

Summary Value for Money Profiles 2013

An overview of the calculations used

© HMIC 2013

www.hmic.gov.uk

Information displayed in the summary value for money profiles

HMIC's summary value for money (VfM) profiles display high-level information from the full VfM profiles.¹ They focus on the following groups of data:

- expenditure and earned income – how much money does the force estimate it will spend and earn in 2013/14 compared with others?
- workforce – how much money does the force estimate it will spend on visible front line, non-visible front line, frontline support and business support functions in 2013/14 compared with others?
- funding – how much central and local funding does the force anticipate it will receive in 2013/14 compared with others?
- demand – how many 999 calls and priority incidents did the force deal with in 2012/13 compared with others?
- workload – how many crimes were recorded and charges made per visible officer in the force in 2012/13 compared with others?
- crime – what were the crime levels in the force in 2012/13? and
- investigative outcomes – what were the levels of different types of outcomes (such as cautions or charges) in 2012/13 compared with others?

Bar charts show the percentage difference² between the force's data and the average of its most similar group of forces (called *peers* in the summary profile). The figures to the left or right of the bars show the net 'cost' of the variation.³

Calculations used in the summary value for money profiles

The rest of this document outlines how the figures in the full VfM profiles are used to produce the outputs in the summaries.

A note on rounding

All figures shown in the summary profiles are to one decimal place. Costs are given in millions (m), while incidents, 999 calls, crimes and outcomes are given in thousands (k). The figures provided in the full profiles are rounded whereas

¹ Both full and summary profiles are available from www.hmic.gov.uk.

² The percentage differences to the peer averages are not explicitly given in the full profiles, but can be calculated using the approaches outlined later in this document.

³ These figures are directly available in the full profiles (labelled *Difference/Diff*) but the calculations are included here for completeness.

complete values are used to calculate the outputs in the summary profiles. This means that it is not possible to precisely replicate the calculation of the numbers shown in the summary profile using the figures provided in the full profile, as small discrepancies may result from using the rounded figures.

1. How does the force's income and expenditure compare with peers?

For each category (net revenue expenditure (NRE), officers, staff, PCSOs, non-staff costs and earned income), the force's expenditure/income per head of population (*Force value*) is used alongside the average value of its most similar group of forces (*MSG average*):

$$\text{Net difference in cost} = (\text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}) \times \text{Force population}$$

$$\text{Percentage difference from peer average} = 100 \times \left(\frac{\text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}}{\text{MSG average}} \right)$$

See page 9 of the full VfM profile for the data used in the calculations, and the associated caveats. In particular, note that in order to compare forces more accurately, national policing functions are excluded from each force's data.

2. Where is the force spending money compared with peers?

For each category (visible front line, non-visible front line, frontline support and business support), the proportion of the force's NRE in each category (*Force %*) is used, alongside the average value of its MSG (*MSG %*):

$$\text{Net difference in cost} = (\text{Force \%} - \text{MSG \%}) \times \text{NRE}$$

$$\text{Percentage difference from peer average} = 100 \times \left(\frac{\text{Force \%} - \text{MSG \%}}{\text{MSG \%}} \right)$$

Note that here, as in the full profiles, any NRE that is not frontline, frontline support or business support (recorded as *Other*⁴) is not included in the calculations.

See Annex 3 of the full VfM profile for a list of the functions in each category, and page 10 for the values used in the calculations and the associated caveats.

3. How is the local policing body funded compared with peers?

The level of both local and central funding per head of population for the force (*Force value*) is used, alongside the average of its MSG (*MSG average*):

$$\text{Net difference in funding} = (\text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}) \times \text{Force population}$$

$$\text{Percentage difference from peer average} = 100 \times \left(\frac{\text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}}{\text{MSG average}} \right)$$

⁴ Categories recorded as 'Other' include national policing functions, Police and Crime Commissioner/local policing body costs and central costs.

See page 14 of the full VfM profile for the values used in the calculations and the associated caveats. Note that here, national policing functions are included; this means the total funding may not equal the NRE given in Section 1.

4. Is the force experiencing higher demand than peers?

The number of 999 calls and emergency and priority incidents per 1,000 head of population reported in the force (*Force value*) is used, alongside the average of its MSG (*MSG average*):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Net difference in calls/incidents} \\ = (\text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}) \times \text{Force population}/1,000 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Percentage difference from peer average} = 100 \times \left(\frac{\text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}}{\text{MSG average}} \right)$$

See pages 55 to 56 of the full VfM profile for the values used in the calculations and the associated caveats.

5. Are the force's police officers dealing with more crimes compared with peers?

The number of recorded crimes⁵ (victim-based and other crimes against society) and charges for crimes (excluding fraud) per visible officer in the force (*Force value*) is used along with the average of its MSG (*MSG average*):

$$\text{Net difference in crimes/charges per visible officer} = \text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}$$

$$\text{Percentage difference from peer average} = 100 \times \left(\frac{\text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}}{\text{MSG average}} \right)$$

See pages 53 to 54 of the full VfM profile for the values used in the calculations and the associated caveats. A full list of the crime types considered is given in Annex 1 of the full profiles.

6. How does the level of crime in the force compare with peers?

The number of recorded crimes (victim-based and other crimes against society) per 1,000 head of population in the force (*Force value*) is used, alongside the average of its MSG (*MSG average*):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Net difference in recorded crime} \\ = (\text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}) \times \text{Force population}/1,000 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Percentage difference from peer average} = 100 \times \left(\frac{\text{Force value} - \text{MSG average}}{\text{MSG average}} \right)$$

⁵ The Office for National Statistics divides crime into: victim-based crime, other crimes against society and fraud.

See pages 60 to 81 of the full VfM profile for the values used in the calculations and the associated caveats. A full list of the crime types considered is given in Annex 1 of the full profiles.

Please note that the percentage differences in the full VfM profiles give the net difference in recorded crime as a percentage of the force's recorded crime rate. This is different to the percentage difference calculated here, which gives the difference between the force's recorded crime rate and that of its peers, expressed as a percentage of the peer average rate.

7. How do the investigative outcomes in the force compare with peers?

The number of sanction detections, charges and cautions per crime in the force (*Force %*) are used, alongside the averages of its MSG (*MSG %*). Note that total sanction detections include charges and cautions, but also other outcomes where a sanction is applied.

The net difference in outcomes calculation is repeated across all the separate crime types (excluding fraud) and summed:⁶

Net difference in outcomes = (Force % – MSG %) × Number of recorded crimes in force [summed over each crime type]

Percentage difference from peer average
= $100 \times \left(\frac{\text{Force value} - (\text{Force value} - \text{Net difference in outcomes})}{\text{Force value} - \text{Net difference in outcomes}} \right)$

The percentage difference calculation is of a different form to those used in other sections. We again compare the force's value with the MSG average but, here, the MSG average is equal to the number of outcomes the force would have had if it had achieved the average MSG rate of outcomes for each crime-type.

See pages 53 to 54 of the full VfM profile for the values used in the calculations and the associated caveats. A full list of the crime types considered is given in Annex 1 of the full profiles.

⁶ This is an important distinction. If the calculation had been done on the sanction detection rate of all crimes (excluding fraud), rather than summed over the separate crime types, forces' particular mix of crime-types would not be taken into consideration. For example, since the sanction detection rate for drug offences is generally high, comparing the overall rate between forces with very different proportions of their total crime made up of drug offences would be misleading.