



Report to: Performance Review Committee
Agenda item: 5
Date: 22 July 2013
Subject: Thematic: Data Quality
Sponsor: Deputy Chief Constable
For: Information

1. PURPOSE OF PAPER

1.1 This purpose of this paper is update members on quality assurance processes in place relating to key datasets.

2. DATA QUALITY

2.1 Crime and Incident Data

2.1.1 The crime and incident audit team consists of a Force Crime Registrar (FCR), Deputy FCR, two full-time and one part-time auditor. One of the full-time auditors is based at the First Contact Centre and the other at the Crime Recording Centre, to help support BTP's compliance with incident data and provide additional support in relation to the application of the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) and National Standard of Incident Recording (NSIR).

2.1.2 For a number of years the focus of the Crime Audit team had been to undertake an audit of a specific theme / crime type on an infrequent basis with the findings reported to the Contact Handling Board. Whilst this audit regime provided reassurance in relation to certain crimes, this was not undertaken on a risk basis.

2.1.3 The Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) through the Integrity & Compliance Board (ICB) requested that the remit was widened to include risk based auditing that could compromise crime recording standards and ethical disposal. As a consequence the audit regime was changed to monthly risk based auditing looking across the whole spectrum of crime types and currently focusing on the following:

- No Crimes
- Detections (now listed as Outcomes)
- Offences Taken into Consideration (TIC)
- Community Resolutions (CRS)



-
- Cleared Other than by Prosecution (COP)
 - Cautions
 - Penalty Notices for Disorder
 - Reclassifications
 - Lost Property
 - Anti Social Behaviour
 - Crime Related Incidents (CRI)
 - Repeat and Vulnerable Victims

2.1.4 The source documents used that provide direction and guidance for recording crimes are the NSIR, the National Crime Recording Standard and the HOCR. For each monthly crime audit, data is selected from all incidents reported to BTP within a specific time frame. An agreed formula is used to give a confidence level of 95% which is accurate to +/- 3% identifies the data sample to be scrutinised. From this the data sample for each Area is then selected based on the percentage of crimes recorded during the previous financial year.

2.1.5 From the crimes selected the audits look across the following and highlight areas for improvement (AFI) as appropriate:

- Correct classifications of crime and connecting records
- Missed detections
- SOCO involvement
- CCTV issues
- Victim updates
- Victim status
- Evidence of an investigation plan
- Evidence of supervision

2.1.6 Monthly reports are submitted to ICB for monitoring and directing any action to be taken. The AFIs are passed to the DCS Crime for actioning and reporting back to ICB. Additionally the FCR has provided Designated Decision Maker training to DCIs and CMU Managers in relation to the HOCR and their role within this, as well as providing guidance on specific activities.

2.1.7 This new audit regime has allowed the Crime Audit team to highlight areas where there are training or process issues that would not necessarily have been flagged up before. These include the lack of supervisory oversight of investigations, inconsistent DCI endorsement of 'no crime' decisions, the processes relating to the use of Community Resolutions, and the authority levels required for the issuing of cautions. Following publication of the HMIC report on Crime Recording in Kent in June 2013, the FCR undertook a review to ascertain how BTP was positioned in relation to the issues raised in the Kent report. The results from this report and the monthly audit report for June were presented to the Service Excellence Board (SEB) in July 2013 and the same areas outlined above were highlighted for action.

2.1.8 In light of these findings, the DCC has tasked all Areas with undertaking a further analysis of the AFIs from the Crime Audit Reports as well as a plan to address the issues highlighted above. Full updates are to be provided to SEB in August 2013, after which a national action plan will be maintained by Audit and Compliance (SDD) with progress regularly monitored by the Integrity and Compliance Board.

2.1.9 *Crime Audits, Scotland* – For the most recent audit, 2012, BTP achieved 98.28% for Test 1 (Incidents Recorded Correctly) and 97.22% for Test 2 (Crimes Recorded Correctly), which is above the Scotland overall total of 97.02% and 96.13% respectively and above that achieved in 2011. For BTP this equates to one failure. The audits were undertaken by the Scottish forces themselves with the results shared with the ACPOS Scottish Crime Registrars' Audit Sub Group.

2.2 Comparative Statistics (CompStat)

2.2.1 The Corporate Resources CompStat process is now centrally managed, maintained and produced by the Analysis & Performance team, who provide an independent and impartial analysis of performance across all Corporate Resources departments. This ensures that data from key BTP systems such ORIGIN, Training Administration System (TAS), Concept 500 (helpdesk systems) and numerous other sources is centrally quality assured and reported on. Many processes which used to be manual and involves several individuals are now automated meaning there is now much less risk of human error as well as making increasing efficiency. Centralisation has also ensured that all



reporting is impartial and objective and any issues regarding performance or data quality are quickly acted upon.

2.2.2 There are over 100 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for 2013/14, with at least 50 completely new measures that have not previously been collated and measured for performance purposes. This includes performance in areas such as Human Resources; Learning & Development; Estates; Facilities; Maintenance; Uniform; Vehicle Fleet; Sustainability; Technology; Information Management; Finance; Procurement; Criminal Justice; and Custody.

2.2.3 Areas now overseen by Analysis & Performance include:

- Dip sampling helpdesk incidents to improve customer service
- Management and resolution of complaints
- Negotiating better management information from external service providers
- Origin and Payroll record accuracy
- Staff recognition and reward
- Improving the time taken to recruit
- Provision of mandatory training
- Reducing training wastage
- Minimising training abstractions for non mandatory training
- Sickness and availability for work
- Operating within affordable workforce target
- Billing / Payment accuracy and timeliness
- Purchase Orders
- Gas, electricity and water usage
- Paper and ink/toner usage
- Fleet fuel consumption
- Reducing the time vehicles spend off the road
- Health & Safety inspections
- Estates/sites ranked fit for purpose
- Uniform delivery and reduction of stock-outs
- Timely body armour provision
- Internal mail delivery times
- Printer availability and maintenance



-
- Network availability
 - Critical application availability
 - Delivery of hardware
 - Information management
 - Provision of FOI requests
 - Criminal records checks
 - Data Protection Act
 - Criminal Justice
 - Custody

2.2.4 The process will be further enhanced by the Analysis & Performance team with the introduction of Six Sigma Statistical Process Controls (SPC). Clearly defined SPC will allow analysis to quality control KPIs and ensure that processes are operating at their full potential and on track for success. SPC will also greatly assist in distinguishing between actual performance exceptions and random variation. This will also allow analysts to evidence if a change in process has made a genuine impact on performance or not and provide an “early warning signal” when performance is deteriorating.

2.3 Stop and Search Records

2.3.1 In relation to Stop and Search, BTP currently undertakes the following audits / reviews:

- Initial review by subject of stop / search
- Review by Supervisor
- Regular dip samples by FIS System Manager
- Quarterly review of formatted data pack for the Stop, Search and Account Steering Group / BTPA PRC on a six-monthly basis.

2.3.2 In addition, following the HMIC Inspection on Stop and Search, BTP has developed new Stop and Search guidance which will be launched by ACC Thomas at the next Stop and Search Steering Group meeting on 25 July 2013. The guidance will implement BTP's action plan to deliver improvements to Stop and Search, including data quality.

2.3.3 In addition to the audits and reviews described above, Areas will be required to send hard copies of all stop and search records to FHQ on a timely basis. Due to resourcing challenges in AIBs, and the ongoing force restructure, these will be subject to regular



review and dip sampling by relevant FHQ staff, focusing initially on the priorities highlighted by the Home Secretary in the recent speech to Parliament, and on the issues identified by HMIC. Issues identified through this process, and through the ongoing dip sampling undertaken by FIB, will be followed up directly with Areas, and through future Steering Group meetings.

2.3.4 In advance of the new guidance being launched, FIB has recently conducted dip sampling into the proper use of relevant powers, data quality on individual records, positive outcomes, drugs searches, and officers conducting the highest number of searches. Further research has also been conducted on benchmarking, and relevant findings / comparisons will be included in the next Stop and Search pack, to be sent to the BTPA PRC in October 2013.

2.3.5 BTP has also started to explore opportunities to streamline recording practices further in line with the Home Secretary's priorities and has visited Greater Manchester Police to review its new recording initiative, through which officers record searches using Airwave rather than paper records. This initiative also has the potential to deliver data quality improvements; the Steering Group meeting on 25 July 2013 will receive an initial presentation on this and consider BTP's approach.

2.4 User Satisfaction Survey (USS)

2.4.1 The USS, also referred to as the Victims of Crime Survey, is a telephone survey of victims of theft, vehicle, violent and racial offences. Interviews lasting approximately 15 minutes are conducted with a sample of victims on a weekly basis throughout the performance year. The survey is conducted by SPA Future Thinking, a market research company based in High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire. This survey was developed by the Home Office for use by the police service as a whole, so it is widely viewed as an independent, robust and comparable method of measuring victim satisfaction.

2.4.2 *Sampling and data accuracy* – The survey sample is derived from the total number of eligible crimes (as defined by Home Office guidance) reported during the preceding performance year. Table 1 outlines the total eligible population (i.e. all theft, vehicle, violent and racial offences) broken down by BTP Area and by crime type for 2012/13.



Table 1: Total eligible population by Area and crime type

No. of crimes 2012/13	Theft	Vehicle	Violent	Racial	Total
London North	5,048	193	1,058	325	6,624
London South	4,863	250	1,391	313	6,817
London Underground	6,504	80	1,278	343	8,205
North Eastern	1,298	115	445	97	1,955
North Western	949	93	501	81	1,624
Wales and Western	1,687	192	471	138	2,488
Scotland	346	18	265	17	646
Forcewide	20,695	941	5,409	1,314	28,359

2.4.3 To get a representative sample from this BTP uses a 'sample size calculator' developed by the Home Office. This provides a sample with a 3.5% (two-directional) confidence interval, which means that the sample estimates, i.e. the reported victim satisfaction rate, will be accurate to within 3.5% of the total population satisfaction rate 95% of the time. So if the satisfaction rate measured by the survey is 85%, BTP can be confident that the satisfaction rate within the total population will lie somewhere between 81.5% and 88.5% 95 times out of 100 hundred. Aiming for this level of accuracy requires a specific number of interviews to be conducted over the course of the performance year.

2.4.4 BTP then adjusts this sample by boosting certain categories with small populations and reducing categories with large populations. In two cases, Scottish vehicle and Scottish racial (highlighted in Table 2), this has resulted in a sample size that exceeds the available number of crimes – in these cases all available sample should be utilised. This is to ensure that certain categories, as shown in Table 2 below, return the maximum possible number of responses. For these categories BTP is effectively trying to survey the total eligible population rather than a representative sample. The annual figures are then divided by 12 to provide the number of interviews that BTP requires SPA Future Thinking to achieve each month.

Table 2: 'Adjusted sample' by Area and crime type

No. of interviews 2013/14	Theft	Vehicle	Violent	Racial	Total
London North	443	67	105	88	703
London South	416	70	135	84	705
London Underground	471	55	105	86	717
North Eastern	308	66	120	66	560
North Western	256	60	154	61	531
Wales and Western	336	81	106	75	598
Scotland	157	29	137	32	355
Forcewide	2,387	428	862	492	4,169



2.4.5 *Procedure* – The interview schedule for each month is determined before the start of each performance year. For example, for April 2013 interviewing began on 24 March and finished on 28 April. As interviews are conducted between six and 12 weeks following the initial crime report, this interviewing period corresponds to a crime reported from the period 10 February to 9 March. The six to 12 week interval is based on two considerations: 1) sufficient time for the victim to receive a service; and 2) an upper limit to prevent memory fade.

2.4.6 The data, from which SPA Future Thinking randomly selects a sample, is sent to them via email five days before interviewing is due to commence. To ensure data security and efficient transfer of data, the file is sent using the secure Criminal Justice Secure eMail (CJSM) to SPA Future Thinking. Upon completion, the file is returned to BTP, again via CJSM, analysed and reported on.

2.4.7 *Content of the survey* – this is for the most part prescribed by the Home Office. Individual forces do have some discretion regarding a small number of questions but this is largely restricted to survey diagnostics. To ensure comparability, the questions which comprise the basis of the Quality of Service (QoS) Key Performance Measures, including Ease of Contact, Police Actions, Follow Up, Treatment and Overall Satisfaction, are mandatory and cannot be changed. It is these performance measures which form the basis of the QoS submission to the Force Management Information (FMI) document.

2.5 Network Rail

2.5.1 Using Network Rail's (NWR) data, BTP has set a National Policing Plan target to reduce police-related disruption minutes from the 2012-13 total by 3%. All BTP Areas (with the exception of London Underground) have this target, which applies to the whole of the Area.

2.5.2 North Western and Scotland Areas have Local Policing Plan targets to reduce NWR disruption minutes on six specific routes, similar to last year's national target. North Eastern also has a local target to reduce disruption minutes in relation to two specific categories; cable theft and trespass.



2.5.3 BTP's target is based on the following NWR disruption categories:

- Trespass
- Cable vandalism / theft
- Level crossing incidents
- Level crossing misuse
- Vandalism / theft
- Vandalism / theft (including the placing of objects on the line)
- Disorders & drunks
- Fatalities / injuries caused by being hit by train
- Fatalities /injuries sustained on a platform after falling or being struck by train.

2.5.4 The data is provided to BTP on a daily basis by NWR showing all disruption incidents recorded since the beginning of the financial year. Area analysts receive this data and on occasions challenge the figures through their Area contacts at NWR. Although NWR's categorisation of incidents is sometimes debated, on the whole the data is accurate and there is quick resolution of any faults. There is a good relationship between Analysis & Performance and the NWR seconded analyst in FHQ and the data providers in Milton Keynes and this facilitates quick and easy resolution of any issues.

2.6 Criminal Justice Data

2.6.1 The Criminal Justice (CJ) performance measures were implemented to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the force Criminal Justice System (CJS) by identifying processes or performance issues that needed to be resolved.

2.6.2 There is a need to correlate the pre-charge performance data with the post-charge prosecution success to ensure BTP has confidence in the 'right first time' process. The CJ performance data is in two sections with four fundamental measures in each section as detailed in the below table:



Stage	Measure	Description
Pre-charge	Bail	To determine bail culture internally and externally and to identify any potential blockers in the process in terms of evidential delivery, local HO force service etc.
	Return to Officers	Case-files returned to officers by the Justice Units for rework to address quality or evidentiary issues.
	Disposal Types	Disposals by Force Crime Group to determine the levels of Charge, Summons and Out of Court disposals against offence type to identify opportunities to improve disposal decisions.
	Victim Care	Timeliness of OIC updates to victims against the time-frames outlined in the Victims Code of Practice (VCoP). To ensure compliance with the VCoP.
Post-charge	Witness Care	Post-charge service given to victims and witnesses by Justice Units highlighting the level of Witness Care provided by BTP. Monitors witness attendance at court, the number of Full Needs Assessments (FNAs) and Referrals.
	Warrant Management	The effective management of warrants showing the number of warrants issued, executed and outstanding. The number of executed warrants should be higher than those issued; to keep the number of outstanding warrants at a manageable level.
	PNC Performance	Timeliness of court results onto PNC, after receipt at the Justice Unit. There is a national 7 working day target of updating offences on PNC with an internal target of 3 working days for Justice Units.
	CPS Charging Performance	Measurement of CPS prosecution data, detailing successful outcomes versus unsuccessful outcomes.

2.6.3 There are a series of systems that are used in isolation of each other to formulate the CJ performance data as follows:

- CRIME
- Victim Portal
- Justice Administration System (JAS)
- Custody spreadsheets
- PNC
- Warrant Management spreadsheets
- Compass CMS - CPS external data



2.6.4 The data is produced on a monthly basis for all Areas Commanders as a performance framework to support Area policing. The data is supported by appendices which align to the eight principles in the table above and highlight exceptions and trends in terms of officers, supervisors, police posts and police Areas. The performance data is overseen by the Justice Directorate and exceptions are reported to SEB on a monthly basis where Area Commanders are asked to report on performance issues.

2.6.5 The CJ performance data is relatively new and is continually reviewed in terms of quality and delivery to ensure accurate and meaningful data. An example of this is a change to the CPS Charging Performance measure using BTP's attrition data from July 2013 instead, which is due to the CPS performance framework discounting judge directed Out of Court Disposals as successes, un-timeliness of court resulting and inaccurate recording of rationale. Although the CPS data is beneficial in terms of national benchmarking over a long period of time, as this is governed by CPS with their desired framework, it does not truly reflect BTP's attrition which renders the data incompatible for driving performance.

2.7 Police National Database

2.7.1 HMIC published the report '*Mistakes were made*' in March 2013, which was a review into the allegations and intelligence material concerning Jimmy Saville between 1964 and 2012. The report raised a number of considerations for all forces including BTP, particularly around Police National Database (PND). Through the Integrity and Compliance Board the DCC requested that the Crime Department look at the findings of the report in relation to BTP and at BTP's use of the database in general.

2.7.2 The PND emerged from the investigation into the Soham murders and the subsequent public inquiry. It was designed to provide a single view of data held in police intelligence, custody, crime, child and domestic abuse systems across the whole of the UK. PND was introduced into BTP in 2011, following the implementation process by a project board between late 2009 and January 2011. However PND was not fully implemented at this time and final issues regarding the Confidential Network and software for the issuing of PND cards to authorised users were transferred to business as usual to resolve. BTP has access to PND through terminals at FHQ, Force Control Room London and at selected police stations.



2.7.3 BTP currently uploads data manually on a weekly basis to PND which is in line with other forces. Automated upload is not possible at present as the aggregated data is considered by PND to be 'confidential' and cannot therefore be transferred via the 'pnn' network; a problem faced by most forces.

2.7.4 The creation of a Nominal record is a manual process within each Area Intelligence Bureau (AIB). Following agreement, the criteria was published in January 2011 and Nominal records are created when the subject of an Intelligence report meets the specific criteria. From discussions with MoPI staff, the Director of Intelligence (DOI) has ascertained that Nominal records are not created in all cases where they should be and that some records are being protected beyond reasonable levels. Protected intelligence does not get uploaded to PND.

2.7.5 A gold group has been convened and the following actions / priority pieces of work carried out:

- To ensure that Nominal records are uploaded, a key word search to identify probable 5x5x5 reports was undertaken and those identified passed to the relevant AIB to have the Nominal created.
- All protected records older than two years were unprotected and records that still required protection placed in a file for the specific investigation. The decision to protect a file will be removed from the Area to the Detective Chief Inspector (DCI) in Intelligence or the DOI.
- If the MoPI team find any records that should have a Nominal record created, then authority is sought from the DCI and a request to the relevant AIB to create a Nominal is made; this is then uploaded to PND the following week.
- AIBs have been briefed and provided with guidance in relation to Nominal uploads. Recruitment is underway to get Researchers in to clear the back records. Four suitable candidates have been identified for a six month period and are currently undergoing vetting; they will be based in FIB.
- Technical problems with card issuing and the Confidential Network have now been resolved.



2.7.6 The ability to provide a detailed audit of PND is limited. There are no plans nationally to provide training and all forces are being encouraged to learn via the manual of guidance. As an interim solution Areas complete a PND spreadsheet which records the police number and the reason for PND search. Moving forward this information will be used to audit the use of PND within BTP.

3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 That members note this paper.