Agenda Item 2:

Performance data Q2 2010/11: BTPA supplementary analysis

1. Agenda Item 2: Business Health Indicators

Headline areas for discussion at end of Q2[1]:

- Variation in Area performance against Plan has reduced since the last meeting – NE Area is still facing a challenge but the position is improving
- Target to reduce notifiable crime - only 1 of 7 Areas are meeting this target and 3 of 7 are failing the target by more than 10%
- Local targets to detect violence, sexual and robbery offences (NE & NW are still facing a challenge against this target)
- Progress against sickness targets – the position was much improved from Q1 to the end of August – however the position has deteriorated for police officers and PCSO sickness to the end Sept
- Staff and officer turnover – there is still a great deal of variation by Area and employee type
- Technology department improvement programme outcomes
- PDAs – non-use rates and training challenges
- Freedom of Information Act compliance and oversight by ICO

[1] Last full set of data held at BTPA Executive at time of preparing report – next dataset due to be released 16.10.10.

1.1 Policing Plan: progress against national and local targets

At the end of August Area performance against the National plan varied widely with non-London Areas facing the greatest challenge.

Area	National targets met as at end Aug 2010 (position at May 2010)	National targets being missed by > 10% (position at May 2010)	Change since Q1 report
LN	9/11 (9/11)	1/11 (1/11)	-
LS	5/11 (4/11)	5/11 (6/11)	↑
LU	11/11 (8/11)	0/11 (1/11)	↑
NE	4/11 (3/11)	6/11 (7/11)	↑
NW	8/11 (6/11)	2/11 (2/11)	↑
W&W	6/11 (4/11)	4/11 (6/11)	↑
Scotland	4/11 (4/11)	4/11 (5/11)	↑

NE Area in particular is facing a challenge on a significant number of both National and Local targets though the overall position is improved since Q1. Notifiable crime detections per officer on NE are also low vs the BTP average (0.96 vs 1.12) and lower than ytd in 2009/10 (1.43) and 2008/9 (1.84).

Where Areas are failing targets it would be useful to explore whether there any positive aspects – for example numbers of detections have increased or detection rates have improved; this was hinted at at the October FMT meeting.

1.2 Reducing notifiable crime (also non-notifiable NW)

Again the whole force is close to achieving this target, though the margin of failure has increased from -1.4 to -3.9% against target. Performance by Area also remains variable.

This is counter to the most recent annual British Crime Survey and Recorded Crime Statistics for the year to end of June 2010[2], in this report crime in England and Wales is down by 8%, for BTP the figure is slightly less at -7%. BTP's ongoing position against other forces will need to be monitored in the future.

Of note within current performance figures is that North East is now at a 5% increase on levels of recorded crime compared with 2009/10 (+135 offences) though this is largely accounted for by cable related theft (+148) and serious and violent offences (+19) which both seem to have action plans in place.

North East, North West and London South are all showing an increase in both notifiable and non-notifiable crime compared with ytd 2009 as at end of August 2010. North West is showing and increase in non-notifiable crime of = 18% ytd.

Question: Do we know what crime types this increase relates to – is something different happening on BTP NW that might be mirrored elsewhere in the future?

By contrast London North; London Underground and BTP Scotland have all achieved reductions for all recorded offences (-9.0%; -16.8% and -4.6% respectively). Of particular note is London Underground with a 33.5% reduction in non-notifiable crime compared with ytd in 2009.

Again – given the overall position in relation to notifiable crime is there a sense of why these improvements have been achieved and is there any good practice that could be shared across BTP? The cover paper doesn't really link activities with outcomes – without understanding BTP's role in this improved performance (versus actions by operators or other forces) it is difficult to know how sustainable it is.

---

[2] Recorded Crime and British Crime Survey data (21st October, 2010) July 2009 to June 2010

1.3 Local targets: detect violence, sexual and robbery offences

These are 'local' targets on both NE and NW and are both being missed by 10 percentage points or more; however this is an improved position since the Q1 report when the Areas were 35 and 17 percentage points adrift respectively.
It would be useful to understand what actions have been taken to secure this level of improvement thus; for example have potential detections in the system been exploited or has there been a change in approach?

1.4 Progress against sickness targets[3]

At Force level, by the end of August performance had improved significantly since our last Q1 report with all Areas seeing an upward trend in performance. However this position had reversed at the end September

Of note:

- **5 of 7 Areas are now failing the police officer sickness target and the position has deteriorated on 4 of 7 Areas since last month**
- **6 of 7 Areas are meeting the staff sickness target but the position has deteriorated in 4 of 7 Areas since last month**
- NE Area is now failing sickness targets for both officers and staff
- The impact of long term female PCSO sickness on LU Area as discussed at the August FMT meeting.

The position on sickness seems to have been fluctuating on most Areas since Q1; although a deteriorating trend may now be emerging. Recommend that the Group receives a further update on the position on sickness at its January 2011 meeting – should include an analysis of the management of the 20% of employees who account for (this is 913 employees[4] having 13588[5] days off sick = 14 days per person)

[3] BTP HR Management information report to end Sept 2010

[4] 20% of a headcount of 4566 employees as at August FMI

Also are the figures reported expressed as full time equivalents (FTE) or actual headcounts – there have been some historical concerns about accuracy of part-time employee record keeping though this may have been addressed via EPS records. Home Office forces record sickness in terms of FTE so it is difficult to compare BTP's performance with the current data set.

1.5 Turnover[6]

Turnover varies a great deal both by employee type and by Area, for example, as at end of September – for all employee types BME and female turnover continues to be higher than for the force average. For example;

- FHQ
    - Female employees 18.8% vs 12.4% average
- London North
    - BME officers (12.9% vs 6.3% ave)
- London Underground
    - BME staff (26.7 % vs 18.0% ave)
    - Female staff (21.5 % vs 16.8 % ave)
    - Female PSCOs (25.9% vs 10.8% ave)
- London South
    - BME PCSOs (19.0% vs 8.9% ave)

---

[5] 13588 total days sickness as at end of August

[6] BTP HR Management information report to end Sept 2010

Question: What additional work is ongoing to understand and address these differences? How does this pattern compare to other Forces?

The cover paper suggests that some exit research has been done by AMP but without knowing the nature of the sample (how large, how selected, when the interviewee left) it would be difficult to state how robust the initial findings may be.

1.6 Disclosure Unit performance – FOIA compliance

On 1st October 2010 the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) published a list[7] of organisations that will be subject to a 3 month monitoring period as a result of the number of complaints the ICO has received about non-compliance with statutory timeframes for responding to Freedom of Information Act Requests. British Transport Police is included in this list (along with the Metropolitan Police Service) and will be subject to ongoing monitoring by the ICO until the end of December.

Questions:

What is the nature of the challenge facing BTP around non-compliance with FOI timeframes? Has this been raised as an operational risk?

What actions are in place to improve performance in this area? What are the long term plans to ensure service delivery in this area of work?

[7] http://www.ico.gov.uk/upload/documents/library/freedom_of_information/notices/list_of_ico_monitored_bodies.pdf

1.7 Other organisational KPIs

A review of the Force Management Information document for end of August 2010 identified the following issues that may be worthy of further discussion at this or the next performance review group meeting;

- Technology:

  Technology service desk performance was highlighted in the last report to this Group – data provided in the end of August organisational KPI document suggests that this situation has deteriorated further for all service desk KPIs in the last quarter.

  A 50 day review of IT provision is now underway

  Questions: what issues have been identified that might be impacting on the technology service desk performance? E.g. are there staffing/hardware/software issues, have call volumes changed significantly?

  What outcomes and associated KPIs have been developed as part of this project? Tasks are identified but it is not clear what benefits are anticipated at the end of the project.

- **PDAs**

  The Force report indicates that 800 underused devices have now been returned, from the recent FMI report this appears to be out of total of 1033 allocated devices[8]; this data suggests that that 77% of devices have now been returned and are awaiting redeployment. We must understand why there has been such a high return rate before more officers are trained and these devices are redeployed.

  Question: How many currently PDA trained officers now no longer have devices? Why are they not using them?

[8] As at end July 2010

Question: What are the risks around funding further training if they are unpopular devices? Given levels of investment in equipment and training to date (and that planned for the future) we would suggest looking at this issue in more detail in next quarter's thematic on resource deployment.

2. Agenda Item 3: Use of Stop & Search Powers

2.1 Use of S44 powers.

Question: Use of S44 powers was suspended in July 2010- how is BTP monitoring compliance with this ruling? How is unauthorised usage being managed?

2.2 Proportionality – *S60 and S44 very different patterns of use by ethnicity (see p7 table 2) what analysis has been done, or is planned, to explain this position? (Use of S60 variance may be largely explained by use at the Notting Hill Carnival but this is not explicit in the paper.)*