

Report to the Commissioner's Performance and Delivery Board

Date: 6 December 2017

Title: Crime Data Integrity Update

From: Chief Constable



INTRODUCTION

1. On the 30 January 2017 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) announced to the force that they would conduct a crime data integrity (CDI) inspection commencing on the 6 March 2017. This inspection duly took place, and the HMICFRS published their report on 15 June 2017. Kent Police were graded 'inadequate'. HMICFRS made seven recommendations and highlighted one area for improvement.
2. Following the inspection in March 2017 the force conducted a deep dive analysis to identify why the issues identified in the HMICFRS CDI were not recognised earlier. A comprehensive improvement plan was authorised by Chief Officers with regular reporting to both the Deputy Chief Constable and Chief Constable. The results from the analysis along with progress against the HMICFRS recommendations were reported to the last Commissioner's Performance and Delivery Board on 27 September 2017.
3. Since the improvement plan has been put in place, significant improvements in crime data integrity have been made, and an upward trajectory is being maintained.

CURRENT POSITION

4. Performance against the improvement plan is good and subject to regular scrutiny by the Deputy Chief Constable and Chief Constable. Progress against the HMIC recommendations is detailed below.

Recommendation	Progress
<p>Immediately, the force should take steps to identify and address gaps in its systems and processes for the recording of reports of crime. This work should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include a review of the quality of incident recording; • provide a consistent and structured approach to call-handling quality assurance processes; and • identify and address shortcomings in the identification and recording of reported crime by the Investigation Management Unit (IMU). 	<p>Full report submitted to Chief Officers Strategic Meeting (COSM) outlining why this position arose. All recommendations contained within the report have been accepted, and are being taken forward.</p>
<p>Immediately, the force should take steps to ensure that all reported crimes of rape are recorded without delay and that classification N100 (Rape Allegations Classification) is used correctly.</p>	<p>Relevant departments have been briefed on the recording of offences and this has been further reinforced through an Aide Memoire prepared by IMU, team briefings and one to one. Policy around N100 has been amended and briefed to Public Protection Units (PPU) and IMU. Daily checking of new N100s now takes place, and the review period has been reduced from 4 weeks to 2 weeks. These messages have been reinforced via a briefing delivered by the DCC to PPU Senior Leadership Teams. This issue has now been resolved.</p>
<p>Within three months, the force should review the use of secondary incident records (SIs) when a crime has been disclosed and in particular where crimes are disclosed during the course of investigations, to ensure the use of secondary incidents does not inhibit crime-recording accuracy.</p>	<p>A review has been completed and this recommends retention of SIs, with improved audit and quality assurance.</p>

<p>Within three months the force should develop and implement procedures to ensure that where more than one crime is disclosed within an incident record or is identified as part of other recorded crime investigations; that these are recorded.</p>	<p>IMU and PPU staff have been briefed to ensure that reports are reviewed thoroughly so that all crimes alleged by all victims are recorded correctly. This also includes a direction for all supervisors to review all crime reports and CADs (the system used for dispatching calls), to ensure all allegations are recorded and include this within their Supervisory Reviews. In addition a regular report is run which details offence types that regularly have missed multiple crimes. This list is reviewed by IMU Supervisors on a monthly basis.</p>
<p>Within three months, the force should develop and implement procedures for the effective supervision of crime-recording decisions throughout the whole force.</p>	<p>A new process has been introduced for Force Control Room (FCR) Team Leaders to review and endorse CADs that are removed from the IMU list. The Data Audit Team (DAT) has now trained the Team Leaders from four of the five FCR teams specifically in relation to the HOCR and its interpretation. A recommendation has also been made to increase the supervision levels within the IMU to enable greater and more effective supervision of crime recording decisions.</p>
<p>Within three months, the force should ensure sufficient audit capacity and capability is available to the Force Crime and Incident Registrar (FCIR) to provide reassurance that the force is identifying and managing any gaps in its crime-recording accuracy. This is particularly important for vulnerable victims and those crimes where the risk to the victim is greatest, such as rape, sexual offences, domestic abuse and modern slavery.</p>	<p>All DAT staff are now on permanent contracts, bringing the establishment of auditors to five. Continued professional development is in place via Performance Development Review (PDR) process, and annual audit calendar signed off by Chief Officers. In addition, further training has been given to Kent auditors by HMICFRS Inspectors.</p>
<p>Within six months, the force should design and provide training for all staff who make crime-recording decisions. This should include training in regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent of the information required to provide for a crime-recording decision to be made; • the expectation that reported crime is recorded at the first point that sufficient information exists to record a crime, which in the majority of cases will be at the point of report; • the proper use of classification N100 for reports of rape and recording crimes of rape involving multiple offenders and from third party reports; • offences involving the public order act, malicious communications, harassment and common assault; and • the additional verifiable information required in order to make crime-cancellation decisions. 	<p>Bespoke training has now been delivered to all staff in IMU, FCR and PPU.</p> <p>E learning in respect of Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) has now been completed by more than 3000 officers and staff in the organisation.</p>
<p>Area for Improvement</p>	<p>Progress</p>
<p>The force should immediately improve how it collects diversity information from all victims of crime and how it uses this to inform its compliance with its equality duty.</p>	<p>The force already captures victims' age, gender and ethnicity on every occasion however "protected characteristics" such as sexual orientation, disability, gender re-assignment etc. are only captured where these are determined to be relevant to the offence. The inference drawn is the force should ask every victim of crime if they are transgender, gay etc. Kent are committed to protect all communities however, it is felt that to ask victims about this when this has no relevance on the offence being reported would not be justified or proportionate. The Deputy Chief Constable has written to the HMICFRS to raise these concerns.</p>

LATEST AUDIT RESULTS

5. The force is carrying out regular audits to test compliance with the HOCR/National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS). These audits are based on the current HMICFRS CDI inspection criteria and involve auditors listening to calls made to operators as part of the initial reports to police.
6. The audit was broken-down into the three individual sections of Violence Against the Person (VAP), sexual and all other crime with the following criteria applied:
 - The data sample in respect of VAP and all other crime has been extracted from the period 9 September 2017 to 20 September 2017. The time period selected covers the most recent period that data would not already have been audited by the Data Audit Team as part of daily business.
 - The dates selected for the sexual offences sample had been widened to ensure a representative and statistically robust number for audit. The date range was 1 July 2017 to the 20 September 2017.
 - The opening code ('opened as') search criteria used to extract the data is the same which was applied in previous audits and by the HMICFRS.
 - An agreed variation of the audit workbook adopted by HMICFRS was used.
 - The samples sizes for each category were determined with reference to the Data Quality Audit Manual, and a confidence level of +/- 3% was applied.
7. The sample size for each was as follows:
 - VAP - 228 records reviewed
 - Sexual offences - 213 records reviewed
 - All other crime - 228 records reviewed
8. Overall compliance for the three categories is 90%. This is predicated by how many crimes should have been recorded in that incident, to how many were. The breakdown for the three categories is as follows:
 - VAP - 92% (216 crimes should have been recorded, 199 were)
 - Sexual offences - 83% (266 crimes should have been recorded, 222 were)
 - All other crime - 95% (235 crimes should have been recorded, 223 were)
9. The main issue in relation to VAP incidents was that all failures had originally been opened as a 'domestic' incident when in fact a notifiable crime should have been recorded. This will continue to be addressed as part of the risk based, daily audits.
10. The issue within the 'sexual offences' category was largely attributed to the investigations arising from two incidents, where numerous occurrences of incitement to sexual activity and 'sexting' were apparent. This is continuing to be addressed through briefings and bespoke training sessions.
11. In 'all other crime' most cases involved allegations which amounted to criminal damage that had not been recorded.
12. The results from the recent audit are encouraging and should be regarded as showing clear signs of improvement. In all cases reviewed the safeguarding of victims was apparent and victim care was very good.