

HMIC Value for Money Profiles 2012

Durham Constabulary

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** Durham
- b** Cumbria
- c** Derbyshire
- d** Gwent
- e** Humberside
- f** Nottinghamshire
- g** South Wales
- h** South Yorkshire

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 in at 31st March 2012, and so

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



Police officer FTE per 1,000




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).



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



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



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

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

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

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.

	£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	2.07 <<
£000/FTE	£49.5k	£51.1k

Source: POA Statistics 2012/13 estimates and ADR502

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 incidentsⁱ 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 forcesⁱⁱ 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.

ⁱ 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.

ⁱⁱ 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: $(\text{Force cost per head} - \text{MSG cost per head}) * \text{population}$.

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: $(\text{Police officer spend} + \text{Police officer overtime}) / \text{Gross Revenue Expenditure (GRE)}$.

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 612k

	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
Police officers	73.5	120	109	6.8
Police staff	22.2	36	40	-2.2
PCSOs	4.6	7	8	-0.1
Workforce	100.2	164	157	4.5
Non-staff costs	24.5	40	42	-1.1
Earned income	-1.7	-3	-7	2.6
Net revenue exp.	123.1	201	191	6.0
Total exc national	121.5	199	188	6.7






Source: POA estimates 2012/13

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)	71.1	116.2	105.6	6.4
Police overtime	2.4	4.0	3.5	0.3
Total	73.5	120.2	109.1	6.8

PO overtime % salary	% sal	Avg	Diff. £m
National functions	0.0%	0.1%	-0.1
Other	3.4%	3.1%	0.2
Total	3.4%	3.3%	0.1

	Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	2.24 2.08	4.9
£000/FTE	£51.9k £50.9k	1.3

Source: POA Statistics 2012/13 estimates and ADR502

Budgeted FTE 2012/13 (POA)	1,370
FTE Mar 12 (ADR502)	1,363

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

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
22	36.3	39.9	-2.2

	Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	1.23	1.26
£000/FTE	29.4k	32.0k






Budgeted FTE 2012/13 (POA)	754
FTE Mar 12 (ADR502)	671

PCSOs

£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
4.6	7.5	7.6	-0.1

	Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	0.29	0.26
£000/FTE	£26.1k	£29.6k


Budgeted FTE 2012/13 (POA)	175
FTE Mar 12 (ADR502)	173



Source: POA Statistics 2012/13 estimates and ADR502

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 £100m





	£m	% staff	Avg	Diff. £m
Supplies & services*	11.3	11.2%	13.3%	-2.01
Premises	4.8	4.7%	5.0%	-0.24
Transport	3.1	3.1%	3.1%	-0.03
Collaboration payments	0.0	0.0%	0.9%	-0.94
Other employee exps**	1.8	1.8%	2.6%	-0.79
Non-staff costs	20.9	20.8%	24.8%	-4.00

Capital financing	3.6	3.6%	2.5%	1.16
Total	24.5	24.4%	27.3%	-2.85

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

* Inc 3rd party payments exc collaboration

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








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 612k

	£m	£/head	Avg
Central funding			
Formula funding*	87	142	118
Specific grants	5	9	12
Local funding			
Council tax	29	48	60
Reserves (transfers)	2	3	1
Net revenue exp.	123	201	191



Band D tax rate	Avg
£153	£166



Council Tax £/head	Yield of £1 CT	Avg
£48	£0.31	£0.36







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

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

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 612k


	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
Sales, fees, charges & rents	0.9	1.5	2.2	-0.4
Reimbursed Income				
- Collaboration	0.0	0.0	1.1	-0.7
- Exc collaboration	0.7	1.1	1.8	-0.4
Partnership income	0.0	0.0	1.0	-0.6
Special police services	0.0	0.0	0.7	-0.4
Interest	0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.1
Total earned income	1.7	2.7	7.1	-2.6 <

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	165.4	166.9	159.1	150.5	-9%
Reserves	-0.9	-1.9	0.0	2.7	
Council tax	45.8	47.8	47.7	48.0	5%
Total funding	210.4	212.8	206.8	201.2	-4%

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	£148	£153	£153	£153
Average	£157	£162	£162	£166

Source: CIPFA statistics; POA Statistics 2012/13 estimates

Durham







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 612k

	FTE	per 1,000	Avg	Diff	% Total	Avg
Community POs	660	1.08	1.09	-6	30%	31%
PCSOs	173	0.28	0.24	25	8%	7%
Sub-total	833	1.36	1.33	19	38%	38%
Other POs	704	1.15	0.98	105	32%	28%
Police staff	671	1.10	1.14	-25	30%	33%
Total	2,207	3.61	3.45	99	100%	100%

Special constables	118	0.19	0.32	-78
Contractors	2	0.00	0.03	-16






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	3	0.2%	0.2%
Chief superintendent	5	0.3%	0.3%
Superintendent	9	0.6%	0.6%
Chief inspector	16	1.0%	1.2%
Inspector	75	4.9%	4.5%
Sergeant	201	13.1%	14.2%
Constable	1,054	68.6%	68.5%
PCSO	173	11.3%	10.5%
Force total	1,536	100.0%	100.0%



Constables per sergeant	5.2	4.9
Const. & PCSOs per Sergeant	6.1	5.6

Source: ADR 502 March 2012



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	1,716	1,705	1,632	1,588	1,507	1,431	1,363
Police staff	733	762	816	935	920	777	734
All crime ex F&F	52,738	52,906	47,418	44,741	39,941	36,189	34,951
Charges ex F&F	8,072	8,624	8,248	8,091	7,732	7,707	7,590

Crimes/officer	31	31	29	28	27	25	26
National Avg	40	40	37	34	32	31	31

Charges/officer	4.7	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.4	5.6
National Avg	5.6	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.0	5.2	5.3

% crime victim-based			89.8%	89.2%	88.6%	88.9%
National Avg			88.1%	87.7%	87.5%	87.6%



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




Durham

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	660
Total police officers	1,363

Crime	N	per CPO	Avg	per all PO's	Avg
Victim based	31,402	48	53	23	28
Non victim based	3,549	5	6	3	3
Total exc fraud	34,951	53	60	26	31

Source: ADR 601 March 2012

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Durham

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

Population 612k

	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	174	148	322	0.28	0.24	0.53	0.44	0.28	0.72	-94	-24	-118	14%	19%
Incident response	395	0	395	0.65	0.00	0.65	0.57	0.00	0.57	48	-2	46	17%	15%
Local investigation	193	0	193	0.32	0.00	0.32	0.24	0.03	0.27	45	-17	28	9%	7%
Other	32	44	76	0.05	0.07	0.12	0.08	0.05	0.13	-15	15	-1	3%	3%
Local policing	794	192	986	1.30	0.31	1.61	1.32	0.36	1.68	-16	-28	-44	44%	44%
Dealing with the public	62	150	212	0.10	0.24	0.35	0.06	0.30	0.36	27	-37	-9	9%	9%
Road policing	93	13	106	0.15	0.02	0.17	0.11	0.03	0.14	24	-4	20	5%	4%
Specialist operations	51	1	52	0.08	0.00	0.09	0.14	0.01	0.15	-35	-7	-42	2%	4%
Intelligence	69	49	118	0.11	0.08	0.19	0.11	0.08	0.19	-1	-1	-2	5%	5%
Investigations	142	29	170	0.23	0.05	0.28	0.31	0.08	0.39	-48	-20	-68	8%	10%
Investigative support	0	66	66	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.09	0.09	-3	11	8	3%	2%
Custody	30	33	63	0.05	0.05	0.10	0.05	0.06	0.10	2	-1	1	3%	3%
Other	35	132	166	0.06	0.22	0.27	0.03	0.18	0.21	19	19	38	7%	5%
Criminal justice	65	165	229	0.11	0.27	0.37	0.07	0.24	0.31	20	18	38	10%	8%
ICT	0	41	41	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.07	-1	1	0	2%	2%
Human resources	3	27	30	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.05	2	-6	-4	1%	1%
Training	32	18	50	0.05	0.03	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.08	8	-5	3	2%	2%
Other	26	165	191	0.04	0.27	0.31	0.03	0.27	0.30	7	1	8	8%	8%
Support functions	61	250	311	0.10	0.41	0.51	0.07	0.42	0.50	17	-9	7	14%	13%
Police authority	0	10	10	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	1	6	8	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	1,336	924	2,260	2.18	1.51	3.70	2.21	1.63	3.83	-13	-70	-84	100%	100%
National policing	34	5	39	0.06	0.01	0.06	0.04	0.02	0.06	9	-5	4		
Total	1,370	929	2,299	2.24	1.52	3.76	2.25	1.64	3.89	-5	-75	-79		

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 612k

	Budgeted spend £m	Spend per head		Diff from group £m	% of total		% PO *	
		Force	Group		Force	Group	Force	Group
Neighbourhood	13.0	21.3	30.3	-5.5	11%	15%	69%	64%
Incident response	20.1	32.9	28.6	2.6	17%	14%	99%	86%
Local investigation	10.1	16.4	13.1	2.0	8%	7%	99%	93%
Other	3.4	5.6	7.6	-1.2	3%	4%	61%	66%
Local policing	46.6	76.2	79.6	-2.1	38%	40%	88%	84%
Dealing with the public	8.6	14.0	13.0	0.6	7%	7%	41%	24%
Road policing	5.2	8.5	6.5	1.2	4%	3%	91%	79%
Specialist operations	3.8	6.2	9.2	-1.9	3%	5%	75%	83%
Intelligence	5.8	9.5	8.9	0.4	5%	4%	65%	66%
Investigations	9.4	15.3	16.7	-0.8	8%	8%	86%	76%
Investigative support	3.1	5.0	5.5	-0.3	3%	3%	0%	4%
Custody	4.7	7.6	6.7	0.6	4%	3%	42%	43%
Other	5.3	8.6	6.3	1.4	4%	3%	34%	15%
Criminal justice	9.9	16.2	13.0	2.0	8%	7%	38%	31%
ICT	5.2	8.4	8.8	-0.2	4%	4%	0%	1%
Human resources	1.2	2.0	2.2	-0.1	1%	1%	12%	3%
Training	2.7	4.4	4.0	0.3	2%	2%	0%	1%
Other	13.9	22.8	23.7	-0.6	11%	12%	22%	17%
Support functions	23.0	37.6	38.6	-0.7	19%	19%	16%	12%
Police authority	1.2	2.0	1.2	0.4	1%	1%	0%	0%
Central costs	4.9	8.0	6.3	1.1	4%	3%	0%	0%
Total exc national	121.5	198.6	198.7	0.0	100%	100%	58%	56%
National policing	1.6	2.6	2.6	0.0				
Total	123.1	201.2	201.3	0.0				

* 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	1,431				
Exc transfers		87	6.1%	4.8%	
Transfers		1	0.1%	0.3%	
Leaving force		88	6.2%	5.1%	4.6
PCSO	174	15	8.6%	6.4%	0.4
Police staff	777	63	8.1%	11.4%	1.8
Force total	2,383	166	7.0%	7.5%	6.8






* 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	1,431	12	0.8%	1.0%
PCSO	174	14	8.0%	6.2%
Police staff	777	19	2.5%	3.5%
Overall	2,383	45	1.9%	2.2%

* as at Mar 11

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

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	1,363			
Long term absence		21	1.5%	1.7%
Sickness absence		26	1.9%	2.1%
PCSO	173			
Long term absence		4	2.3%	1.7%
Sickness absence		0	na	2.0%
Staff	734			
Long term absence		5	0.6%	1.7%
Sickness absence		8	1.1%	2.1%

* as at Mar 12





Long term absence: 2010/11-Q4

Officers	1,363			
Recuperative		18	1.3%	2.1%
Restricted		51	3.6%	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




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
1,383

25 YEARS OR MORE - Projected retirement



Total
179
£9.3m










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

Durham

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 612k

			Averages		Diff £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Local policing	46.6	76.2	75.9	79.6	0.2	-2.1
Dealing with the public	8.6	14.0	11.5	13.0	1.5	0.6
Criminal justice	9.9	16.2	12.7	13.0	2.1	2.0
Road policing	5.2	8.5	5.8	6.5	1.7	1.2
Specialist operations	3.8	6.2	8.2	9.2	-1.3	-1.9
Intelligence	5.8	9.5	7.6	8.9	1.2	0.4
Investigations	9.4	15.3	15.0	16.7	0.2	-0.8
Investigative support	3.1	5.0	5.1	5.5	-0.1	-0.3
Support functions	23.0	37.6	38.3	38.6	-0.4	-0.7
Police authority	1.2	2.0	1.2	1.2	0.5	0.4
Central costs	4.9	8.0	6.4	6.3	1.0	1.1
Total exc national	121.5	198.6	187.7	198.7	6.7	0.0

National policing	1.6	2.6	3.7	2.6	-0.7	0.0
Total	123.1	201.2	191.4	201.3	6.0	0.0

Source: POA estimates 2012/13


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



Population 612k

	Averages				Diff £m		% PO * MSG	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	% PO *	MSG
Neighbourhood policing	13.0	21.3	25.4	30.3	-2.5	-5.5	69%	64%
Incident (response) managemen	20.1	32.9	29.7	28.6	1.9	2.6	99%	86%
Local Investigation	10.1	16.4	14.3	13.1	1.3	2.0	99%	93%
Specialist community liaison	2.3	3.7	3.5	4.4	0.1	-0.4	43%	62%
Command team & support	1.1	1.8	3.0	3.1	-0.7	-0.8	97%	71%
Total local policing	46.6	76.2	75.9	79.6	0.2	-2.1	88%	84%
Total exc local investigation	36.6	59.8	61.7	66.5	-1.2	-4.1	84%	82%







Source: POA estimates 2012/13



* PO salaries + overtime as % of gross expenditure

LOCAL POLICING

Use of resources



Staffing	FTE	FTE/1000	Averages	
			All	MSG
Police officers	794	1.30	1.28	1.32
PCSOs	175	0.29	0.25	0.28
Police staff	17	0.03	0.08	0.08

Diff FTE	
All	MSG
11	-16
19	2
-33	-29

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages	
			All	MSG
PO salaries	39.6	64.7	62.9	65.1
PO overtime	1.3	2.2	1.8	2.3
PCSOs	4.6	7.5	7.5	8.4
Police staff	0.5	0.8	2.4	2.4
Non-staff costs	0.8	1.3	2.4	2.3
Income	-0.1	-0.2	-1.2	-0.9
Total cost	46.6	76.2	75.9	79.6

Diff FTE	
All	MSG
1.1	-0.2
0.2	-0.1
0.0	-0.6
-1.0	-1.0
-0.7	-0.6
0.6	0.4
0.2	-2.1





Cost/fte		Averages	
		All	MSG
Police officers	£50k	£49k	£49k
PCSOs	£26k	£30k	£30k
Staff	£27k	£29k	£30k

Diff FTE	
All	MSG
0.5	0.6
-0.6	-0.6
0.0	-0.1

Source: POA estimates 2012/13
HMIC

DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC

Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 612k




	Averages			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Central communications unit	7.8	12.7	7.6	8.9
Local call centres/front desk	0.7	1.1	2.4	2.7
Contact management units	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.2
Command team & support	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3
Total dealing with the public	8.6	14.0	11.5	13.0

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

Diff £m		% PO MSG	
All	MSG	% PO	MSG
3.2	2.4	40%	20%
-0.8	-0.9	37%	20%
-0.7	-0.7	na	7%
-0.1	-0.1	100%	62%
1.5	0.6	41%	24%

DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC

Use of resources



Staffing	Averages		Diff FTE			
	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	62	0.10	0.04	0.06	35	27
Police Staff	150	0.24	0.26	0.30	-12	-37


Expenditure	Averages		Diff FTE			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	3.5	5.7	2.5	3.2	2.0	1.5
Police staff +PCSO	5.0	8.1	8.4	9.7	-0.2	-1.0
Non-staff costs	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.1	-0.3	0.0
Income	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total cost	8.6	14.0	11.5	13.0	1.5	0.6

Cost/fte	Averages		Diff FTE			
	£/fte	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£54k	£55k	£55k	£56k	0.0	-0.1
Police Staff	£32k	£31k	£31k	£31k	0.2	0.2

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	612k
Calls received	86,427

Central communications unit only






FTE staff	187
Gross cost	£7.8m

		Avg
FTE/1000 pop	0.31	0.24
Calls per FTE	462	670
Calls per 1000	141	150

Cost per call	£90	£61
---------------	-----	-----

Source: POA data

CCU + Front Desk



FTE staff	211
Gross cost	£8.5m

		Avg
FTE/1000 pop	0.34	0.32
Calls per FTE	410	500
Calls per 1000	141	150





Cost per call	£98	£79
---------------	-----	-----

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 612k

Calls

	Calls	Calls/1000	MSG Avg
ASB	27,747	45	33
Crimes	14,405	24	31
All Other	59,207	97	94
EP Total	101,359	166	158

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ARRANGEMENTS

Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 612k

			Averages		Diff £m		% PO MSG	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	% PO	MSG
Custody *	4.7	7.6	6.8	6.7	0.5	0.6	42%	43%
Criminal justice	3.7	6.0	3.7	4.2	1.4	1.1	44%	19%
Police national computer	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	0%	1%
Criminal records bureau	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0%	0%
Property officer / stores	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0%	0%
Coroner assistance	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	41%	7%
Fixed penalty scheme	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0%	0%
Command team & support	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	-0.1	-0.1	100%	43%
Total criminal justice arrangements	9.9	16.2	12.7	13.0	2.1	2.0	38%	31%

Source: POA estimates 2012/13 * Appendix 3 lists the forces that outsource custody






Note: Custody above includes

Surgeons, doctors & other medical	1.5	2.40	1.00	1.05	0.9	0.8
Interpreters & translators	0.1	0.10	0.31	0.28	-0.1	-0.1

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

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ARRANGEMENTS

Use of resources



Staffing			Averages	
	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	65	0.11	0.07	0.07
Police Staff	165	0.27	0.22	0.24

Diff FTE	
All	MSG
23	20
31	18

Expenditure			Averages	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Police officers	3.8	6.2	3.8	4.3
Police staff +PCSO	4.0	6.6	6.0	6.4
Non-staff costs	2.3	3.7	3.4	2.6
Income	-0.2	-0.3	-0.5	-0.4
Total cost	9.9	16.2	12.7	13.0

Diff £m	
All	MSG
1.5	1.2
0.4	0.1
0.2	0.7
0.1	0.0
2.1	2.0



Cost/FTE			Averages	
	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£56k	£55k	£57k	
Police Staff	£24k	£27k	£27k	

Diff £m	
All	MSG
0.1	-0.1
-0.5	-0.4

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 7,788







		per 100 charges	Group
Criminal justice FTE	119	1.5	1.1
Criminal justice cost	£3.7m	£47k	£31k

Diff
31
£1.2m

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

SPECIALIST OPERATIONS

Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 612k

	Averages				Diff £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Firearms unit	1.5	2.4	3.0	3.0	-0.3	-0.3
Dogs section	1.2	2.0	1.3	1.6	0.4	0.2
Lev 1 adv public order	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.7	-0.8	-1.0
Air operations	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.1	0.0
Civil contingencies	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.0	-0.1
Specialist terrain	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	-0.1	-0.1
Mounted police	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	-0.1	-0.1
Airports & ports	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-0.1
Command team & support	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	-0.4	-0.3
Total specialist operations	3.8	6.2	8.2	9.2	-1.3	-1.9




Diff £m	
All	MSG
-0.3	-0.3
0.4	0.2
-0.8	-1.0
0.1	0.0
0.0	-0.1
-0.1	-0.1
-0.1	-0.1
0.0	-0.1
-0.4	-0.3
-1.3	-1.9

% PO	MSG
72%	90%
100%	93%
0%	84%
31%	24%
95%	74%
na	35%
na	37%
na	30%
na	72%
75%	83%

Staffing	FTE
Firearms unit	18
Dogs section	22
Lev 1 adv public order	-

SPECIALIST OPERATIONS

Use of resources



Staffing	Averages		Diff FTE	
	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	51	0.08	0.13	0.14
Police Staff	1	0.00	0.01	0.01


Expenditure	Averages		Diff £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
PO salaries	2.7	4.5	6.8	7.4
PO overtime	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3
Police staff	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5
Non-staff costs	0.9	1.5	1.5	1.1
Income	0.0	0.0	-0.8	-0.2
Total cost	3.8	6.2	8.2	9.2

Cost/fte	Averages		Diff £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Police officers	£53k	£52k	£52k	£53k
Police staff	£20k	£32k	£32k	£33k

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

INTELLIGENCE

Objectives – cost per head of population






Population 612k

	Averages		Diff £m		% PO MSG			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG		
Intelligence gathering	0.7	1.1	3.5	3.5	-1.5	-1.5	81%	72%
Intelligence analysis/threat assessments	5.0	8.1	3.7	5.2	2.7	1.8	62%	64%
Command team & support	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.1	73%	62%
Total intelligence	5.8	9.5	7.6	8.9	1.2	0.4	65%	66%

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

INTELLIGENCE
Use of resources



Staffing	Averages			
	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	69	0.11	0.09	0.11
Police staff	49	0.08	0.07	0.08

Diff FTE	
All	MSG
13	-1
3	-1

Expenditure	Averages			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Police officers	3.8	6.2	4.9	6.2
Police staff	1.4	2.4	2.3	2.3
Non-staff costs	0.6	1.0	0.7	0.9
Income	0.0	0.0	-0.3	-0.5
Total cost	5.8	9.5	7.6	8.9

Diff £m	
All	MSG
0.8	0.0
0.0	0.0
0.2	0.1
0.2	0.3
1.2	0.4








Cost/fte	Averages	
	All	MSG
Police officers	£54k	£54k
Police staff	£29k	£28k

Diff £m	
All	MSG
0.1	0.0
0.0	0.1

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

INVESTIGATIONS exc local investigation/prisoner processing

Objectives – cost per head of population



Population 612k





	Averages			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Public protection	3.7	6.12	6.66	8.07
Major investigations unit	1.3	2.11	3.55	3.54
Serious/organised crime unit	0.9	1.49	2.35	2.02
Economic crime	1.2	1.90	1.03	1.34
Specialist investigation units	1.6	2.57	0.37	0.55
Command team & support	0.7	1.15	1.05	1.18
Total	9.4	15.34	15.00	16.70

Diff £m	
All	MSG
-0.3	-1.2
-0.9	-0.9
-0.5	-0.3
0.5	0.3
1.3	1.2
0.1	0.0
0.2	-0.8

% PO MSG	
% PO	MSG
87%	85%
92%	77%
92%	86%
59%	64%
90%	45%
99%	58%
86%	76%

INVESTIGATIONS

Use of resources



Staffing	FTE	FTE/1000	Averages		Diff FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	142	0.23	0.23	0.31	3	-48
Police staff	29	0.05	0.07	0.08	-17	-20





Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
PO salaries	7.6	12.4	11.2	13.2	0.7	-0.5
PO overtime	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.1	0.1
Police staff	0.9	1.4	2.4	2.4	-0.6	-0.6
Non-staff costs	0.4	0.7	1.3	1.2	-0.4	-0.3
Income	0.0	0.0	-0.5	-0.9	0.3	0.6
Total cost	9.4	15.3	15.0	16.7	0.2	-0.8

Cost/FTE		Averages		Diff £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£53k	£50k	£43k	0.5	1.5
Police staff	£30k	£31k	£30k	0.0	0.0

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

INVESTIGATIVE SUPPORT

Objectives – cost per head of population




Population 612k

			Averages		Diff £m		% PO	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	All	MSG
External forensic costs	1.0	1.63	1.67	1.73	0.0	-0.1	0%	0%
Scenes of crime officers	1.4	2.21	1.53	1.72	0.4	0.3	0%	7%
Fingerprint/DNA bureau	0.4	0.57	0.74	0.91	-0.1	-0.2	0%	0%
Photographic image recovery	0.2	0.26	0.28	0.34	0.0	-0.1	0%	7%
Other forensic services	0.1	0.20	0.72	0.69	-0.3	-0.3	0%	13%
Command team & support	0.1	0.11	0.18	0.10	0.0	0.0	0%	0%
Total investigative support	3.1	4.99	5.12	5.49	-0.1	-0.3	0%	4%

HMIC Source: POA estimates 2012/13

INVESTIGATIVE SUPPORT

Use of resources



Staffing	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	-	-	0.01	0.00
Police staff	66	0.11	0.08	0.09

Diff FTE

All	MSG
-3	-3
18	11

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Avg	MSG
PO salaries	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2
Police staff	1.9	3.1	2.8	3.0
Non-staff costs	1.1	1.9	2.1	2.3
Income	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total cost	3.1	5.0	5.1	5.5

Diff £m

All	MSG
-0.2	-0.2
0.2	0.1
-0.1	-0.2
0.0	0.0
-0.1	-0.3

Cost/fte	Avg	MSG
Police officers	na	£53k £51k
Police staff	£28k	£35k £34k









Diff £m

All	MSG
0.0	0.0
-0.4	-0.4

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

SUPPORT FUNCTIONS

Objectives – cost per head of population







Population 612

	Averages				Diff £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Estates/building costs	5.3	8.7	8.6	8.5	0.1	0.1
ICT	5.2	8.4	8.4	8.8	0.0	-0.2
Training	2.7	4.4	3.8	4.0	0.3	0.3
Fleet services	2.0	3.3	3.2	3.5	0.1	-0.1
Administration support	1.3	2.1	2.5	2.3	-0.2	-0.1
Human resources	1.2	2.0	2.3	2.2	-0.2	-0.1
Finance	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.4	0.0	-0.1
Performance review	1.5	2.4	2.4	2.1	0.0	0.2
Professional standard:	0.9	1.5	1.3	1.5	0.1	0.0
All other	2.1	3.5	4.2	4.3	-0.4	-0.5
Total	23.0	37.6	38.3	38.6	-0.4	-0.7

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

SUPPORT FUNCTIONS

Use of resources



Staffing	Averages			
	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	61	0.10	0.07	0.07
Police staff	250	0.41	0.39	0.42

Diff FTE	
All	MSG
16	17
11	-9

Expenditure	Diff £m			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Police officers	3.7	6.1	4.7	4.7
Police staff	8.0	13.0	13.2	13.8
Non-staff costs	11.9	19.5	21.7	21.0
Income	-0.7	-1.1	-1.3	-0.9
Total cost	23.0	37.6	38.3	38.6

Diff £m	
All	MSG
0.9	0.9
-0.1	-0.5
-1.4	-0.9
0.1	-0.1
-0.4	-0.7

Cost/FTE	Diff £m	
	All	MSG
Police officers	£61k	£62k £64k
Police staff	£32k	£33k £32k

Diff £m	
All	MSG
-0.1	-0.1
-0.4	-0.1

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	2,299
Total NRE	£123m




	Cost £m	per FTE	Avg	Diff £m
Human resources	1.20	£521	£661	-0.3
Finance	0.75	£326	£370	-0.1
ICT	5.16	£2,246	£2,385	-0.3
Training	2.69	£1,172	£1,087	0.2
Premises	5.34	£2,321	£2,425	-0.2

	% NRE	Avg	Diff £m
Human resources	1.0%	1.2%	-0.3
Finance	0.6%	0.7%	-0.1
ICT	4.2%	4.4%	-0.3
Training	2.2%	2.0%	0.2
Premises	4.3%	4.5%	-0.2



NATIONAL POLICING

Objectives – cost per head of population








Population 612k

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Counter terrorism/special branch	1.3	2.17	3.14	2.39	-0.6	-0.1
Other national policing requirements	0.0	0.00	0.49	0.09	-0.3	-0.1
Hosting national services	0.0	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.0	0.0
Secondments (out of force)	0.3	0.47	0.00	0.13	0.3	0.2
ACPO projects / initiatives	0.0	0.00	0.07	0.04	0.0	0.0
Total	1.6	2.64	3.72	2.65	-0.7	0.0
Specific grants	0.7	1.14	2.91	1.57	-1.1	-0.3
Cost net of grants	0.9	1.50	0.81	1.08	0.4	0.3

% PO	MSG
89%	70%
na	17%
na	3%
98%	75%
na	0%
92%	71%

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

NATIONAL POLICING
Use of resources



Staffing	Averages		Diff FTE	
	FTE	FTE/1000	All	MSG
Police officers	34	0.06	0.06	0.04
PCSOs	-	-	0.00	-
Police staff	5	0.01	0.02	0.02

Expenditure	Averages		Diff £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG
Police officers	1.9	3.1	3.6	2.5
Police staff	0.1	0.2	0.7	0.5
Non-staff costs	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.7
Income	-0.4	-0.7	-1.1	-1.1
Total cost	1.6	2.6	3.7	2.6

	Averages	Diff £m		
	All	MSG		
Specific grants	0.7	1.1	2.9	1.6
Cost net of grants	0.9	1.5	0.8	1.1

Cost/fte	Averages		Diff £m	
	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£55k	£58k	0.0	-0.1
Police staff	£26k	£33k	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 %	(no. of posts)	Cost of difference	National UQ %	(no. of posts)	Cost of difference	
Criminal Justice	32	87	73%	93%	23	£683k	97%	28	£846k	£30k
Central Communications Unit	56	131	70%	88%	33	£833k	95%	47	£1,172k	£25k
Intelligence Analysis	57	49	46%	58%	12	£285k	75%	30	£710k	£23k
Administration Support	0	44	100%	100%	0	£0k	100%	0	£0k	£37k
Local Call Centres / Front Desk	5	19	79%	100%	5	£126k	100%	5	£126k	£25k
Training	32	24	43%	44%	1	£10k	57%	8	£151k	£18k
Intelligence Gathering	10	0	0%	24%	0	£0k	36%	0	£0k	£20k
Custody	30	33	52%	57%	0	£0k	61%	4	£112k	£26k
Contact Management Units	0	0	na	95%	0	£0k	100%	0	£0k	£25k
Human Resources	3	27	90%	100%	3	£72k	100%	3	£72k	£24k
Other Forensic Services	0	4	100%	89%	0	£0k	97%	0	£0k	£20k
Scenes of Crime Officers	0	33	100%	100%	0	£0k	100%	0	£0k	£16k
Grand Total	225	449			77	£2,009k		126	£3,190k	

Source: POA estimates 2012/13

Total CoD per population £3.3

£5.2

Durham

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.



Force
Group
Others

Your force	3.2	3.8	3.8	4.4	9.1	8.5	7.8	6.0	5.6	5.5	4.9
Group	4.6	8.1	9.1	9.8	11.5	10.8	9.6	8.7	8.2	7.1	6.2
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

Durham




— Force
 — Group
 — Others

Your force	13.9	13.2	12.6	9.8	11.1	11.0	8.9	8.1	7.4	5.6	5.9
Group	19.7	21.7	20.4	16.9	16.6	15.6	12.8	11.5	9.4	7.5	6.7
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

Durham


Note range = max - min rate



Burglary is shown per population to maintain consistency

Your force	14.5	12.5	11.6	11.2	10.9	11.0	9.9	10.2	9.2	7.5	7.7
Group	18.2	19.4	17.3	14.2	12.8	12.6	11.6	11.4	10.5	9.5	8.9
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





Durham



Your force	21.2	22.9	23.2	24.7	26.5	26.7	23.9	21.2	17.6	14.3	12.7
Group	20.8	22.4	23.7	24.6	25.5	25.6	22.9	20.5	17.6	14.7	13.0
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

Durham

RECORDED OFFENCES - ALL CRIMES
2011/12 per 1,000 population



Population 612k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
Victim based	31,402	51.3	58.8	-4,577	-13%
Non victim based	3,549	5.8	7.3	-918	-21%
Total exc fraud	34,951	57.1	66.1	-5,495	-14%

Fraud & forgery	380	0.6	0.8
Grand total	35,331	57.8	66.9






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	31,402	9,702	31%	26%	7,741	1,961
Non victim based	3,549	3,272	92%	88%	3,090	182
Total exc fraud	34,951	12,974	37%	33%	10,831	2,143

Actual % expected 135%

Fraud & forgery	380	287	76%	47%	178	109
-----------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

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








Population 612k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
Violence against the person	4,966	8.1	10.2	-1,254	-20%
Sexual offences	431	0.7	0.8	-88	-17%
Stealing	18,230	29.8	34.8	-3,070	-14%
Criminal damage & arson	7,775	12.7	13.0	-165	-2%
Victim based offences	31,402	51.3	58.8	-4,577	-13%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Durham




SANCTION DETECTIONS - VICTIM BASED



	Offences	SDs	%	MSG	Exp	Diff
Violence against the person	4,966	3,256	66%	50%	2,490	766
Sexual offences	431	205	48%	36%	157	48
Stealing	18,230	4,745	26%	23%	3,932	813
Criminal damage & arson	7,775	1,496	19%	15%	1,162	334
Victim based offences	31,402	9,702	31%	26%	7,741	1,961

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

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






Population 612k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
With injury	2,998	4.9	6.2	-781	-21%
Without injury	1,968	3.2	4.0	-473	-19%
Violence against person	4,966	8.1	10.2	-1,254	-20%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12




SANCTION DETECTIONS - VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON



	Offences	SDs	%	MSG	Exp	Diff
With injury	2,998	1,845	62%	50%	1,484	361
Without injury	1,968	1,411	72%	51%	1,006	405
Violence against person	4,966	3,256	66%	50%	2,490	766

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

RECORDED OFFENCES - SEXUAL OFFENCES
 2011/12 per 1,000 population






Population 612k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
Rape	125	0.20	0.27	-40	-24%
Other sexual offences	306	0.50	0.58	-47	-13%
Sexual offences	431	0.70	0.85	-88	-17%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12


SANCTION DETECTIONS - SEXUAL OFFENCES



	Offences	SDs	%	Msg	Exp	Diff
Rape	125	51	41%	27%	34	17
Other sexual offences	306	154	50%	40%	123	31
Sexual offences	431	205	48%	36%	157	48

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12










RECORDED OFFENCES - STEALING
2011/12 per 1,000 population











Population 612k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference	
Robbery					
Personal	85	0.1	0.4	-167	-66%
Business	18	0.0	0.0	-11	-37%
	103	0.2	0.5	-178	-63%
Burglary					
Domestic	1,654	2.7	3.6	-551	-25%
Non-domestic	3,081	5.0	5.3	-132	-4%
	4,735	7.7	8.9	-683	-13%
Vehicle crime	3,626	5.9	6.7	-467	-11%
Shoplifting	2,984	4.9	6.0	-662	-18%
Other stealing	6,782	11.1	12.9	-1,081	-14%
Stealing	18,230	29.8	34.8	-3,070	-14%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12





SANCTION DETECTIONS - STEALING









Population 612k

	Offences	SDs	%	MSG	Exp	Diff
Robbery						
Personal	85	37	44%	38%	32	5
Business	18	9	50%	49%	9	0
	103	46	45%	39%	41	5
Burglary						
Domestic	1,654	411	25%	23%	379	32
Non-domestic	3,081	414	13%	11%	332	82
	4,735	825	17%	16%	711	114
Vehicle crime	3,626	611	17%	15%	552	59
Shoplifting	2,984	2,008	67%	63%	1,873	135
Other stealing	6,782	1,255	19%	11%	755	500
Stealing	18,230	4,745	26%	23%	3,932	813

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12



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




Population 612k

	Offences	per 1000	MSG	Difference
Drug trafficking	356	0.6	0.6	-37 -10%
Drug possession	1,078	1.8	2.9	-688 -39%
Drug offences	1,434	2.3	3.5	-725 -34%
Public disorder	1,348	2.2	2.6	-249 -16%
Crimes disrupted	512	0.8	0.8	32 7%
Other non victim based	255	0.4	0.4	24 10%
Non victim based	3,549	5.8	7.3	-918 -21%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12





SANCTION DETECTIONS - NON VICTIM BASED



	Offences	SDs	%	MSG	Exp	Diff
Drug trafficking	356	333	94%	92%	329	4
Drug possession	1,078	1,043	97%	96%	1,033	10
Drug offences	1,434	1,376	96%	95%	1,362	14
Public disorder	1,348	1,183	88%	80%	1,076	107
Crimes disrupted	512	488	95%	88%	449	39
Other non victim based	255	225	88%	80%	203	22
Non victim based	3,549	3,272	92%	88%	3,090	182

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	40,488	31,402	-22%	-23%
Non victim based	4,253	3,549	-17%	-15%
Total exc fraud	44,741	34,951	-22%	-22%

Fraud & forgery	332	380	14%	-17%
All crime	45,073	35,331	-22%	-22%

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	5,687	4,966	-13%	-16%
Sexual offences	474	431	-9%	-1%
Stealing	21,351	18,230	-15%	-18%
Criminal damage & arson	12,976	7,775	-40%	-36%
Victim based offences	40,488	31,402	-22%	-23%

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	3,678	2,998	-18%	-27%
Without injury	2,009	1,968	-2%	17%
Violence against person	5,687	4,966	-13%	-16%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12







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



	2008/09	2011/12	Change	MSG
Rape	121	125	3%	23%
Other sexual offences	353	306	-13%	-9%
Sexual offences	474	431	-9%	-1%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

RECORDED OFFENCES - STEALING
Change 2008/09 to 2011/12









Population 612k

	2008/09	2011/12	Change	MSG
Robbery				
Personal	134	85	-37%	-33%
Business	36	18	-50%	-27%
	170	103	-39%	-32%
Burglary				
Domestic	2,577	1,654	-36%	-26%
Non-domestic	3,649	3,081	-16%	-17%
	6,226	4,735	-24%	-21%
Vehicle crime	4,940	3,626	-27%	-40%
Shoplifting	3,296	2,984	-9%	-1%
Other stealing	6,719	6,782	1%	-4%
Stealing	21,351	18,230	-15%	-18%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

RECORDED OFFENCES - NON VICTIM BASED
Change 2008/09 to 2011/12



	2008/09	2011/12	Change	MSG
Drug trafficking	264	356	35%	10%
Drug possession	1,063	1,078	1%	10%
Drug offences	1,327	1,434	8%	9%
Public disorder	2,030	1,348	-34%	-32%
Crimes disrupted	605	512	-15%	-22%
Other non victim based	291	255	-12%	-22%
Non victim based	4,253	3,549	-17%	-15%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2011/12

Durham

CHANGE IN SANCTION DETECTIONS %

	2008/09	2011/12	Change	Msg
Victim based	24%	31%	7%	3%
Non victim based	88%	92%	5%	3%
All crime exc fraud & forgery	30%	37%	7%	3%
Fraud & forgery	62%	76%	14%	-7%
Victim based				
Violence against the person	58%	66%	8%	4%
Sexual offences	44%	48%	4%	2%
Stealing	20%	26%	6%	2%
Criminal damage & arson	15%	19%	5%	1%
Non victim based				
Public disorder	83%	88%	5%	1%
Drug offences	96%	96%	0%	1%
Crimes disrupted	91%	95%	4%	2%
Other non victim based	77%	88%	11%	2%
Violence against the person (VAP)				
VAP with injury	55%	62%	6%	4%
VAP without Injury	62%	72%	10%	3%
Sexual offences				
Rape	42%	41%	-1%	-3%
Other sexual offences	44%	50%	6%	5%
Stealing				
Personal robbery	40%	44%	4%	5%
Business robbery	67%	50%	-17%	-2%
Domestic burglary	17%	25%	8%	5%
Non Domestic burglary	11%	13%	3%	1%
Vehicle crime	8%	17%	8%	2%
Shoplifting	65%	67%	2%	-2%
Other stealing	12%	19%	7%	1%
Drugs				
Drug trafficking	90%	94%	4%	5%
Drug possession	97%	97%	-1%	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

Durham

SANCTION DETECTIONS BY TYPE 2011/12

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







	%	MSG
Charge summons	59%	61%
Cautions	25%	20%
Penalty notices	6%	7%
Cannabis warnings	3%	4%
Taken into consideration	7%	7%
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	61%	59%	-2%	6%
Cautions	25%	25%	0%	-4%
Penalty notices	7%	6%	-1%	-1%
Cannabis warnings	2%	3%	1%	0%
Taken into consideration	5%	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
Victim based				
VAP with injury	2,998	1,194	40%	35%
VAP without Injury	1,968	855	43%	35%
Rape	125	47	38%	27%
Other sexual offences	306	111	36%	33%
Domestic burglary	1,654	299	18%	14%
Non-domestic burglary	3,081	268	9%	7%
Robbery of personal property	85	35	41%	36%
Business robbery	18	9	50%	48%
Vehicle crime	3,626	337	9%	7%
Shoplifting	2,984	1,176	39%	38%
Other stealing	6,782	721	11%	7%
Criminal damage & arson	7,775	821	11%	9%
Non-victim based				
Public disorder	1,348	667	49%	49%
Drug trafficking	356	234	66%	69%
Drug possession	1,078	272	25%	33%
Crimes disrupted	512	356	70%	69%
Other non victim based	255	188	74%	68%
Total exc fraud	34,951	7,590	22%	20%
Fraud & forgery	380	198	52%	33%
All crime	35,331	7,788	22%	20%

Diff from expected
133
161
14
9
71
49
4
0
71
50
252
88
4
-13
-79
2
14
830
73
903



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 forces 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	1.4%	1.4%	3.2%	2.6%	1.9%
Robbery	4.0%	4.2%	5.6%	12.0%	4.7%
Other stealing	3.2%	3.1%	3.8%	3.1%	5.4%
Rape	13.6%	3.2%	11.2%	9.4%	11.1%
Other sexual	5.6%	4.2%	7.3%	3.8%	5.3%
Criminal damage	2.1%	2.1%	3.5%	2.8%	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	86.7%	83.9%
Confidence interval	1.9%	0.2%

Source: Victims of Crime Survey 2011/12

Durham

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