot taken at 31st March 2012, and so will not necessarily be the same.



	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
Police officers (exc. OT)	214.3	95.1	105.6	-23.8
Police overtime	7.1	3.1	3.5	-0.7
Total	221.4	98.3	109.1	-24.4

PO overtime % salary	% sal	Avg	Diff. £m
National functions	0.4%	0.1%	0.5
Other	3.0%	3.1%	-0.3
Total	3.3%	3.3%	0.1

		Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	1.87	2.08	-24.4
£000/FTE	£50.9k	£50.9k	-0.2

Budgeted FTE 2012/13 (POA)	4,213
FTE Mar 12 (ADR502)	4,355

Here and on next page, flagged as outlier where the two figures differ by more than 5%

Source: POA Statistics 2012/13 estimates and ADR502

Thames Valley

## POLICE STAFF AND POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS (PCSO)

### 2012/13 estimates £ per head of population

These charts break down police staff and PCSO costs into more detail.

Estimated FTE numbers for the year 2012/13 are also presented. An additional data table compares these with Home Office published FTE figures (ADR502), which are a snapshot taken at 31st March 2012, and so will not necessarily be the same.

Home Office staff FTE data includes S38, and excludes temporary contract staff and traffic wardens while POA includes traffic wardens.

#### POLICE STAFF

£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
94	41.6	39.9	3.8

	Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	1.27	1.26
£000/FTE	32.6k	32.0k






Budgeted FTE 2012/13 (POA)	2,873
FTE Mar 12 (ADR502)	2,689

#### PCSOs

£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
15.3	6.8	7.6	-1.8

	Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	0.22	0.26
£000/FTE	£30.1k	£29.6k

Budgeted FTE 2012/13 (POA)	507
FTE Mar 12 (ADR502)	508




Source: POA Statistics 2012/13 estimates and ADR502

Thames Valley

## NON-STAFF COSTS AS PERCENTAGE OF WORKFORCE COSTS

2012/13 estimates

These charts provide information about non-staff costs broken down into specific types of running costs. Non-staff costs are shown as a percentage of staff costs, as non-staff costs are largely dependent on the number of staff working for an organisation. Third party payments include mutual aid from other police authorities, contributions to inter-authority services, transfer payments and national levies.



Staff costs £330m





	£m	% staff	Avg	Diff. £m
Supplies & services*	45.8	13.9%	13.3%	1.99
Premises	23.4	7.1%	5.0%	6.93
Transport	10.0	3.0%	3.1%	-0.20
Collaboration payments	2.7	0.8%	0.9%	-0.40
Other employee exps**	7.0	2.1%	2.6%	-1.50
Non-staff costs	88.8	26.9%	24.8%	6.83

Capital financing	4.4	1.3%	2.5%	-3.77
Total	93.2	28.2%	27.3%	3.07

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

\* Inc 3rd party payments exc collaboration

\*\* Inc temporary & agency staff, injury & ill health costs








Thames Valley

## FINANCING OF EXPENDITURE

### 2012/13 estimates £ per head of population


These charts show how the force funds its expenditure broken down into more detail using POA finance data. Central funding is broken down into formula based funding, and government grants, which are not formula based. Local funding is comprised of council tax and use of reserves.

Note: forces in Wales did not receive an increase in government grant for agreeing to freeze or reduce council tax but did receive a four year grant from the Welsh Government for an additional 500 PCSO's across Wales.




Population 2,253k

	£m	£/head	Avg
<b>Central funding</b>			
Formula funding*	234	104	118
Specific grants	28	12	12
<b>Local funding</b>			
Council tax	137	61	60
Reserves (transfers)	4	2	1
<b>Net revenue exp.</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>191</b>



Band D tax rate	Avg
£154	£166



Council Tax £/head	Yield of £1 CT	Avg
£61	£0.39	£0.36

\* Sum of Police Grant, Non-Domestic Rates, & Revenue Support Grant







Source: POA estimates 2012/13

Thames Valley

## EARNED INCOME

### 2012/13 estimates £ per head of population

These charts break down information into different categories of 'earned' or external income using POA. This is the income removed from GRE in order to calculate NRE and does not include government grants.



Population 2,253k

	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
Sales, fees, charges & rents	8.0	3.5	2.2	3.0
Reimbursed Income				
- Collaboration	7.4	3.3	1.1	5.0
- Exc collaboration	0.9	0.4	1.8	-3.1
Partnership income	2.2	1.0	1.0	-0.1
Special police services	1.0	0.4	0.7	-0.7
Interest	1.0	0.4	0.2	0.5
Total earned income	20.5	9.1	7.1	4.6


Source: POA estimates 2012/13



## FUNDING SOURCE TRENDS

2009/10 - 2010/11 actuals and estimates for 2011/12 - 2012/13 £ per head of population

These charts show how the financial position and funding of forces has changed since 2009/10. Please note that estimates of reserves are unreliable, and that these figures are not adjusted for inflation.



£ per 1000	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Change
Central gov funding	131.3	138.6	120.7	116.3	-11%
Reserves	0.1	-1.8	1.2	1.8	
Council tax	58.0	59.5	60.2	60.7	5%
Total funding	189.4	196.3	182.1	178.9	-6%

Average	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Change
Central gov funding	142.4	145.9	137.9	130.4	-8%
Reserves	0.4	-3.6	1.3	1.3	
Council tax	55.7	57.2	57.5	59.7	7%
Total funding	198.5	199.5	196.7	191.4	-4%

Band D tax rate	£151	£154	£154	£154
Average	£157	£162	£162	£166

Source: CIPFA statistics; POA Statistics 2012/13 estimates

Thames Valley







## WORKFORCE - SUMMARY

March 2012

These charts show the overall police workforce per 1,000 population which are then broken down into police officers, police staff and PCSOs.

We have subdivided officers into community police officers (CPO - those within neighbourhood response, traffic roles and probationers) and others, and therefore used ADR 502 and 601 as the data source.

Specials numbers are headcount as opposed to FTE.



Population 2,253k

	FTE	per 1,000	Avg	Diff	% Total	Avg
Community POs	2,265	1.00	1.09	-187	30%	31%
PCSOs	508	0.23	0.24	-37	7%	7%
Sub-total	2,773	1.23	1.33	-224	37%	38%
Other POs	2,090	0.93	0.98	-114	28%	28%
Police staff	2,689	1.19	1.14	122	36%	33%
Total	7,552	3.35	3.45	-217	100%	100%

Special constables	719	0.32	0.32	-1
Contractors	293	0.13	0.03	230






Source: ADR 502 / 601 March 2012

## POLICE OFFICERS/PCSOs BY RANK

March 2012 % of FTE

These charts show the percentage of the total officer and PCSO workforce by rank. The chart for superintendents includes chief superintendents, and the chart for inspectors includes chief inspectors. Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) are officers above the rank of chief superintendents.



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



	FTE	%	Avg
ACPO	5	0.1%	0.2%
Chief superintendent	10	0.2%	0.3%
Superintendent	25	0.5%	0.6%
Chief inspector	53	1.1%	1.2%
Inspector	192	4.0%	4.5%
Sergeant	653	13.4%	14.2%
Constable	3,417	70.3%	68.5%
PCSO	508	10.4%	10.5%
Force total	4,863	100.0%	100.0%

Constables per sergeant	5.2	4.9
Const. & PCSOs per Sergeant	6.0	5.6

Source: ADR 502 March 2012





Thames Valley

## WORKFORCE & CRIME TRENDS

These charts compare trends of all officers and total crime excluding fraud and forgery. Charges data also exclude fraud and forgery. We have opted to show totals in order to maintain both consistency and better data quality over time.

Note: PCSO are not shown.

These charts should be used to highlight relative changes rather than absolute values.




	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Police officers	4,288	4,260	4,186	4,317	4,434	4,375	4,355
Police staff	2,782	2,756	2,772	2,945	3,000	2,958	2,751
All crime ex F&F	197,849	208,111	194,133	192,223	182,294	169,292	147,252
Charges ex F&F	23,910	21,110	20,146	20,512	18,631	20,824	19,715

Crimes/officer	46	49	46	45	41	39	34
National Avg	40	40	37	34	32	31	31

Charges/officer	5.6	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.8	4.5
National Avg	5.6	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.0	5.2	5.3

% crime victim-based				87.5%	88.3%	87.2%	87.8%
National Avg				88.1%	87.7%	87.5%	87.6%



Source: ADR 502 March 2012 and Home Office Crime :08/09




Thames Valley

## COMMUNITY POLICE OFFICERS AND CRIME

### March 2012 workforce, 2011/12 crime

These charts show numbers of police officers allocated to community duties in relation to the amount of crime in the force. While police officers are not just dealing with crime, the numbers of crimes per police officer allocated to CPO (Community police officers - see Workforce Summary) gives some indication of how busy these officers are compared to their peer group of forces.

Detail on crime can be found in section two.



Community police officers	2,265
Total police officers	4,355

Crime	N	per CPO	Avg	per all PO's	Avg
Victim based	131,535	58	53	30	28
Non victim based	15,717	7	6	4	3
Total exc fraud	147,252	65	60	34	31

Source: ADR 601 March 2012

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Thames Valley

**Force breakdown against group average - staff**  
**POA 12/13 ESTIMATES**

Population 2,253k

	Budgeted staff FTE			Staff per head FTE / 1,000 pop			Group average FTE / 1,000 pop			Diff from group FTE			% of total PO+PS	
	PO	PS	Total	PO	PS	Total	PO	PS	Total	PO	PS	Total	Force	Group
Neighbourhood	752	556	1,308	0.33	0.25	0.58	0.26	0.22	0.48	169	66	235	18%	15%
Incident response	1,337	1	1,337	0.59	0.00	0.59	0.60	0.00	0.61	-24	-8	-32	18%	19%
Local investigation	581	85	666	0.26	0.04	0.30	0.23	0.04	0.27	61	-4	57	9%	8%
Other	76	114	190	0.03	0.05	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.10	-64	26	-39	3%	3%
Local policing	2,746	755	3,501	1.22	0.34	1.55	1.16	0.30	1.45	142	80	222	47%	46%
Dealing with the public	52	612	664	0.02	0.27	0.29	0.03	0.27	0.30	-17	10	-7	9%	9%
Road policing	212	26	238	0.09	0.01	0.11	0.08	0.03	0.11	25	-34	-9	3%	3%
Specialist operations	203	13	215	0.09	0.01	0.10	0.13	0.01	0.14	-93	-18	-111	3%	5%
Intelligence	254	119	373	0.11	0.05	0.17	0.07	0.06	0.14	88	-21	67	5%	4%
Investigations	364	132	496	0.16	0.06	0.22	0.19	0.08	0.27	-58	-44	-102	7%	8%
Investigative support	8	194	202	0.00	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.07	0.08	-10	27	18	3%	3%
Custody	89	1	90	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.08	-7	-86	-93	1%	3%
Other	48	486	534	0.02	0.22	0.24	0.02	0.17	0.19	-2	113	111	7%	6%
Criminal justice	137	487	624	0.06	0.22	0.28	0.06	0.20	0.27	-9	27	18	8%	8%
ICT	0	264	264	0.00	0.12	0.12	0.00	0.05	0.05	-1	143	142	4%	2%
Human resources	2	112	114	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.04	-1	14	13	2%	1%
Training	59	62	121	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.06	-28	4	-24	2%	2%
Other	34	536	570	0.02	0.24	0.25	0.03	0.24	0.27	-25	-11	-36	8%	8%
Support functions	95	973	1,068	0.04	0.43	0.47	0.07	0.37	0.43	-54	150	96	14%	14%
Police authority	0	28	28	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0	13	13	0%	0%
Central costs	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0%	0%
Total exc national	4,070	3,338	7,408	1.81	1.48	3.29	1.80	1.40	3.20	15	191	206	100%	100%
National policing	143	43	186	0.06	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.03	0.10	-5	-30	-35		
Total	4,213	3,380	7,593	1.87	1.50	3.37	1.86	1.43	3.29	10	161	171		

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

Note that workforce under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' not 'investigation'

**Force breakdown against group average - cost**  
**POA 12/13 ESTIMATES**

Population 2,253k

	Budgeted spend £m	Spend per head		Diff from group £m	% of total		% PO *	
		Force	Group		Force	Group	Force	Group
Neighbourhood	51.3	22.8	19.2	8.1	13%	11%	69%	65%
Incident response	67.1	29.8	29.4	0.8	17%	17%	100%	99%
Local investigation	34.3	15.2	13.5	4.0	9%	8%	89%	90%
Other	14.0	6.2	6.5	-0.7	4%	4%	35%	62%
Local policing	166.7	74.0	68.6	12.1	42%	40%	82%	84%
Dealing with the public	23.4	10.4	10.9	-1.3	6%	6%	13%	16%
Road policing	12.7	5.6	4.9	1.6	3%	3%	67%	70%
Specialist operations	13.8	6.1	7.0	-2.0	4%	4%	76%	79%
Intelligence	19.5	8.7	6.5	4.8	5%	4%	71%	59%
Investigations	26.2	11.6	14.1	-5.6	7%	8%	79%	76%
Investigative support	11.5	5.1	4.9	0.4	3%	3%	4%	8%
Custody	15.1	6.7	6.4	0.6	4%	4%	35%	36%
Other	16.6	7.4	6.4	2.2	4%	4%	14%	15%
Criminal justice	31.7	14.1	12.8	2.8	8%	8%	24%	27%
ICT	17.5	7.7	7.8	0.0	4%	5%	0%	0%
Human resources	5.8	2.6	2.2	0.8	1%	1%	3%	3%
Training	8.2	3.6	3.7	-0.1	2%	2%	0%	0%
Other	46.7	20.7	22.6	-4.2	12%	13%	10%	16%
Support functions	78.2	34.7	36.2	-3.5	20%	21%	7%	11%
Police authority	1.8	0.8	1.0	-0.5	0%	1%	0%	0%
Central costs	7.1	3.2	3.5	-0.7	2%	2%	0%	0%
Total exc national	392.5	174.2	170.6	8.1	100%	100%	52%	53%
National policing	10.5	4.7	4.2	1.0				
Total	403.1	178.9	174.8	9.2				

\* PO salaries + overtime as  
 % of gross expenditure

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

Note that workforce under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' not 'investigation'


## LEAVERS

2011-12

These charts show the percentage of the workforce that left the force between 31st March 2011 and 2012; using 31st March 2011 as the baseline.

Officers are broken down into those who transferred or left the service. Because of the current financial climate, we have costed the salary impact of staff leaving the service. However, PCSOs leaving forces may return as police officers.

NB: The leavers figures are FTE.



	Strength *	Leavers	% Force	Avg Salary £m	
Police officers	4,375				
Exc transfers		206	4.7%	4.8%	
Transfers		28	0.6%	0.3%	
Leaving force		234	5.3%	5.1%	11.9
PCSO	506	67	13.1%	6.4%	2.0
Police staff	2,958	327	11.1%	11.4%	10.7
Force total	7,839	628	8.0%	7.5%	24.6






\* as at Mar 11

All leavers

Source: ADR531 (as at 31/03/12)

Source: ADR531 (as at 31/09/11)

Source: ADR502 (as at 31/03/11)









## JOINERS

2011-12

These charts show the percentage of the workforce that joined the force in 2011/12, against a baseline of 2010/11.

NB: The joiners figures are FTE.



	Strength*	Joiners	%	Avg
Police officers	4,375	218	5.0%	1.0%
PCSO	506	64	12.6%	6.2%
Police staff	2,958	139	4.7%	3.5%
Overall	7,839	421	5.4%	2.2%

\* as at Mar 11

Source: ADR521 & ADR 502 (as at 31/03/12 and 30/09/2011)

Thames Valley

## SICKNESS & RECUPERATIVE RESTRICTED

March 2012

These charts show sickness absence 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 limiting factor, 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.

NB: The gaps towards the left of some charts indicate that data is not available or has not been included; absence above 12% of the workforce and zero absence have been excluded.

	Strength *	FTE	%	Avg
Officers	4,355			
Long term absence		41	0.9%	1.7%
Sickness absence		55	1.3%	2.1%
PCSO	508			
Long term absence		9	1.7%	1.7%
Sickness absence		7	1.4%	2.0%
Staff	2,751			
Long term absence		33	1.2%	1.7%
Sickness absence		35	1.3%	2.1%

\* as at Mar 12





Long term absence: 2010/11-Q4

Officers	4,355			
Recuperative		154	3.5%	2.1%
Restricted		167	3.8%	4.2%





Source: ADR 502, 551 and 554 (as at 31/03/12)

ADR 554 figures are headcount not FTE

### Long-term absence



### Short and medium term absence




Thames Valley

## POLICE OFFICERS LENGTH OF SERVICE

These charts show the number of officers by length of service. A more detailed breakdown of 25 – 30 years is provided for planning purposes, shown by projected retirement dates. Salary costs are presented using the average cost of a police officer.


### ALL OFFICERS

National average



Total  
4,437

### 25 YEARS OR MORE - Projected retirement



Total  
412  
£21.0m










Source: ADR 582 (as at 31/03/12)

Thames Valley

## WORKFORCE BY FUNCTION

Budgeted FTE 2012/13 per 1,000

These charts show the workforce costs by function in terms of FTE per 1,000 population. For definitions of the workforce categories, please refer to Appendix 2.




Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## NET REVENUE EXPENDITURE BY FUNCTION

### Cost per head of population by function

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











Population 2,253k






			Averages		Diff £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Local policing	166.7	74.0	75.9	68.6	-4.4	12.1
Dealing with the public	23.4	10.4	11.5	10.9	-2.5	-1.3
Criminal justice	31.7	14.1	12.7	12.8	3.0	2.8
Road policing	12.7	5.6	5.8	4.9	-0.3	1.6
Specialist operations	13.8	6.1	8.2	7.0	-4.8	-2.0
Intelligence	19.5	8.7	7.6	6.5	2.4	4.8
Investigations	26.2	11.6	15.0	14.1	-7.6	-5.6
Investigative support	11.5	5.1	5.1	4.9	0.0	0.4
Support functions	78.2	34.7	38.3	36.2	-8.0	-3.5
Police authority	1.8	0.8	1.2	1.0	-0.9	-0.5
Central costs	7.1	3.2	6.4	3.5	-7.2	-0.7
Total exc national	392.5	174.2	187.7	170.6	-30.4	8.1

National policing	10.5	4.7	3.7	4.2	2.2	1.0
Total	403.1	178.9	191.4	174.8	-28.3	9.2

Source: POA estimates 2012/13



**LOCAL POLICING** including local investigation/ prisoner processing  
Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 2,253k

	Averages			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Neighbourhood policing	51.3	22.8	25.4	19.2
Incident (response) manageme	67.1	29.8	29.7	29.4
Local Investigation	34.3	15.2	14.3	13.5
Specialist community liaison	4.7	2.1	3.5	3.4
Command team & support	9.3	4.1	3.0	3.1
Total local policing	166.7	74.0	75.9	68.6

Diff £m	
All	MSG
-5.9	8.1
0.2	0.8
2.1	4.0
-3.3	-3.1
2.5	2.3
-4.4	12.1

% PO *	MSG
69%	65%
100%	99%
89%	90%
31%	60%
36%	67%
82%	84%


Total exc local investigation	132.4	58.8	61.7	55.2
-------------------------------	-------	------	------	------

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

-6.5	8.1
------	-----


80%	83%
-----	-----

\* PO salaries + overtime as % of gross expenditure



## LOCAL POLICING

### Use of resources



Staffing	FTE	FTE/1000	Averages	
			All	MSG
Police officers	2,746	1.22	1.28	1.16
PCSOs	507	0.22	0.25	0.21
Police staff	248	0.11	0.08	0.09







	Diff FTE	
	All	MSG
Police officers	-137	142
PCSOs	-66	28
Police staff	61	52

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages	
			All	MSG
PO salaries	136.7	60.7	62.9	57.0
PO overtime	2.3	1.0	1.8	1.4
PCSOs	15.3	6.8	7.5	6.4
Police staff	7.8	3.4	2.4	2.7
Non-staff costs	7.3	3.2	2.4	1.9
Income	-2.6	-1.2	-1.2	-0.8
Total cost	166.7	74.0	75.9	68.6

	Diff	
	All	MSG
PO salaries	-5.1	8.2
PO overtime	-1.9	-0.9
PCSOs	-1.7	0.8
Police staff	2.3	1.7
Non-staff costs	1.9	3.0
Income	0.1	-0.8
Total cost	-4.4	12.1

Cost/fte		Averages	
		All	MSG
Police officers	£50k	£49k	£49k
PCSOs	£30k	£30k	£30k
Staff	£31k	£29k	£30k





	Diff	
	All	MSG
Police officers	1.6	1.2
PCSOs	0.2	0.0
Staff	0.6	0.2



Source: POA estimates 2012/13  
HMIC

## DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC

Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 2,253k

### Averages

	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Central communications unit	10.0	4.5	7.6	6.9
Local call centres/front desk	3.4	1.5	2.4	2.1
Contact management units	7.4	3.3	1.1	1.4
Command team & support	2.6	1.2	0.3	0.5
Total dealing with the public	23.4	10.4	11.5	10.9

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

### Diff £m




All	MSG
-7.0	-5.5
-2.2	-1.3
4.8	4.1
1.8	1.4
-2.5	-1.3

% PO	MSG
23%	19%
0%	4%
2%	15%
26%	60%
13%	16%



## DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC

### Use of resources



Staffing	Averages		Diff FTE	
	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	52	0.02	0.04	0.03
Police Staff	612	0.27	0.26	0.27

Expenditure	Averages		Diff FTE	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Police officers	3.1	1.4	2.5	1.8
Police staff +PCSO	19.8	8.8	8.4	8.8
Non-staff costs	0.5	0.2	0.6	0.4
Income	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.1
Total cost	23.4	10.4	11.5	10.9


Cost/fte	Averages		Diff FTE	
	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£59k	£58k	0.2	0.1
Police Staff	£31k	£32k	0.1	-0.7

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## 999 CALLS




2011/12

Data taken from ADR 441, showing the number of calls per 1,000 population and per staff within central communications units (CCU) and also within CCU + Front Desk combined to account for differences in force structure. Cost per call is calculated using the same function.



Population	2,253k
Calls received	281,288

## Central communications unit only






FTE staff	263
Gross cost	£10.0m

		Avg
FTE/1000 pop	0.12	0.19
Calls per FTE	1,072	746
Calls per 1000	125	135

Cost per call	£36	£52
---------------	-----	-----

Source: POA data

## CCU + Front Desk



FTE staff	378
Gross cost	£13.4m

		Avg
FTE/1000 pop	0.17	0.25
Calls per FTE	745	559
Calls per 1000	125	135


Cost per call	£48	£67
---------------	-----	-----

Source: ADR 441

## EMERGENCY & PRIORITY (EP) CALLS PER POPULATION

2011-12




Number of emergency (aim to arrive within 15 minutes in urban and 20 minutes in rural areas) and priority (aim to arrive within 60 minutes) graded closing incident codes, showing incidents per population.



Population 2,253k




### Calls

	Calls	Calls/1000	MSG Avg
ASB	34,827	15	23
Crimes	71,437	32	24
All Other	172,809	77	76
EP Total	279,073	124	123



## CRIMINAL JUSTICE ARRANGEMENTS

### Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 2,253k

			Averages		Diff £m		% PO	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	MSG	MSG
Custody *	15.1	6.7	6.8	6.4	-0.2	0.6	35%	36%
Criminal justice	9.7	4.3	3.7	4.2	1.4	0.3	24%	20%
Police national computer	3.1	1.4	0.8	1.0	1.2	0.9	5%	1%
Criminal records bureau	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.3	-0.1	0.1	0%	0%
Property officer / stores	0.8	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0%	0%
Coroner assistance	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	-0.1	0.0	0%	0%
Fixed penalty scheme	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	-0.5	-0.2	0%	5%
Command team & support	1.7	0.8	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.8	23%	47%
Total criminal justice arrangements	31.7	14.1	12.7	12.8	3.0	2.8	24%	27%



Source: POA estimates 2012/13

\* Appendix 3 lists the forces that outsource custody

#### Note: Custody above includes






Surgeons, doctors & other medical	0.6	0.28	1.00	0.66	-1.6	-0.8
Interpreters & translators	1.2	0.54	0.31	0.39	0.5	0.3

Source: CIPFA Police Estimates Statistics 2012-13, as POA data was incomplete within these objectives.



## CRIMINAL JUSTICE ARRANGEMENTS

### Use of resources





		<i>Averages</i>		<i>Diff FTE</i>	
Staffing	FTE FTE/1000	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	137 0.06	0.07	0.06	-15	-9
Police Staff	487 0.22	0.22	0.20	-6	27
		<i>Diff £m</i>			
Expenditure	£m £/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	8.3 3.7	3.8	3.6	-0.2	0.3
Police staff +PCSO	12.5 5.5	6.0	5.9	-1.1	-0.9
Non-staff costs	13.7 6.1	3.4	3.7	6.1	5.4
Income	-2.8 -1.2	-0.5	-0.4	-1.8	-2.0
Total cost	31.7 14.1	12.7	12.8	3.0	2.8
		<i>Diff £m</i>			
Cost/FTE		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£60k	£55k	£54k	0.7	0.9
Police Staff	£26k	£27k	£29k	-0.9	-1.5

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE

### Staffing and cost compared to charges

These charts show the NRE cost of criminal justice (as opposed to criminal justice arrangements) per 100 charges. FTE within the criminal justice function is then shown per 100 charges. Crimes stated are those recorded on Crimesec3



Charges	20,157
---------	--------







		per 100 charges	Group
Criminal justice FTE	336	1.7	1.3
Criminal justice cost	£9.7m	£48k	£42k

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

Diff
67
£1.3m

## SPECIALIST OPERATIONS

Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 2,253k

	Averages			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Firearms unit	6.2	2.7	3.0	2.9
Dogs section	2.2	1.0	1.3	1.1
Lev 1 adv public order	0.5	0.2	1.4	1.0
Air operations	1.4	0.6	1.0	0.7
Civil contingencies	0.4	0.2	0.7	0.5
Specialist terrain	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.3
Mounted police	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.1
Airports & ports	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1
Command team & support	2.1	0.9	0.6	0.5
Total specialist operations	13.8	6.1	8.2	7.0




	Diff £m	
	All	MSG
Firearms unit	-0.5	-0.5
Dogs section	-0.8	-0.2
Lev 1 adv public order	-2.6	-1.6
Air operations	-0.8	-0.3
Civil contingencies	-1.1	-0.7
Specialist terrain	0.2	-0.2
Mounted police	0.3	0.4
Airports & ports	-0.1	0.2
Command team & support	0.7	0.8
Total specialist operations	-4.8	-2.0

	% PO MSG	
	% PO	MSG
Firearms unit	92%	93%
Dogs section	81%	88%
Lev 1 adv public order	96%	76%
Air operations	28%	21%
Civil contingencies	65%	60%
Specialist terrain	93%	62%
Mounted police	73%	27%
Airports & ports	na	42%
Command team & support	53%	80%
Total specialist operations	76%	79%

Staffing	FTE
Firearms unit	106
Dogs section	36
Lev 1 adv public order	11

## SPECIALIST OPERATIONS

### Use of resources




			<b>Averages</b>		<b>Diff FTE</b>	
<b>Staffing</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>FTE/1000</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>MSG</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>MSG</b>
Police officers	203	0.09	0.13	0.13	-94	-93
Police Staff	13	0.01	0.01	0.01	-20	-15
					<b>Diff £m</b>	
<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£/head</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>MSG</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>MSG</b>
PO salaries	10.3	4.6	6.8	6.7	-5.0	-4.9
PO overtime	1.1	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4
Police staff	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.5	-0.7	-0.6
Non-staff costs	3.2	1.4	1.5	1.5	-0.1	-0.3
Income	-1.2	-0.5	-0.8	-2.1	0.7	3.5
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>-4.8</b>	<b>-2.0</b>
					<b>Diff £m</b>	
<b>Cost/fte</b>			<b>All</b>	<b>MSG</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>MSG</b>
Police officers	£51k		£52k	£51k	-0.2	-0.1
Police staff	£30k		£32k	£34k	0.0	-0.1

Source: POA estimates 2012/13



## INTELLIGENCE

Objectives – cost per head of population






Population 2,253k

			Averages		Diff £m		% PO MSG	
			All	MSG	All	MSG		
Intelligence gathering	£m	£/head	3.5	3.2	1.9	2.6	80%	70%
Intelligence analysis/threat assessments	7.4	3.3	3.7	3.0	-1.0	0.7	72%	46%
Command team & support	2.4	1.1	0.4	0.4	1.5	1.6	33%	48%
Total intelligence	19.5	8.7	7.6	6.5	2.4	4.8	71%	59%

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## INTELLIGENCE

### Use of resources



Averages				
Staffing	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	254	0.11	0.09	0.07
Police staff	119	0.05	0.07	0.06

Diff FTE	
All	MSG
48	88
-50	-21

Averages				
Expenditure	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Police officers	13.9	6.1	4.9	4.1
Police staff	3.7	1.7	2.3	2.0
Non-staff costs	1.9	0.9	0.7	0.7
Income	0.0	0.0	-0.3	-0.3
Total cost	19.5	8.7	7.6	6.5

Diff £m	
All	MSG
2.8	4.6
-1.4	-0.9
0.3	0.3
0.7	0.7
2.4	4.8








Cost/fte		All	MSG
Police officers	£52k	£53k	£54k
Police staff	£31k	£30k	£32k

Diff £m	
All	MSG
-0.2	-0.6
0.1	-0.2

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## INVESTIGATIONS exc local investigation/prisoner processing

Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 2,253k





	Averages			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Public protection	13.6	6.04	6.66	5.80
Major investigations unit	6.0	2.68	3.55	3.52
Serious/organised crime unit	2.8	1.23	2.35	2.71
Economic crime	1.8	0.79	1.03	0.91
Specialist investigation units	0.0	-	0.37	0.17
Command team & support	1.9	0.86	1.05	1.00
Total	26.2	11.61	15.00	14.10

Diff £m	
All	MSG
-1.4	0.6
-2.0	-1.9
-2.5	-3.3
-0.5	-0.3
-0.8	-0.4
-0.4	-0.3
-7.6	-5.6

% PO	MSG
86%	82%
83%	68%
88%	69%
60%	64%
na	17%
26%	66%
79%	76%

## INVESTIGATIONS

### Use of resources



Staffing	FTE	FTE/1000	Averages		Diff FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	364	0.16	0.23	0.19	-145	-58
Police staff	132	0.06	0.07	0.08	-37	-44





Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
PO salaries	19.1	8.5	11.2	9.8	-6.2	-3.1
PO overtime	1.6	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.2	-0.2
Police staff	3.9	1.7	2.4	2.5	-1.4	-1.7
Non-staff costs	1.5	0.7	1.3	1.1	-1.4	-1.0
Income	0.0	0.0	-0.5	-0.2	1.1	0.4
Total cost	26.2	11.6	15.0	14.1	-7.6	-5.6

Cost/FTE		Averages		Diff £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£52k	£50k	£52k	1.0	0.0
Police staff	£29k	£31k	£31k	-0.2	-0.3

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## INVESTIGATIVE SUPPORT

Objectives – cost per head of population




Population 2,253k

			Averages		Diff £m		% PO	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG		MSG
External forensic costs	4.2	1.86	1.67	1.66	0.4	0.5	0%	2%
Scenes of crime officers	2.9	1.27	1.53	1.49	-0.6	-0.5	0%	13%
Fingerprint/DNA bureau	2.0	0.90	0.74	0.69	0.4	0.5	0%	0%
Photographic image recovery	0.5	0.23	0.28	0.26	-0.1	-0.1	0%	0%
Other forensic services	1.9	0.84	0.72	0.72	0.3	0.3	18%	22%
Command team & support	0.0	-	0.18	0.14	-0.4	-0.3	na	17%
Total investigative support	11.5	5.11	5.12	4.95	0.0	0.4	4%	8%

HMIC Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## INVESTIGATIVE SUPPORT

### Use of resources



Staffing	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	8	0.00	0.01	0.01
Police staff	194	0.09	0.08	0.07

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Avg	MSG
PO salaries	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.4
Police staff	6.6	2.9	2.8	2.7
Non-staff costs	5.1	2.3	2.1	1.9
Income	-0.7	-0.3	0.0	-0.1
Total cost	11.5	5.1	5.1	4.9

Cost/fte	Avg	MSG
Police officers	£54k	£53k
Police staff	£34k	£37k

#### Diff FTE

All	MSG
-4	-10
16	27

#### Diff £m

All	MSG
-0.2	-0.5
0.3	0.5
0.4	0.8
-0.6	-0.5
0.0	0.4











#### Diff £m

All	MSG
0.0	0.0
-0.3	-0.6

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## SUPPORT FUNCTIONS

Objectives – cost per head of population







Population 2,253

	Averages				Diff £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Estates/building costs	25.8	11.4	8.6	8.8	6.3	5.9
ICT	17.5	7.7	8.4	7.8	-1.5	0.0
Training	8.2	3.6	3.8	3.7	-0.5	-0.1
Fleet services	3.5	1.5	3.2	2.9	-3.8	-3.0
Administration support	3.4	1.5	2.5	2.3	-2.2	-1.8
Human resources	5.8	2.6	2.3	2.2	0.5	0.8
Finance	2.9	1.3	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0
Performance review	1.9	0.9	2.4	2.4	-3.6	-3.5
Professional standards	1.8	0.8	1.3	1.0	-1.2	-0.5
All other	7.4	3.3	4.2	3.9	-2.0	-1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>78.2</b>	<b>34.7</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>36.2</b>	<b>-8.0</b>	<b>-3.5</b>

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## SUPPORT FUNCTIONS

### Use of resources



Averages				
Staffing	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	95	0.04	0.07	0.07
Police staff	973	0.43	0.39	0.37

Diff FTE	
All	MSG
-70	-54
90	150

Diff £m				
Expenditure	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Police officers	5.9	2.6	4.7	4.2
Police staff	35.9	15.9	13.2	12.7
Non-staff costs	45.0	20.0	21.7	20.6
Income	-8.6	-3.8	-1.3	-1.3
Total cost	78.2	34.7	38.3	36.2

Diff £m	
All	MSG
-4.6	-3.5
6.2	7.2
-3.9	-1.5
-5.7	-5.6
-8.0	-3.5

Diff £m			
Cost/FTE	All	MSG	
Police officers	£61k	£62k	£63k
Police staff	£36k	£33k	£35k

Diff £m	
All	MSG
-0.2	-0.2
2.8	1.7

Source: POA estimates 2012/13



## SUPPORT FUNCTIONS






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

Total FTE	7,593
Total NRE	£403m






	Cost £m	per FTE	Avg	Diff £m
Human resources	5.79	£763	£661	0.8
Finance	2.90	£381	£370	0.1
ICT	17.46	£2,300	£2,385	-0.6
Training	8.18	£1,077	£1,087	-0.1
Premises	25.78	£3,396	£2,425	7.4

	% NRE	Avg	Diff £m
Human resources	1.4%	1.2%	0.8
Finance	0.7%	0.7%	0.1
ICT	4.3%	4.4%	-0.4
Training	2.0%	2.0%	0.0
Premises	6.4%	4.5%	7.6

### Cost per FTE






### % NRE



## NATIONAL POLICING

### Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 2,253k

	£m	£/head	Averages	
			All	MSG
Counter terrorism/special branch	3.2	1.41	3.14	3.56
Other national policing requirements	7.0	3.10	0.49	0.53
Hosting national services	0.0	0.00	0.02	0.01
Secondments (out of force)	-0.1	-0.03	0.00	-0.04
ACPO projects / initiatives	0.4	0.20	0.07	0.17
<b>Total</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>4.68</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>4.22</b>

	Diff £m	
	All	MSG
Counter terrorism/special branch	-3.9	-4.8
Other national policing requirements	5.9	5.8
Hosting national services	0.0	0.0
Secondments (out of force)	-0.1	0.0
ACPO projects / initiatives	0.3	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.0</b>

	% PO	MSG
Counter terrorism/special branch	66%	75%
Other national policing requirements	82%	47%
Hosting national services	na	15%
Secondments (out of force)	na	55%
ACPO projects / initiatives	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>74%</b>






Specific grants	10.1	4.49	2.91	3.34
Cost net of grants	0.4	0.19	0.81	0.88

Specific grants	3.5	2.6
Cost net of grants	-1.4	-1.5

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## NATIONAL POLICING

### Use of resources



Averages					Diff FTE	
Staffing	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	143	0.06	0.06	0.07	3	-5
PCSOs	-	-	0.00	0.00	0	0
Police staff	43	0.02	0.02	0.03	-3	-30

Diff £m					Diff £m	
Expenditure	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	7.9	3.5	3.6	3.6	-0.1	-0.2
Police staff	1.6	0.7	0.7	1.0	0.1	-0.6
Non-staff costs	1.2	0.5	0.6	0.6	-0.2	-0.2
Income	-0.2	-0.1	-1.1	-1.0	2.4	2.1
Total cost	10.5	4.7	3.7	4.2	2.2	1.0

Specific grants	10.1	4.5	2.9	3.3	3.5	2.6
Cost net of grants	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.9	-1.4	-1.5

Diff £m				Diff £m	
Cost/fte		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£50k	£55k	£53k	-0.7	-0.5
Police staff	£36k	£32k	£30k	na	na

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

## WORKFORCE MIX

The table below uses POA data to look at differences in the proportion of workforce that are police staff and PCSOs, compared to the proportion that are officers. For each POA category the percentage of workforce who are staff and PCSOs in your force are compared to levels in other forces.

This comparison is done twice:

- 1) Comparing your force to the median percentage (i.e. 'middle' ratio of staff to officers where 21 forces report a high %staff and or PCSO and 21 forces report a lower %).
- 2) Comparing your force to the upper quartile (the percentage above which only a quarter of forces report higher staff and or PCSO).

Each time, the number of posts this change represents to your force is calculated, along with the cost of this difference (based on the number of posts and the difference between the median cost per office and median cost per police staff/PCSO). These average costs include overtime but exclude agency staff and are calculated separately for each of the chosen POA categories.

Please note, the cost of difference is indicative and not a 'saving' opportunity as it is unlikely that the full differences could be realised in any given case.

The analysis focuses on thirteen POA categories where our analysis found significant costs of difference between forces.

The analysis does not include specials or look at the 'Local Policing' POA category (where most specials are counted and where a different analytical approach would be required).

**Note:** If total staff numbers per population in a particular category are less than a quarter of the national median for that category then the relevant rows in the table are left blank. This is because such low numbers either indicate a problem with the data or that the relevant function may be contracted out (and hence the calculations are not applicable).

	Current staffing			Difference from median			Difference from UQ			Difference in median pay
	Police officers	Staff /PCSO	%Staff/ PCSOs	National median %	from median (no. of posts)	Cost of difference	National UQ %	(no. of posts)	Cost of difference	
Criminal Justice	39	298	88%	93%	14	£419k	97%	30	£884k	£30k
Central Communications Unit	40	223	85%	88%	8	£192k	95%	27	£667k	£25k
Intelligence Analysis	101	63	39%	58%	31	£727k	75%	60	£1,389k	£23k
Administration Support	2	100	98%	100%	2	£74k	100%	2	£74k	£37k
Local Call Centres / Front Desk	0	115	100%	100%	0	£0k	100%	0	£0k	£25k
Training	59	138	70%	44%	0	£0k	57%	0	£0k	£18k
Intelligence Gathering	145	48	25%	24%	0	£0k	36%	21	£418k	£20k
Custody	na	na	na	57%	na	na	61%	na	na	£26k
Contact Management Units	3	228	99%	95%	0	£0k	100%	3	£74k	£25k
Human Resources	2	112	98%	100%	2	£48k	100%	2	£48k	£24k
Other Forensic Services	8	42	84%	89%	3	£52k	97%	7	£136k	£20k
Scenes of Crime Officers	0	80	100%	100%	0	£0k	100%	0	£0k	£16k
Grand Total	398	1,446			59	£1,512k		150	£3,689k	

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

Total CoD per population £0.7

£1.6

Thames Valley

## Section Two - Offences & Outcomes

### INTRODUCTION

This section focuses on criminal offences dealt with by each force and resulting outcomes. Crime and sanction detections are presented in the format developed by HMIC in consultation with stakeholders as displayed below.

The intention is to differentiate between crimes that are victim based, and those that are driven by police activity.



Data is shown as offences per 1,000 population.

Definitions of offences in each category can be found in Appendix 1.

Note that fraud and forgery are generally excluded from all crime as we recognise that the recording in this area is not as robust as other crime categories.

A sanction detection means that a recorded crime has been resolved by the police. The types of outcomes are:

- > Caution - police have identified a suspect and issued them with a caution
- > Penalty notice for disorder - a fine issued by the police for anti-social behaviour, as well as shoplifting, criminal damage and possession of cannabis
- > Charge summons - the suspect has been charged and/or brought to court
- > Taken into consideration (TIC) - courts take this offence into consideration when sentencing for other crimes
- > Cannabis warning

We acknowledge that 24 forces are returning data on community resolutions / restorative justice, and that these will affect sanction detection rates. These forces are listed in Appendix 3.

Expected sanction detection volumes are calculated by modelling what force detections would be should the force align to the peer average.

MSG averages are generally used in this section. The averages quoted are simple unweighted averages and not weighted national averages.


Changes over time for crimes and sanction detections are measured against the baseline of 2008/09 due to the introduction of public order offences.

## LONG TERM TRENDS – RIBBON CHARTS

### Crime rate per 1,000 pop from 2001/02


Note range = max - min rate

The first three charts show interesting longer term trends across all forces, notably a reduction in variance between the start and end of the period.



Your force	2.8	4.8	5.6	6.9	6.9	6.6	6.4	6.5	6.4	5.0	4.1
Group	2.9	4.9	6.7	8.0	7.9	7.4	6.7	6.3	6.2	5.8	5.4
All forces	3.7	6.5	8.2	9.0	9.4	8.7	7.7	7.1	6.7	6.2	5.7
Range	7.2	9.9	10.0	9.7	9.1	9.3	8.0	7.1	6.4	5.4	4.9

Thames Valley




Your force	20.5	18.7	17.5	15.4	14.5	14.1	12.0	11.4	10.3	8.2	6.7
Group	17.2	17.0	15.4	12.7	12.5	11.9	10.5	9.2	7.8	6.9	6.5
All forces	17.2	17.5	16.2	13.5	12.8	12.4	10.5	9.4	7.7	6.7	6.2
Range	27.5	30.3	27.1	20.6	20.2	18.3	14.5	12.3	10.7	8.4	8.1

Thames Valley




Note range = max - min rate



Burglary is shown per population to maintain consistency

Your force	12.3	13.1	13.3	11.3	11.0	10.7	9.9	10.2	9.8	9.2	8.4
Group	11.8	12.1	11.9	10.2	9.7	9.2	9.1	9.2	8.5	8.3	7.7
All forces	15.0	15.3	14.3	11.7	10.8	10.5	9.8	9.8	9.0	8.6	8.2
Range	26.4	26.9	23.5	17.4	14.2	14.5	12.9	12.7	13.0	12.4	11.4

Thames Valley







Your force	14.2	14.9	16.5	16.4	16.5	17.7	15.9	15.0	13.3	11.4	9.7
Group	15.3	16.6	18.7	18.6	18.4	18.9	16.9	15.2	13.2	11.8	10.5
All forces	18.4	19.8	21.6	21.6	21.6	21.8	19.3	17.3	14.8	12.8	11.5
Range	22.3	19.6	16.9	16.9	18.1	17.4	17.9	12.6	10.5	7.6	8.3

Thames Valley

## RECORDED OFFENCES - ALL CRIMES

2011/12 per 1,000 population



Population 2,253k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
Victim based	131,535	58.4	56.2	4,972	4%
Non victim based	15,717	7.0	6.8	402	3%
Total exc fraud	147,252	65.3	63.0	5,374	4%

Fraud & forgery	2,514	1.1	1.2
Grand total	149,766	66.5	64.2



Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

## SANCTION DETECTIONS - ALL CRIMES

The actual % expected figures shows your detection rate as a percentage of the **national** average detection rate. Hence if above 100%, you are achieving more sanction detections than the national average.

As at March 2012, 23 forces submitted data on community resolutions / restorative justice - this will negatively affect sanction detection rates.

Forces reporting these data are listed in Appendix 3.






	Offences	SDs	%	MSG	Exp	Diff
Victim based	131,535	23,672	18%	20%	25,594	-1,922
Non victim based	15,717	12,159	77%	82%	12,756	-597
Total exc fraud	147,252	35,831	24%	27%	38,349	-2,518






Actual % expected 86%

Fraud & forgery	2,514	624	25%	30%	761	-137
-----------------	-------	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12



**RECORDED OFFENCES - VICTIM BASED**  
**2011/12 per 1,000 population**








Population 2,253k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
Violence against the person	21,612	9.6	10.5	-2,033	-9%
Sexual offences	1,948	0.9	0.8	93	5%
Stealing	86,179	38.2	34.3	8,888	11%
Criminal damage & arson	21,796	9.7	10.5	-1,977	-8%
Victim based offences	131,535	58.4	56.2	4,972	4%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

## SANCTION DETECTIONS - VICTIM BASED






	Offences	SDs	%	MSG	Exp	Diff
Violence against the person	21,612	7,706	36%	39%	8,341	-635
Sexual offences	1,948	557	29%	30%	600	-43
Stealing	86,179	13,020	15%	17%	13,829	-809
Criminal damage & arson	21,796	2,389	11%	13%	2,823	-434
Victim based offences	131,535	23,672	18%	20%	25,594	-1,922

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Thames Valley

**RECORDED OFFENCES - VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON**  
2011/12 per 1,000 population






Population 2,253k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
With injury	9,314	4.1	5.4	-2,895	-24%
Without injury	12,298	5.5	5.1	862	8%
Violence against person	21,612	9.6	10.5	-2,033	-9%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Thames Valley

SANCTION DETECTIONS - VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON






	Offences	SDs	%	MSG	Exp	Diff
With injury	9,314	4,179	45%	40%	3,722	457
Without injury	12,298	3,527	29%	38%	4,619	-1,092
Violence against person	21,612	7,706	36%	39%	8,341	-635

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12



## RECORDED OFFENCES - SEXUAL OFFENCES

2011/12 per 1,000 population






Population 2,253k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
Rape	467	0.21	0.24	-68	-13%
Other sexual offences	1,481	0.66	0.59	161	12%
Sexual offences	1,948	0.86	0.82	93	5%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Thames Valley

SANCTION DETECTIONS - SEXUAL OFFENCES




	Offences	SDs	%	Msg	Exp	Diff
Rape	467	125	27%	23%	106	19
Other sexual offences	1,481	432	29%	33%	494	-62
Sexual offences	1,948	557	29%	30%	600	-43

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

# RECORDED OFFENCES - STEALING










2011/12 per 1,000 population




Population 2,253k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
Robbery					
Personal	1,539	0.7	0.6	161	12%
Business	187	0.1	0.1	49	35%
Burglary	1,726	0.8	0.7	210	14%
Domestic	8,820	3.9	3.3	1,278	17%
Non-domestic	10,046	4.5	4.3	343	4%
	18,866	8.4	7.7	1,621	9%
Vehicle crime	15,173	6.7	6.5	428	3%
Shoplifting	13,273	5.9	5.9	-25	0%
Other stealing	37,141	16.5	13.5	6,655	22%
<b>Stealing</b>	<b>86,179</b>	<b>38.2</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>8,888</b>	<b>11%</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12












## SANCTION DETECTIONS - STEALING



Population 2,253k







	Offences	SDs	%	MSG	Exp	Diff
Robbery						
Personal	1,539	386	25%	22%	344	42
Business	187	57	30%	46%	86	-29
	1,726	443	26%	24%	430	13
Burglary						
Domestic	8,820	1,338	15%	17%	1,542	-204
Non-domestic	10,046	679	7%	9%	877	-198
	18,866	2,017	11%	12%	2,419	-402
Vehicle crime	15,173	1,588	10%	9%	1,404	184
Shoplifting	13,273	6,580	50%	52%	6,851	-271
Other stealing	37,141	2,392	6%	7%	2,726	-334
<b>Stealing</b>	<b>86,179</b>	<b>13,020</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>13,829</b>	<b>-809</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12



Thames Valley

**RECORDED OFFENCES - NON VICTIM BASED**  
2011/12 per 1,000 population




Population 2,253k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
Drug trafficking	818	0.4	0.4	-125	-13%
Drug possession	6,481	2.9	2.9	24	0%
Drug offences	7,299	3.2	3.3	-101	-1%
Public disorder	6,017	2.7	2.5	483	9%
Crimes disrupted	1,537	0.7	0.7	-36	-2%
Other non victim based	864	0.4	0.4	57	7%
Non victim based	15,717	7.0	6.8	402	3%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12





## SANCTION DETECTIONS - NON VICTIM BASED



	Offences	SDs	%	MSG	Exp	Diff
Drug trafficking	818	644	79%	91%	743	-99
Drug possession	6,481	5,945	92%	96%	6,191	-246
Drug offences	7,299	6,589	90%	95%	6,935	-346
Public disorder	6,017	3,893	65%	66%	3,946	-53
Crimes disrupted	1,537	1,138	74%	82%	1,263	-125
Other non victim based	864	539	62%	71%	613	-74
Non victim based	15,717	12,159	77%	82%	12,756	-597

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

**RECORDED OFFENCES - ALL CRIMES**  
Change 2008/09 to 2011/12








	2008/09	2011/12	Change	MSG
Victim based	171,265	131,535	-23%	-15%
Non victim based	20,958	15,717	-25%	-9%
Total exc fraud	192,223	147,252	-23%	-15%

Fraud & forgery	3,415	2,514	-26%	-3%
All crime	195,638	149,766	-23%	-14%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

# RECORDED OFFENCES - VICTIM BASED

Change 2008/09 to 2011/12






	2008/09	2011/12	Change	MSG
Violence against person	31,104	21,612	-31%	-7%
Sexual offences	2,058	1,948	-5%	-1%
Stealing	104,365	86,179	-17%	-11%
Criminal damage & arson	33,738	21,796	-35%	-30%
Victim based offences	171,265	131,535	-23%	-15%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12






# **RECORDED OFFENCES - VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON** **Change 2008/09 to 2011/12**



	2008/09	2011/12	Change	MSG
With injury	14,556	9,314	-36%	-14%
Without injury	16,548	12,298	-26%	5%
Violence against person	31,104	21,612	-31%	-7%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

# **RECORDED OFFENCES - SEXUAL OFFENCES** **Change 2008/09 to 2011/12**









	2008/09	2011/12	Change	MSG
Rape	434	467	8%	13%
Other sexual offences	1,624	1,481	-9%	-5%
Sexual offences	2,058	1,948	-5%	-1%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

## RECORDED OFFENCES - STEALING

Change 2008/09 to 2011/12



Population 2,253k


	2008/09	2011/12	Change	MSG
Robbery				
Personal	2,093	1,539	-26%	-20%
Business	272	187	-31%	-32%
	2,365	1,726	-27%	-22%
Burglary				
Domestic	11,416	8,820	-23%	-18%
Non-domestic	11,513	10,046	-13%	-13%
	22,929	18,866	-18%	-15%
Vehicle crime	25,781	15,173	-41%	-27%
Shoplifting	14,268	13,273	-7%	-2%
Other stealing	39,022	37,141	-5%	-1%
Stealing	104,365	86,179	-17%	-11%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Thames Valley

## RECORDED OFFENCES - NON VICTIM BASED

Change 2008/09 to 2011/12



Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Thames Valley

## CHANGE IN SANCTION DETECTIONS %

	2008/09	2011/12	Change	Msg
Victim based	17%	18%	1%	-1%
Non victim based	77%	77%	0%	-1%
All crime exc fraud & forgery	24%	24%	1%	-1%
Fraud & forgery	26%	25%	-1%	-15%
<b>Victim based</b>				
Violence against the person	29%	36%	7%	-2%
Sexual offences	21%	29%	7%	6%
Stealing	15%	15%	0%	-1%
Criminal damage & arson	12%	11%	-1%	-1%
<b>Non victim based</b>				
Public disorder	69%	65%	-4%	-7%
Drug offences	91%	90%	-1%	0%
Crimes disrupted	68%	74%	6%	0%
Other non victim based	66%	62%	-4%	-1%
<b>Violence against the person (VAP)</b>				
VAP with injury	33%	45%	12%	-2%
VAP without Injury	25%	29%	3%	-3%
<b>Sexual offences</b>				
Rape	19%	27%	8%	5%
Other sexual offences	22%	29%	7%	6%
<b>Stealing</b>				
Personal robbery	17%	25%	8%	3%
Business robbery	39%	30%	-8%	10%
Domestic burglary	14%	15%	1%	2%
Non Domestic burglary	8%	7%	-1%	-1%
Vehicle crime	9%	10%	1%	0%
Shoplifting	56%	50%	-6%	-8%
Other stealing	7%	6%	0%	-2%
<b>Drugs</b>				
Drug trafficking	83%	79%	-5%	-1%
Drug possession	92%	92%	0%	0%






Note: Please be aware that community resolutions / restorative justice may impact on changes in sanction detection rates.

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Thames Valley

## SANCTION DETECTIONS BY TYPE 2011/12

These charts show how different types of sanction detections are used.







	%	MSG
Charge summons	55%	59%
Cautions	21%	22%
Penalty notices	11%	7%
Cannabis warnings	6%	6%
Taken into consideration	7%	6%
Total	100%	100%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

## CHANGES IN DETECTION TYPES


Changes 2008/09 to 2011/12

These charts show how the proportions of the types of sanction detections have changed since 2008/09. Note that up to 2008/09 cannabis warnings were recorded as FPN detections, from this point they have moved into 'Other'.



	2008/09	2011/12	Change	MSG
Charge summons	46%	55%	10%	7%
Cautions	27%	21%	-6%	-4%
Penalty notices	13%	11%	-2%	-1%
Cannabis warnings	5%	6%	0%	1%
Taken into consideration	9%	7%	-2%	0%
Total	100%	100%		

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12





## CHARGES

2011/12

These charts and tables show the overall charge rates and compare them with the expected charge rates. The expected charge rates show what the force would have achieved if they had matched the average for each crime type. The term charges relates to crime offences cleared up by means of charge or summons.

	Offences	Charges	%	MSG	Diff from expected
<b>Victim based</b>					
VAP with injury	9,314	2,868	31%	28%	281
VAP without Injury	12,298	2,201	18%	25%	-890
Rape	467	124	27%	22%	20
Other sexual offences	1,481	368	25%	29%	-57
Domestic burglary	8,820	823	9%	10%	-72
Non-domestic burglary	10,046	452	4%	5%	-73
Robbery of personal property	1,539	367	24%	22%	35
Business robbery	187	53	28%	45%	-30
Vehicle crime	15,173	800	5%	5%	-19
Shoplifting	13,273	3,708	28%	31%	-410
Other stealing	37,141	1,495	4%	4%	-172
Criminal damage & arson	21,796	1,388	6%	8%	-315
<b>Non-victim based</b>					
Public disorder	6,017	1,568	26%	40%	-844
Drug trafficking	818	525	64%	77%	-101
Drug possession	6,481	1,651	25%	28%	-154
Crimes disrupted	1,537	834	54%	61%	-97
Other non victim based	864	490	57%	56%	7
Total exc fraud	147,252	19,715	13%	16%	-2,891
Fraud & forgery	2,514	442	18%	20%	-65
All crime	149,766	20,157	13%	16%	-2,956

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12



The level of expected charges is based on MSG average charge rates, whereas expected sanction detections shown on p61 are based on average rates for all forces









## NO CRIME

These charts show the 'no crime rate' (number of 'no crimes' divided by total recorded crime).

This information gives a more rounded picture of a force's crime recording practises.

A crime could be no crimed where it is considered to have been recorded in error or where, having been recorded, additional verifiable information becomes available that determines that no crime was committed.

Outliers in the table below are highlighted for those in the top and bottom 10% nationally.



	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	Average	
Burglary	3.0%	2.9%	2.1%	0.7%	1.9%	<<
Robbery	3.9%	4.5%	2.7%	1.5%	4.7%	
Other stealing	4.3%	4.6%	4.6%	2.9%	5.4%	<<
Rape	14.4%	17.1%	12.3%	7.5%	11.1%	
Other sexual	7.0%	9.2%	7.3%	4.1%	5.3%	
Criminal damage	3.2%	3.0%	2.8%	1.7%	2.4%	

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

### Please note:


The proportion of 'no crimes' does not in itself infer high or low compliance with the overall requirements of the HOCA. Levels of 'no criming' are particularly susceptible to local recording practice and the IT systems in use. A police force having a high level of 'no crimes' may be indicative of that force having a local recording process that captures all reports as crimes at the first point of contact and before any further investigation has taken place to consider the full facts.

OVERALL SATISFACTION

2011/12 percentage satisfied

These charts show user satisfaction for the 'whole experience' (excluding road traffic collisions).

95% confidence intervals are also shown.



	Avg	
Satisfaction	86.2%	83.9%
Confidence interval	0.9%	0.2%

Source: Victims of Crime Survey 2011/12

Thames Valley

## **Appendix 1 – Crime Codes**

### **Offences included in each category**

#### **1. Victim-based**

##### **1.1. Violence against the person**

###### **1.1.1. Violence with injury**

- 1 Murder
- 4.2 Infanticide
- 4.1 Manslaughter
- 2 Attempted murder
- 37.1 Causing death by aggravated vehicle taking
- 4.10 Corporate manslaughter
- 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
- 4.4/6 Historic code
- 4.4/6/8 Historic code
- 4.9 Causing death by driving: unlicensed drivers etc.
- 5A Wounding or carrying out an act endangering life (GBH with intent)
- 5B Use of substance or object to endanger life
- 8F Inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent
- 8G Actually bodily harm and other injury
- 8A Less serious wounding
- 8D Racially or religiously aggravated less serious wounding
- 5 Wounding or other act endangering life
- 8H Racially or religiously aggravated inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent
- 8J Racially or religiously aggravated actual bodily harm and other injury
- 8K Poisoning or female genital mutilation

1.1.2. Violence without injury (excl crime prevention and public order offences, inc kidnapping)

- 8C Historic - harassment and public fear
- 8E Historic - harassment and public fear (RRA)
- 8M Racially or religiously aggravated harassment
- 8L Harassment
- 7 Endangering life at sea
- 6 Endangering railway passengers
- 3 Threat or conspiracy to murder
- 3B Threats to kill
- 3A Conspiracy to murder
- 36 Kidnapping
- 14 Procuring illegal abortion
- 13 Child abduction
- 12 Abandoning child under two years
- 11 Cruelty to and neglect of children
- 105B Racially or religiously aggravated assault without injury
- 105A Assault without injury
- 104 Assault without injury on a constable

**1.2. Sexual offences**

1.2.1. Rape

- 19A Rape of a female
- 19B Rape of a male
- 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

1.2.2. Other sexual offences (excluding rape)

- 17A Sexual assault on a male aged 13 and over
- 17B Sexual assault on a male child under 13
- 20A Sexual assault on a female aged 13 and over
- 20B Sexual assault on a female child under 13
- 21 Sexual activity involving a child under 13
- 22A Causing sexual activity without consent
- 22B Sexual activity involving child under 16
- 23 Incest or familial sexual offences
- 70 Sexual activity etc with a person with a mental disorder
- 71 Abuse of children through prostitution and pornography
- 72 Trafficking for sexual exploitation
- 73 Abuse of position of trust of a sexual nature
- 88A Sexual grooming
- 88C Other miscellaneous sexual offences
- 88D Unnatural sexual offences
- 88E Exposure and voyeurism
- 16 Buggery
- 17 Indecent assault on a male
- 18 Gross indecency between males
- 20 Indecent assault on a female
- 22 Unlawful sexual intercourse with a girl under 16
- 25 Abduction of female
- 74 Gross indecency with a child
- 139 Indecent exposure

### 1.3. Acquisitive crime

#### 1.3.1. Burglary

##### 1.3.1.1. Domestic burglary

- 28 Domestic Burglary
- 28A Burglary in a dwelling
- 28B Attempted burglary in a dwelling
- 28C Distraction burglary in a dwelling
- 28D Attempted distraction burglary in a dwelling
- 29 Aggravated burglary in a dwelling

##### 1.3.1.2. Non-domestic burglary

- 30 Historic code
- 30A Burglary in a building other than a dwelling
- 30B Attempted burglary in a building other than a dwelling
- 31 Aggravated burglary in a building other than a dwelling
- 30 Historic code

##### 1.3.2.1. Robbery - personal

- 34B Robbery of personal property

##### 1.3.2.2. Robbery - business

- 34A Robbery of business property

#### 1.3.3. Vehicle crime

- 37.2 Aggravated vehicle taking
- 48 Theft or unauthorised taking of motor vehicle
- 2.0007 - of which, attempted theft of a vehicle
- 126 Interfering with a motor vehicle
- 45 Theft from vehicle

#### 1.3.4. Shoplifting

- 46 Shoplifting

#### 1.3.5. Other acquisitive crime

- 39 Theft from the person
- 40 Theft in a dwelling other than from an automatic machine or meter
- 44 Theft or unauthorised taking of a pedal cycle
- 49 Other theft
- 35 Blackmail
- 41 Theft by an employee
- 42 Theft of mail
- 43 Dishonest use of electricity
- 47 Theft from automatic machine or meter
- 53B Preserved other fraud and repealed fraud offences (pre Fraud Act 2006)

#### 1.4. Criminal damage & arson

- 56 Arson
- 56A Arson endangering life
- 56B Arson not endangering life
- 58A Criminal damage to a dwelling
- 58B Criminal damage to a building other than a dwelling
- 58C Criminal damage to a vehicle
- 58D Other criminal damage
- 58E Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a dwelling
- 58F Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a building other than a dwelling
- 58G Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a vehicle
- 58H Racially or religiously aggravated other criminal damage

## 2. Non victim-based Crime

#### 2.1. Public disorder

- 9A Public fear, alarm or distress
- 9B Racially or religiously aggravated public fear, alarm or distress
- 64 Riot
- 65 Violent disorder
- 66 Other offences against the State or public order
- 62 Treason
- 63 Treason - felony

## **2.2. Drug offences**

### **2.2.1. Drug trafficking**

92A      Trafficking in controlled drugs

### **2.2.2. Drug possession**

92C      Other drug offences

92D      Possession of controlled drugs (excl. cannabis)

92E      Possession of controlled drugs (cannabis)

92B      Historic code possession of controlled drugs

## **2.3. Crimes disrupted**

8B      Historic code - possession of weapons

5C      Possession of items to endanger life

10A     Possession of firearms with intent

10B     Possession of firearms offences

10C     Possession of other weapons

10D     Possession of article with blade or point

33      Going equipped for stealing, etc

53J     Possession of articles for use in fraud

54      Handling stolen goods

59      Threat or possession with intent to commit criminal damage

61A     Possession of false documents

90      Other knife offences

## **2.4. Other state-based offences**

15      Concealing an infant death close to birth

26      Bigamy

55      Bankruptcy and insolvency

67      Perjury

68      Libel

75      Betting, gaming and lotteries

76      Aiding suicide

78      Immigration Acts

79      Perverting the course of justice

80      Absconding from lawful custody

81      Other firearms offences

82      Customs and Revenue offences

83      Bail offences

84      Trade descriptions etc

85      Health and Safety offences



86	Obscene publications etc
87	Protection from eviction
89	Adulteration of food
91	Public health offences
94	Planning laws
95	Disclosure, obstruction, false or misleading statements etc
99	Other notifiable offences (class 98/99)
802	Dangerous driving
814	Fraud, forgery etc associated with vehicle or driver records
27	Soliciting for the purposes of prostitution
24	Exploitation of prostitution
38	Profiting from or concealing knowledge of the proceeds of crime
69	Offender management act
53H	Making or supplying articles for use in fraud

### **3. Fraud & forgery**

51	Fraud by company director
52	False accounting
53C	Fraud by false representation: cheque, plastic card and online bank accounts (not PSP)
53D	Fraud by false representation: other frauds
53E	Fraud by failing to disclose information
53F	Fraud by abuse of position
60	Forgery or use of false drug prescription
61	Other forgery
53A	Cheque and credit card fraud (pre Fraud Act 2006)
53G	Obtaining services dishonestly (to be discontinued)

## Appendix 2 – POA Categories

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

### 1) Local policing

- a. Neighbourhood policing
- b. Incident (response) management
- c. Local investigation
- d. Specialist community liaison
- e. Local command team and support overheads

### 2) Dealing with the public

- a. Local call centres / front desk
- b. Central communications unit
- c. Contact management units
- d. Dealing with the public command team and support overheads

### 3) Criminal justice arrangements

- a. Custody / prisoner handling
- b. Criminal justice
- c. Police national computer
- d. Criminal record bureau
- e. Coroner assistance
- f. Fixed penalty schemes (central ticket office)
- g. Property officer / stores
- h. 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

### 5) Specialist operations

- a. Central operations command team and support overheads
- b. Air operations
- c. Mounted police
- d. Specialist terrain
- e. Dogs section
- f. Level 1 advanced public order
- g. Airport & ports policing unit
- h. Firearms unit
- i. Civil contingencies and planning

### 6) Intelligence

- a. Central intelligence command team and support overheads
- b. Intelligence analysis / threat assessments
- c. Intelligence gathering

### 7) Specialist investigations

- a. Crime support command team and support overheads
- b. Major investigation unit
- c. Economic crime (including regional asset recovery team)
- d. Specialist investigation units
- e. Serious & organised crime unit
- f. Public protection

### 8) Investigative support

- a. Scenes of crime officers
- b. External forensic costs
- c. Fingerprint / dna bureau
- d. Photographic image recovery
- e. Other forensic services
- f. Investigative support command team and support overheads

9) National policing

- a. Secondments (out of force)
- b. Counter terrorism / special branch
- c. ACPO 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. Freedom of information
- p. Social club support and force band
- q. Insurance / risk management
- r. Catering

11) Police authority

- a. Democratic representation
- b. Police authority support
- c. Other costs
- d. Yreasury management
- e. Internal audit

12) Central costs

- a. Revenue contribution to capital
- b. Capital financing
- c. Pensions and exit costs

## Appendix 3

### Restorative Justice / Community resolutions

#### Forces who return data on RJ / CR (to Mar-12)

Force	Approx RJ (inc other)
Avon & Somerset	5,287
Cambridgeshire	1,273
Derbyshire	5,829
Devon and Cornwall	5,380
Dorset	236
Dyfed-Powys	197
Essex	3,213
Gloucestershire	2,594
Greater Manchester	2,601
Gwent	205
Hampshire	4,038
Leicestershire	27
Lincolnshire	6
Merseyside	2,117
Norfolk	1,992
Northamptonshire	2,509
Northumbria	2,011
Suffolk	4,003
Surrey	3,492
Sussex	3,891
Thames Valley	4,663
Warwickshire	383
West Mercia	4,540
Wiltshire	1,202

### Outsourcing of Custody

#### Forces who outsource custody (as at 26/07/2012)

Force	with
Cleveland	Reliance
Norfolk	Reliance
Suffolk	Reliance
Sussex	Reliance
TVP	Reliance
Warwickshire	Reliance
West Mercia	Reliance
Lancashire	G4S
Lincolnshire	G4S
South Wales	G4S
Staffordshire	G4S