

## HMIC Value for Money Profile 2016

### Leicestershire Police

compared with all forces in England & Wales

*The forces in the most similar group can be identified  
in the charts in this section by using the key below*

- |          |                 |
|----------|-----------------|
| <b>a</b> | Leicestershire  |
| <b>b</b> | Hertfordshire   |
| <b>c</b> | Hampshire       |
| <b>d</b> | Sussex          |
| <b>e</b> | Essex           |
| <b>f</b> | Bedfordshire    |
| <b>g</b> | Nottinghamshire |
| <b>h</b> | Kent            |

# Contents

## 3 Introduction

## 7 Section One – Costs, workforce and demand/performance

### Income and expenditure

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| 8 Overview                                | 13 Financing               |
| 9 Spend by function                       | 14 Earned income           |
| 10 Workforce costs - Officers             | 15 Funding trends          |
| 11 Workforce costs - Police staff & PCSOs | 16 Total costs by function |
| 12 Non-staff costs                        |                            |

### Net revenue expenditure by function:

- |                                  |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 17 Summary                       | 30 Investigations - public protection |
| 18 Local policing                | 32 Investigations                     |
| 20 Dealing with the public       | 34 Investigative support              |
| 22 Criminal justice arrangements | 36 Support functions                  |
| 24 Road policing                 | 39 PCC/Local policing bodies          |
| 26 Operational support           | 40 Criminal Justice costs             |
| 28 Intelligence                  |                                       |

### Workforce

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 41 Summary                                | 45 Leavers                                   |
| 42 Officers/PCSOs by rank                 | 46 Joiners                                   |
| 43 Officers/staff by back office function | 47 Sickness and recuperative/restricted duty |
| 44 Workforce numbers by function          | 48 Officers' length of service               |

### Demand/performance

- |                                       |                        |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 49 Crime trends                       | 53 Emergency incidents |
| 50 Crime per visible officers         | 54 Priority incidents  |
| 51 Crime outcome per visible officers | 55 All incidents       |
| 52 999 calls                          |                        |

## 56 Section Two – Offences and outcomes

- |                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 60 Crimes (excluding fraud)     | 76 Crime against children                         |
| 62 Victim-based offences        | 78 Outcome percentage                             |
| 64 Violence against the person  | 80 Charged/Summonsed                              |
| 66 Sexual offences              | 81 Out-of-court (formal)                          |
| 68 Robbery                      | 82 Out-of-court (informal)                        |
| 70 Theft offences               | 83 Suspect Identified - No Action Taken           |
| 72 Criminal damage and arson    | 84 Investigation complete – no suspect identified |
| 74 Other crimes against society | 85 Not yet assigned an outcome                    |

## 86 Annexes 1-4

## 95 Outliers

## Introduction

Data about a single force can never reveal all there is to know. Insight comes from putting a force's data side by side with others so that the differences are revealed. No two forces face the same problems, so it makes sense to compare the performance of forces which share similar demographics and are therefore, more likely to have similar problems. For example, there is more value in comparing Greater Manchester Police's crime performance with that of the West Midlands Police and other similar, large urban forces. In fact the Home Office has 'clustered' forces into most similar groups or MSGs, as we refer to them in this document, to produce a standard set of comparison forces to set against your force. We highlight these forces in the bar charts and, where relevant, we also show the most similar group of forces average (or MSG average), represented by a line across the bars in the charts. Forces in the same group as your force are listed on the front cover of this document.

We also show the expenditure for each force (usually expressed as £ per head of population) and compare it with other MSG forces. There are limitations, which you should be aware of. First and foremost, the way the police service is funded is largely based on past expenditure patterns and the ability of forces to raise different levels of income from their council tax base.

Secondly, the financial comparisons used in this document do not adjust for the costs of operating in a particular part of the country. An "area cost adjustment" figure is available from the Home Office, but when we applied it to the data, it made a small difference to some forces close to London, such as Surrey and Thames Valley, and for obvious reasons, a larger difference to the Metropolitan Police. For most forces there was little change, so we decided to present costs without the adjustment. A few forces may want to make some adjustments; but in general most forces are not sufficiently affected.

In any case, users of this information should be looking at larger differences in costs compared with the MSG average, than that represented by the area cost adjustment. Furthermore, it is often the case that the main factors which explain higher costs lie elsewhere. More often than not, the main factor is volume – higher PCSO expenditure is most likely due to having more of them, rather than the average cost of each PCSO. In some areas, such as training, the major factor is the mix of the workforce – a higher percentage of police officers can be expensive. (It may also be more appropriate in some cases.)

The aim of the profiles is to help Police and Crime Commissioners, Police and Crime Panels and force managers identify significant differences, raise legitimate questions, ask for explanations and possibly further investigation. The information draws attention to questions which should be addressed.

Here are some illustrative examples:

- why is it that this force is more able to identify rape suspects and charge them, than others?
- why is it that similar crimes attract different outcomes (such as charges or informal warnings) in different forces?
- is there a relationship between high sickness rates for police officers and the fact that this force has fewer local police officers?
- if more of our incidents are classified as emergencies than other similar forces, is that because we have too few call handlers (classified as dealing with the public) or because more training is required?
- if our information, communications and technology costs are higher, is this helping our force to be more efficient or is it just expensive?
- have major reductions in police staff resulted in more costly police officers doing 'back office type jobs'?

HMIC's Value for Money (VfM) profiles allow you to compare your force's performance, and the costs of achieving it, with that of other forces. The VfM profiles provide an important tool not only to help discover areas of high relative cost or identify differences in performance, but also to identify other forces which are achieving more with less. Although last year's autumn statement changed the financial climate for police forces; it remains challenging. This and a redistribution of the police grant among forces due to changes in the funding formula mean that the profiles continue to be a vital tool.

The VfM profiles are:

- designed for use by force management, police and crime commissioners (PCCs) and local policing bodies as well as HMIC;
- wide ranging, covering a large amount of information in a single, easy to use document;
- presented in a uniform format to allow you to focus attention on the main differences which require explanation and action to improve;
- timely – being published close to the announcement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's autumn statement, when major financial decisions are being taken;
- not league tables or targets – they are designed to raise questions, not make judgments.

Each profile has two parts: a summary (published separately), and this more detailed profile; both are available on our website. They are designed to be investigative tools to draw attention to large, and possibly unexplained, differences in costs or performance. These should be followed up to confirm whether resources are being used efficiently and effectively.

## What changes have been made?

The main changes this year are:

1. There have not been any major changes to the Police Objective Analysis (POA) definitions and categories. However, public protection units have been separated from investigations and are now presented separately as a distinct category (pages 30 and 31).
2. The profiles now provide data on how incidents have been categorised (emergency, priority, scheduled or resolved without deployment) and how this has differed from 2012/13 to 2015/2016.
3. For the second year, the profiles include data covering outcomes associated with recorded crime. The profiles present the data on principle outcomes for each crime category along with the difference from the expected volumes of those outcomes based on the England and Wales average.

## How do I use the profiles?

Most of the data are presented as bar charts so you can see how your force compares with others. Your force is highlighted in black with forces in your 'most similar group' (MSG) shown in teal. MSG forces share similar demographics (more details about MSG forces can be found on page 6). Finally, a horizontal line runs across each bar chart representing the average value across all forces in England and Wales (excluding the Metropolitan Police Service and City of London Police) unless stated otherwise.

The profiles are presented as '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 differences between your force and others. To illustrate, in the example given on page 5 a force could be spending more on police officers because there are more of them (officers per head of population), or because they are more expensive (cost per officer), or because it is spending more on overtime.

Most pages also include tables which lay out the main data presented in the charts as well as some additional comparisons. Typically, from left to right they show:

- a short description the relevant volumes (e.g. staff numbers/total costs/numbers of crimes)
- a ratio for comparison (e.g. staff per head of population)
- the average costs per volumes
- the 'difference' which
  - o for costs shows how much more, or less, it is costing your force than the average;
  - o for crimes/outcomes shows how many more, or fewer, crimes/outcomes your force is recording as a result of the difference from the average; and
  - o for workforce shows how much larger, or smaller, your force's workforce is as a result of the difference from the average.

- chevrons (<<) against the data highlight whether your force is an outlier for this item (whether the force is in the top or bottom 10 percent and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population).

*An example is shown on the following page*

## Note on Crime Data Integrity

In 2014 HMIC completed an inspection into the way police forces in England and Wales record crime data. This report identified serious concerns about the crime recording process and HMIC is now undertaking a programme of inspecting crime data recording across police forces in England and Wales. In response to the findings of both the 2014 report and the inspection programme, many forces have or are in the process of reviewing their crime recording processes. This may have an impact on recorded crime trends although the impact is likely to vary by force.

## Note on Collaboration

For the majority of forces that are not involved in significant or large-scale collaborations, the use of net expenditure provides an adequate comparison. However, as the use of collaboration increases in scale, the way data are collected and presented has adapted. In 2014/15, additional headings were added to the POA, separating out staff and third party costs and income related to collaboration. CIPFA guidance explains how forces should record their collaborations depending on the type of model they operate – As we present costs net of earned income, costs in collaborating forces should be broadly comparable with other forces. The main exception is costs per FTE staff, which can be distorted if the collaboration is reported using the 'lead force' model (where all staff are shown as based in the force providing the service, rather than split across the forces taking part in the collaboration).


## Feedback

Many forces worked with us throughout the development of the VfM profiles, and we are grateful to those that provided us with feedback and comments. HMIC is 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 [HMICProfiles@hmic.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:HMICProfiles@hmic.gsi.gov.uk).

## Guidance page - How to read the profiles



How much do officers in the force cost compared with others? How much overtime do they receive?

1. The profiles use 'logic trees' break each policing function down (from left to right) into component parts. For each breakdown, you can see how the force (labelled 'a') compares to other forces in its most similar group of forces (labelled 'b - f'), as well as all forces in England and Wales.




2. The force (a) has some of the highest officer costs per head of population nationally...


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



3. ...equating to a difference of £15.5m when compared to the national (all) average.



6. The force has more officers per 1,000 population than the national average, equating to a difference in cost of £17.2m (see



7. The cost of individual officers in the force is relatively low.

5. The force spends little (as a proportion) on overtime.

Officer costs	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
All pay exc. overtime	127.7	99.0	121.0	16.0	3.7
Overtime	2.2	3.0	3.4	-0.4	-0.7
Total	129.8	102.0	124.4	15.5	3.0

Officer overtime as a % of total salary costs	% sal	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Total	1.7%	3.0%	2.9%	-0.9	-0.8

Number of officers and cost per officer		Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTE per 1,000 population	2.54	1.93	2.40	17.2	3.8
Cost per FTE (£000s)	50.3	51.3	50.4	-1.4	-0.1

\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

N.B Outliers are highlighted with blue chevrons, and represent the values that are in the highest and lowest 10% of values across all force and, where appropriate, have a value of more than £1 per head.

## Frequently asked questions

### What is the purpose of the most similar group (MSG) comparison?

The MSG was designed to offer a fairer comparison of levels of crime between forces as they group forces with similar demographics. While MSG comparisons do not take account of the fact that some areas have higher costs than others; they are used here to compare costs since forces in a high crime MSG (such as large urban forces) are likely to have greater resources such as more officers, staff and PCSOs. While most forces share similar demographics with the rest of their group, there are a few that are less closely aligned (the Metropolitan Police Service, Dyfed-Powys Police, Surrey Police and City of London Police). Apart from City of London Police, the remaining forces are still included with a most similar group, but their appearance as an outlier means they should be treated with caution. MSGs were last updated for the 2013 VfM profiles using data from the 2011 Census; this grouping remains the most recent update.

### What checks have been applied to the data?

The data presented in the profiles are subject to a systematic checking process:

- The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) applies arithmetic and reconciliation checks to the financial data from forces.
- Each force is asked to check its statistical outliers (where its costs are significantly different from average and/or from its return for the previous year).
- Each force receives a draft profile to check the figures before publication.

Each year forces identify anomalies or inconsistencies which HMIC attempts to resolve. Forces are able to resubmit data to correct any errors.

### Which workforce figures are used?

The profiles include staff numbers drawn from two data sets: the Home Office annual data return (ADR), which is a snapshot at 31 March each year of full-time equivalent staff in post and the Police Objective Analysis (POA) which counts the average, budgeted, full-time equivalent staff for the financial year. Given the differences between the two, these figures in some cases will not align completely. In general, the profiles use POA budgeted staff numbers to make detailed financial comparisons between forces. However, POA is a relatively recent invention and, prior to 2011/12, it was not validated by HMIC. Consequently, it cannot provide a series long enough to show changing trends over time. In contrast, ADR has been validated over several years so is used to present trends on police officers, PCSO and police staff numbers. It is also used where equivalent data are not available from POA.

### Which population figures are used?

The profiles use mid-2015 population estimates, which are the latest available from the ONS. Please note that the ONS police recorded crime data publication, 12 months to 31 March 2016 (published in July 2016) used mid-2014 population estimates so numbers will not match exactly.

### Which crime figures are used?

The VfM profiles include the crime statistics published by the ONS in for the data for the 12 months to March 2016. The Home Office introduced a new framework to measure outcomes associated with crimes in 2013. Data covering outcomes associated with crimes recorded in the 12 months to 31 March 2016 for all forces are published by the Home Office and updated on 20 October 2016.

### How are averages calculated?

Unless stated otherwise, the simple average of all forces and MSG forces are used. Except for their own profiles, City of London Police and the Metropolitan Police Service are omitted from the averages and the charts because they are outliers in most categories.

### What rule is used to highlight outliers?

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.

### Where can I find further contextual information to help me understand the data?

Further contextual information can be provided by HMIC, for example the definitions used by CIPFA in constructing the POA dataset.

## Section One – Costs, workforce and demand/performance

This section looks at how a force deploys its workforce and the associated costs for each of the 13 headline categories within the Police Objective Analysis (POA). POA subcategory information on costs is also presented. POA estimates are used for all cost and workforce data unless stated otherwise. These data are taken as a snapshot as at 8 November 2016. Any updates to the data made after this time will not be reflected in the profile. Home Office Annual Data Requirement (ADR) data is used where relevant POA data is not available. Examples include officers by rank, sickness rates, restricted/recuperative duty rates, officers' length of service and leavers/joiners.

With the exception of special constables, workforce data comprises full-time equivalent (FTE) figures. In POA estimates these are calculated as the number of staff budgeted for each staff type. Police workforce figures published by the Home Office are based on those in-post as of 31 March each year. The two sets of figures are not, therefore, directly comparable.

### Key to the data and calculations

- Net revenue expenditure: The profiles use a different calculation for net revenue expenditure to the 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, including the force in question. As the Metropolitan Police and City of London Police data distort the chart scales, they have been excluded from all charts and averages except for those in their own profiles.
- Difference to most similar group (MSG) / All force: Differences are calculated using the difference in cost per head. An example calculation is as follows: (Force cost per head - MSG cost per head) multiplied by population = absolute cost of difference.
- Police officer spend as % of gross expenditure: The profiles show the proportion of spend on officers (including overtime) by function. Calculation is as follows: (Police officer spend + Police officer overtime) / Gross Revenue Expenditure (GRE) = police officer spend as % of GRE.

- National policing: To more accurately compare forces, national policing functions (such as counter terrorism/special branch) is not included in totals of spend and workforce (unless stated otherwise).
- Operational frontline, frontline support and business support: POA data is mapped onto these categories. Since counter-terrorism/special branch is a national policing function, we do not include this as a frontline role (for the reason given above). Due to this, and the previously described differences between the ADR and POA workforce data, the totals and proportions may not match those published elsewhere. The list of POA categories and their classifications are given in Annex 3.

Please note that, throughout the profiles, rounding may cause apparent discrepancies between totals and the sums of the parts.

### How to use this section

Users may wish to focus on those charts where the force is an outlier, i.e. where the force is significantly different from the average. Outliers are highlighted with blue chevrons and indicate that the force falls within the highest or lowest 10% and, where applicable, the financial value is greater than £1 per head. Alternatively users may wish to examine where the force of interest is positioned relative to other forces they think are similarly performing or where they expect that force to be.

Users should consider exploring 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. Please note that in some cases, charts are not given for all breakdowns; priority is given to those areas with the highest costs or levels.

Throughout the profiles the chart scales vary and as a result the differences shown may not be as significant as they first appear.









## Income and expenditure - Overview

How much does the force spend in each area of business compared with others? How much does it earn in income?

### Cost per head of population

The profiles calculate net revenue expenditure (NRE) as total expenditure minus earned income to show the total cost of policing to the taxpayer. Note that this is different from NRE as reported in the raw POA data.

To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions (such as counter-terrorism/special branch) are excluded from the data analysis and charts.



Population		1,056k				
	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	94.4	89.4	95.1	87.1	-6.0	2.5
Police staff	44.9	42.6	38.9	39.6	3.8	3.1
PCSOs	7.3	6.9	6.4	5.1	0.5	1.9
Workforce	146.7	138.9	140.4	131.8	-1.6	7.5
Non-staff costs	44.7	42.4	45.2	36.5	-3.0	6.2
Earned income	-17.4	-16.5	-8.4	-9.6	-8.6	-7.3
<b>NRE exc nat.pol.</b>	174.0	164.7	177.2	158.7	-13.2	6.4
National policing**	4.4	4.1	4.3	6.1	-0.2	-2.0
<b>NRE inc nat. pol.</b>	178.3	168.9	181.5	164.7	-13.4	4.4

\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Note that national policing has been included in the table only for reference so that the totals reconcile to the financing totals later in this section.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17



## Income and expenditure - Spend by function


What proportion of spend is on the front line or in business support compared with others? What proportion is spent in visible functions?

### Cost per head of population





Police workforce roles are split into three categories: operational front line, frontline support and business support. The front line is further broken down into visible and non-visible roles (see Annex 3 for a breakdown by POA category). These plots show the NRE in each category. To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions are excluded.

Collaboration and outsourcing affect workforce numbers so costs, rather than FTE figures, are presented.

Note that in *PEEL: Police efficiency 2015 (October 2015)* HMIC define frontline support as *operational support*. Since this is the name of a POA category, *frontline support* is used here to avoid confusion.



	NRE £m	Force breakdown	Averages		MSG Diff**
			All	MSG	£m
Visible	53.4	33.4%	38.2%	35.2%	-3.0
Non-visible	63.0	39.4%	32.4%	36.2%	5.1
Operational front line	116.4	72.8%	70.6%	71.5%	2.1
Frontline support	15.4	9.6%	8.7%	8.4%	1.9
Business support	28.2	17.6%	20.7%	20.1%	-4.0
Other*	13.9				
<b>Total (NRE)</b>	<b>174.0</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	



\* Functions classified as *Other* do not fit into any of the three categories. They include costs associated with the PCC and central costs such as capital financing and pension costs.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in proportion spent in each category compared to the average of MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17






Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - Workforce costs - Officers

How much do officers in the force cost compared with others? How much overtime do they receive?

### Cost per head of population

Police officer costs are split into salary and overtime (OT). OT costs are also shown as a percentage of the overall salary costs (including OT). To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions are excluded.



**FTE police officers** 1,851 (exc national policing functions)

Officer costs	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
All pay exc. overtime	91.4	86.6	92.3	84.4	-6.1	2.3
Overtime	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.7	0.1	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>94.4</b>	<b>89.4</b>	<b>95.1</b>	<b>87.1</b>	<b>-6.0</b>	<b>2.5</b>

Officer overtime as a % total salary cost	% salary	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.1</b>

Number of officers and cost per officer	Force	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTE per 1,000 population	1.75	1.76	1.61	-0.4	7.2
Cost** per FTE (£000s)	49.4	52.5	52.4	-5.8	-5.5

\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Cost excludes overtime.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - Workforce costs - Police staff and police community support officers (PCSOs)

How much do police staff and PCSOs cost in the force compared with others?

### Cost per head of population

National policing functions have been excluded to improve comparability between forces.




Note that collaboration/outsourcing arrangements will affect staff costs for certain forces.

### Police staff

<b>Police staff FTE</b>	1,315 (exc national policing functions)		
-------------------------	---	--	--

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
<b>Police staff cost</b>	44.9	42.6	38.9	39.6	3.8	3.1
<i>Including overtime costs</i>						

	Force	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTEs per 1,000 pop	1.2	1.1	1.2	4.4	2.9
Cost** per FTE (£000s)	34.2	35.2	34.0	-1.3	0.2





### PCSOs

<b>PCSOs FTE</b>	251 (exc national policing functions)		
------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
<b>PCSO cost</b>	7.3	6.9	6.4	5.1	0.5	1.9
<i>Including overtime costs</i>						

	Force	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTEs per 1,000 pop	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.1	2.2
Cost** per FTE (£000s)	29.1	31.7	31.5	-0.7	-0.6



\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Cost includes overtime.

## Income and expenditure - Non-staff costs







Apart from on the workforce, where else is the force spending money compared with others?

### Non-staff costs as a percentage of workforce costs

Workforce costs include officer, staff and PCSO salary and overtime costs only. Temporary and agency costs are classified as non-staff. To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions are excluded.

Non-staff costs are broken down into specific types of running costs. They are shown as a percentage of workforce costs as many are largely dependent on the size of the workforce.

Note that collaboration, outsourcing and partnership arrangements will affect the data for some forces.



Force workforce costs		£147m				
	£m	% of w'force costs	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Supplies and services**	18.3	12.5%	11.5%	11.4%	1.5	1.6
Force collaboration payments	3.6	2.5%	5.2%	3.1%	-4.0	-0.9
Premises related expenses	5.1	3.5%	5.0%	4.2%	-2.2	-1.1
Transport related expenses	3.4	2.3%	2.5%	2.4%	-0.3	-0.2
Restructure, training and conference	0.7	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%	-0.1	0.1
Other employee expenses***	4.7	3.2%	2.5%	2.2%	1.1	1.5
PCC outsource/collab/commission	4.7	3.2%	2.2%	2.1%	1.5	1.7
<b>Non-staff costs</b>	<b>40.6</b>	<b>27.7%</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>25.9%</b>	<b>-2.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>
Capital financing	4.1	2.8%	3.1%	1.9%	-0.4	1.4
<b>Total non-staff costs</b>	<b>44.7</b>	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>27.7%</b>	<b>-3.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average percentage of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Includes 3rd party payments excluding collaboration.

\*\*\* Including temporary and agency staff, injury and ill health costs.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire







## Income and expenditure - Financing

How much money does the local policing body receive in funding compared with others and from where? What is the level of council tax in the force and how does that compare with others?

### Funding per head of population

Central funding is broken down into formula-based funding\*, and government grants, which are not formula based. Local funding is comprised of council tax, use of reserves and council tax support grants.

To show a typical council tax payment in the force, Band D tax rates (from CIPFA estimates) have been included. The yield shows the amount, from every £1 of council tax collected, that goes to the local policing body.



Population	1,056k		Averages		Diff** £m
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	
Formula funding*	105.0	99.4	107.4	97.2	2.3
Legacy council tax grants	8.9	8.5	6.7	6.9	1.7
Specific grants	6.2	5.8	7.3	7.3	-1.6
<b>Central funding</b>	<b>120.1</b>	<b>113.7</b>	<b>121.3</b>	<b>111.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>
Council tax	56.9	53.9	58.5	52.6	1.3
Reserves	1.3	1.3	1.7	0.7	0.6
<b>Local funding</b>	<b>58.2</b>	<b>55.2</b>	<b>60.2</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>2.0</b>
<b>Net revenue expenditure</b>	<b>178.3</b>	<b>168.9</b>	<b>181.5</b>	<b>164.7</b>	<b>4.4</b>

\* Sum of police grant, non-domestic rates and revenue support grant.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of MSG forces.

Band D tax rate	Averages	
	All	MSG
£183.6	£178.4	£160.9

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - Earned income







How much money does the force earn compared with others and from where does it receive it?

### Income per head of population

Earned income is removed from Gross Revenue Expenditure (GRE) in order to calculate NRE and does not include government grants.

To improve comparability between forces national policing functions have been excluded.

Some forces have high earned income related to special functions such as policing ports and airports or policing large events (sports, festivals etc.).



Population		Averages				Diff* £m	
	1,056k	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Reimbursed income							
- From collaboration		9.9	9.4	3.0	2.9	6.8	6.9
- Other		0.0	0.0	0.7	0.8	-0.7	-0.8
Sales, fees, charges and rents		4.3	4.1	2.7	2.8	1.4	1.3
Special police services		1.3	1.2	0.9	1.9	0.4	-0.8
Partnership income		1.9	1.8	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.8
Interest		0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	-0.1	-0.1
<b>Total earned income</b>		<b>17.4</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>7.3 &lt;&lt;</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in earnings to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - Funding trends

How has the local policing body's income changed over time compared with others?

Please note that estimates of reserves are unreliable and that these figures are not adjusted for inflation. The change over time is, therefore, a nominal and not a real change.  
The Band D council tax rates are from CIPFA estimates.


Note that change over time for reserves has not been given due to values crossing zero, with the potential for false negatives.

Note that values for previous years have been adjusted using mid-2015 population figures.

Force £ per 1,000 pop	2012/13 estimate	2013/14 estimate	2014/15 estimate	2015/16 estimate	2016/17 estimate	Change 12/13- 16/17
Central funding*	116.5	114.1	110.2	105.6	105.3	-10%
Legacy council tax grants		1.8	9.2	8.5	8.5	
Council tax	52.9	53.4	48.4	51.2	53.9	2%
Reserves	2.5	-0.3	0.2	2.7	1.3	
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>171.9</b>	<b>169.0</b>	<b>168.0</b>	<b>167.9</b>	<b>168.9</b>	<b>-2%</b>

MSG Average £ per 1,000 pop	2012/13 estimate	2013/14 estimate	2014/15 estimate	2015/16 estimate	2016/17 estimate	Change 12/13- 16/17
Central funding*	114.9	113.9	108.1	105.0	104.6	-9%
Legacy council tax grants		1.9	6.8	6.3	6.9	
Council tax	51.3	49.9	48.2	51.2	52.6	3%
Reserves	0.5	-0.4	0.0	1.2	0.7	
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>166.7</b>	<b>165.2</b>	<b>163.1</b>	<b>163.6</b>	<b>164.7</b>	<b>-1%</b>

Band D tax rate	£174	£174	£176	£180	£184
All Average	£166	£169	£172	£175	£178



\*Central funding does not include council tax freeze grant.

Source: POA Estimates 2012/13 to 2016/17

Leicestershire



## Income and expenditure - Total costs by function

How does the force apportion its spend across the different functions compared with others? How has this changed since last year?

Population	1,056k								
	Budgeted spend £m	Spend per head £		Diff from*		% of total**		% Officers***	
		Force	MSG Av	MSG £m	Last year	Force	MSG Av	Force	MSG Av
Neighbourhood policing	25.3	23.9	22.5	1.5	0.6	15.3%	14.6%	68.4%	69.1%
Incident (response) management	18.9	17.9	18.2	-0.3	-0.5	11.4%	11.8%	99.8%	73.3%
Local investigation/prisoner processing	19.4	18.4	14.2	4.4	1.2	11.7%	9.2%	87.6%	93.7%
Other local policing	3.1	2.9	5.2	-2.4	-2.7	1.9%	3.4%	73.2%	71.4%
Local policing	66.7	63.1	60.1	3.2	-1.4	40.2%	38.9%	83.1%	86.1%
Dealing with the public	9.7	9.2	10.3	-1.1	0.1	5.9%	6.6%	14.4%	15.4%
Road policing	2.8	2.6	3.7	-1.1	-0.2	1.7%	2.4%	56.0%	68.6%
Operational support	5.7	5.4	5.5	-0.1	0.0	3.4%	3.6%	80.5%	79.9%
Intelligence	9.0	8.5	7.0	1.7	-0.4	5.4%	4.5%	52.8%	55.2%
Investigation - Public protection	11.0	10.4	9.3	1.1	1.3	6.6%	6.0%	72.1%	80.2%
Investigations [exc local investigation]	11.5	10.9	8.6	2.4	0.3	6.9%	5.6%	60.3%	56.4%
Investigative support	3.9	3.7	4.0	-0.3	0.2	2.4%	2.6%	1.4%	2.1%
Custody	4.5	4.2	5.9	-1.8	0.8	2.7%	3.8%	50.8%	40.1%
Other criminal justice arrangements	4.1	3.9	4.3	-0.4	-1.4	2.5%	2.8%	3.9%	1.2%
Criminal justice arrangements	8.6	8.1	10.2	-2.1	-0.7	5.2%	6.6%	21.5%	23.7%
ICT	7.7	7.3	8.0	-0.7	-0.3	4.7%	5.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Human resources	2.7	2.6	2.1	0.5	-0.1	1.6%	1.4%	0.0%	2.6%
Training	2.9	2.8	3.3	-0.6	-0.1	1.8%	2.2%	26.8%	41.6%
Other support functions	17.7	16.8	18.9	-2.2	-0.6	10.7%	12.2%	16.1%	16.6%
Support functions	31.1	29.5	32.4	-3.0	-1.1	18.8%	20.9%	10.2%	11.1%
Police and Crime Commissioner	5.7	5.4	3.6	1.9	0.2	3.4%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total exc national policing and central costs</b>	<b>165.7</b>	<b>156.9</b>	<b>154.6</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>-1.7</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>49.3%</b>	<b>51.8%</b>
National policing	4.4	4.1							
Central costs	8.3	7.8							
<b>Total</b>	<b>178.3</b>	<b>168.9</b>							

Note that workforce under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' not 'investigation' as in POA

\* The difference in spend per 1,000 population and last year values have been adjusted with mid-2015 population figures.

\*\* Percentage of budgeted spend (excluding on national policing and central costs) by function.

\*\*\* Cost of police officers as % of total gross cost by function.

Source: POA estimates 2015/16 and 2016/17


Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Summary

What does the force spend across the different functions compared with others?

National policing functions have been excluded to improve comparability between forces.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing arrangements will affect staff costs for certain forces.













Population	1,056k					
	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Local policing**	66.7	63.1	66.7	60.1	-3.8	3.2
Dealing with the public	9.7	9.2	11.0	10.3	-1.9	-1.1
Criminal justice arrangements	8.6	8.1	11.2	10.2	-3.2	-2.1 <<
Road policing	2.8	2.6	4.0	3.7	-1.5	-1.1
Operational support***	5.7	5.4	7.2	5.5	-1.9	-0.1 <<
Intelligence	9.0	8.5	7.2	7.0	1.4	1.7
Public protection	11.0	10.4	9.4	9.3	1.0	1.1
Investigations	11.5	10.9	8.2	8.6	2.9	2.4
Investigative support	3.9	3.7	4.5	4.0	-0.8	-0.3
Support functions	31.1	29.5	36.7	32.4	-7.7	-3.0 <<
PCC/Local Policing Body	5.7	5.4	4.2	3.6	1.3	1.9
<b>Tot. exc national pol. &amp; central costs</b>	<b>165.7</b>	<b>156.9</b>	<b>170.3</b>	<b>154.6</b>	<b>-14.1</b>	<b>2.5</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Note that workforce under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' and not 'investigation' as in POA.

\*\*\* Note that this is the POA category, not the workforce descriptor used in *Policing in Austerity: Meeting the Challenge* (July 2014).








Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Local policing (including local investigation/prisoner processing)

What does the force spend on the different areas within local policing compared with others?

Note that a chart showing the combined cost of neighbourhood policing and incident (response) management has been included as some forces use the same staff to fulfil both functions.



Population 1,056k

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m		% Off**	MSG Avg.
			All	MSG	All	MSG		
Incident (response) management	18.9	17.9	26.2	18.2	-8.8	-0.3	100%	73%
Neighbourhood policing	25.3	23.9	23.4	22.5	0.6	1.5	68%	69%
Local investigation/prisoner processing***	19.4	18.4	11.8	14.2	6.9	4.4	88%	94%
Specialist community liaison	2.8	2.6	3.4	3.6	-0.8	-1.1	72%	64%
Policing command team & support overheads	0.3	0.3	1.8	1.6	-1.6	-1.3	85%	77%
<b>Local policing</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>63.1</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>60.1</b>	<b>-3.8</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>86%</b>
<b>Total exc local investigation</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>54.9</b>	<b>45.9</b>	<b>-10.7</b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>84%</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure.

\*\*\* Workforce included 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' not investigation as in POA.






Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Local policing (including local investigation/prisoner processing) - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within local policing compared with others?


Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG		
Police officers	1,125	1.07	1.12	1.01	-55	54
PCSOs	251	0.24	0.20	0.16	38	77
Police staff	100	0.09	0.07	0.08	27	15

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG		
Police officers	55.8	52.8	57.4	52.2	-4.9	0.7
PCSOs	7.3	6.9	6.4	5.1	0.5	1.9
Police staff	3.2	3.0	2.2	2.5	0.8	0.6
Non-staff costs	1.0	0.9	1.6	1.1	-0.7	-0.2
Earned income	-0.5	-0.5	-0.9	-0.8	0.4	0.3
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>63.1</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>60.1</b>	<b>-3.8</b>	<b>3.2</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£50k	£51k	£51k	-2.0	-2.1
PCSOs	£29k	£32k	£31k	-0.7	-0.5
Staff	£32k	£32k	£31k	0.0	0.1



\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.




Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Dealing with the public

How does the force spend its money within dealing with the public compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population	1,056k							
	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m		%	MSG
			All	MSG	All	MSG	Officer**	Average
Central communications unit	8.5	8.0	9.5	8.7	-1.6	-0.7	13%	15%
Local call centres/front desk	0.9	0.8	1.2	1.2	-0.4	-0.4	0%	5%
Command team and support	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	78%	53%
Dealing with the public	9.7	9.2	11.0	10.3	-1.9	-1.1	14%	15%

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure.






Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Dealing with the public - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within dealing with the public compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	22	0.02	0.03	0.03	-15	-5
Police staff and PCSOs	228	0.22	0.24	0.25	-25	-35

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	1.4	1.3	2.1	1.6	-0.8	-0.3
Police staff and PCSOs	8.3	7.9	8.4	8.5	-0.6	-0.6
Non-staff costs	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.2	-0.6	-0.2
Earned income	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>-1.9</b>	<b>-1.1</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£65k	£60k	£64k	0.1	0.0
Police staff and PCSOs	£36k	£35k	£34k	0.3	0.6

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17







Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Criminal justice arrangements

What does the force spend on the different areas within criminal justice arrangements compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population		Averages			
1,056k					
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	
Custody	3.5	3.3	5.2	5.2	
Police doctors / nurses and surgeons	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.7	
Custody subtotal	4.5	4.2	6.3	5.9	
Criminal justice	2.1	2.0	2.6	2.5	
Police national computer	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.8	
Criminal records bureau	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	
Property officer / stores	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	
Fixed penalty scheme	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	
Coroner assistance	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	
Command team and support	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.1	
Other criminal justice arrangements subtotal	2.0	1.9	2.3	1.8	
<b>Criminal justice arrangements</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>10.2</b>	

Diff* £m		% Off**		MSG
All	MSG	Off**	Average	
-2.0	-2.0	<<	51%	40%
-0.1	0.2		0%	0%
-2.1	-1.8	<<	39%	35%
-0.6	-0.5		4%	6%
-0.1	0.2		0%	0%
0.0	0.0		0%	0%
-0.1	-0.1		0%	1%
-0.2	-0.1		0%	0%
-0.2	-0.1		n/a	0%
0.2	0.2		19%	26%
-0.4	0.2			
-3.2	-2.1	<<	21%	24%

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.






Leicestershire



## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Criminal justice arrangements - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within criminal justice arrangements compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	36	0.03	0.05	0.04	-14	-7
Police staff and PCSOs	145	0.14	0.19	0.19	-51	-53

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	2.1	2.0	2.9	2.6	-1.0	-0.7
Police staff and PCSOs	4.1	3.9	5.6	5.4	-1.8	-1.6
Non-staff costs	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.0	-0.1	0.4
Earned income	-1.1	-1.1	-0.7	-0.8	-0.3	-0.3
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>-3.2</b>	<b>-2.1</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff**	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£58k	£61k	£64k	-0.1	-0.2
Police staff and PCSOs	£28k	£30k	£29k	-0.3	-0.1

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17




Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Road policing

What does the force spend on the different areas within road policing compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing may affect costs for certain forces. - particularly those hosting such arrangements.



Lincolnshire police, Leicestershire Police, Northamptonshire Police and Nottinghamshire Police collaborate to deliver the Operational Support Service (EMOpSS). This means that officers from any of these forces may be deployed to other forces. If a force appears as an anomaly in the above charts, this may be explained by their collaborative approach to the delivery of this function.

Population	Averages				Diff* £m		% of which Officers**	MSG Average
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG		
Traffic Units	2.8	2.6	4.3	3.8	-1.7	-1.3	92%	87%
Command Team and Support	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0%	36%
Casualty Reduction Partnership	0.0	0.0	-0.3	-0.2	0.3	0.2	3%	22%
All other road policing subtotal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
<b>Road policing</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>-1.1</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>69%</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17






Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Road policing - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within road policing compared with others?

Note that collaboration, outsourcing and other partnership arrangements will affect costs and earned income for some forces - particularly those hosting such arrangements.

Earned income will include driver awareness courses and Casualty Reduction Partnerships.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	54	0.05	0.08	0.06	-26	-14
Police staff and PCSOs	40	0.04	0.03	0.03	10	9

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	2.6	2.5	4.1	3.6	-1.7	-1.2
Police staff and PCSOs	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.1
Non-staff costs	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.1	0.3
Earned income	-1.9	-1.8	-1.7	-1.6	-0.1	-0.2
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>-1.1</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£49k	£54k	£56k	-0.3	-0.4
Police staff and PCSOs	£28k	£31k	£33k	-0.1	-0.2

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17


Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Operational support

What does the force spend on the different areas within operational support compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs. Operational support used here is the POA category, not the workforce descriptor used in HMIC's PEEL: Police efficiency 2015 (October 2015)

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.








Lincolnshire police, Leicestershire Police, Northamptonshire Police deliver the East Midlands Operational Support Service (EMOpSS training), roads policing, dogs and POLSA search and command officers from any of these forces may be deployed across all four force areas. For any instances where these forces appear as an anomaly, this may be explained by their collaborative approach to the delivery of this function.

Population	1,056k		Averages		Diff* £m		%	MSG
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Off**	Average
Firearms unit	2.8	2.7	3.3	2.5	-0.6	0.2	96%	92%
Dogs section	0.9	0.9	1.1	0.9	-0.3	0.0	87%	89%
Advanced public order	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.6	0.1	0.4	98%	77%
Air operations	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.5	-0.3	0.0	0%	4%
Civil contingencies	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.1	59%	62%
Command team and support	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.0	45%	71%
Other functions	-0.7	-0.7	0.2	0.1	-0.9	-0.8		
<b>Operational support</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>-1.9</b>	<b>-0.1</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>80%</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure

Source: POA estimates 2016/17








Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Operational support - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within operational support compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff** FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	118	0.11	0.11	0.11	-3	1
Police staff and PCSOs	9	0.01	0.01	0.01	-2	-6

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	5.7	5.4	6.5	6.1	-1.2	-0.7
Police staff and PCSOs	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.5	-0.1	-0.3
Non-staff costs	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.0	-0.3	0.0
Earned income	-1.4	-1.3	-1.0	-2.1	-0.3	0.9
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>-1.9</b>	<b>-0.1</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£48k	£56k	£55k	-1.0	-0.8
Police staff and PCSOs	£28k	£37k	£38k	-0.1	-0.1

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.





Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Intelligence

What does the force spend on the different areas within intelligence compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population	1,056k		Averages		Diff* £m		% MSG	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Off**	Average
Intelligence gathering	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.7	0.1	-0.1	72%	66%
Intelligence analysis / threat assessments	4.7	4.4	3.4	2.8	1.0	1.7	36%	33%
Command team and support	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.1	85%	65%
<b>Intelligence</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>55%</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.






\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Intelligence - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within intelligence compared with others?



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	114	0.11	0.07	0.07	36	39
Police staff and PCSOs	137	0.13	0.07	0.08	60	57

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	6.1	5.8	4.2	4.0	1.7	1.9
Police staff and PCSOs	4.5	4.3	2.5	2.5	1.9	1.9
Non-staff costs	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.0	0.1
Earned income	-2.6	-2.5	-0.4	-0.4	-2.2	-2.3
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.7</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£54k	£57k	£56k	-0.4	-0.3
Police staff and PCSOs	£33k	£34k	£33k	-0.2	0.0

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.





Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire



## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigation public protection

What does the force spend on the different areas within public protection compared with others?



Population	1,056k							
	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m		% Average	
			All	MSG	All	MSG	Off**	MSG
Witness protection	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-0.1	0.0	n/a	3%
Child protection	5.7	5.4	2.4	2.3	3.1	3.2	79%	60%
Adult protection	5.3	5.0	6.9	7.0	-2.0	-2.1	65%	80%
<b>Public protection</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>80%</b>

"n/a" indicates zero expenditure

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.






\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigation public protection - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within investigations compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG		
Police officers	173	0.16	0.14	0.14	21	21
Police staff and PCSOs	74	0.07	0.05	0.04	24	29

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG		
Police officers	8.5	8.0	7.6	7.7	0.4	0.4
Police staff and PCSOs	2.2	2.1	1.5	1.3	0.7	0.8
Non-staff costs	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5
Earned income	-0.8	-0.7	-0.2	-0.2	-0.6	-0.6
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG		
Police officers	£49k	£53k	£53k	-0.7	-0.7
Police staff and PCSOs	£30k	£32k	£31k	-0.1	-0.1

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17








Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigations (excluding local investigation/prisoner processing)

What does the force spend on the different areas within investigations compared with others?

Note that spend on local investigation/prisoner processing is classified under local policing. Collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.

A new category for cyber crime was added to the POA dataset for 2015, for use when a force has a separate cyber crime unit. Many forces (10) have entered a zero value.



Population 1,056k

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m		% Average	
			All	MSG	All	MSG	Off**	MSG
Major investigations unit	2.6	2.4	2.9	2.9	-0.5	-0.5	57%	64%
Serious and organised crime unit	3.8	3.6	2.3	2.4	1.3	1.2	72%	71%
Economic crime	2.3	2.2	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.3	46%	47%
Command team and support overheads	1.8	1.7	0.9	1.2	0.8	0.5	60%	69%
Specialist investigation units	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	-0.2	-0.6	n/a	32%
Cyber crime	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.5	47%	27%
<b>Investigations</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>56%</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure






Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigations (excluding local investigation/prisoner processing) - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within investigations compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	141	0.13	0.09	0.09	47	51
PCSOs	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Police staff	105	0.10	0.04	0.08	57	26

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	8.3	7.9	5.9	5.5	2.1	2.5
Police staff and PCSOs	3.8	3.6	1.6	2.9	2.1	0.8
Non-staff costs	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.4	0.2	0.2
Earned income	-2.3	-2.2	-0.7	-1.1	-1.5	-1.1
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.4</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£59k	£66k	£65k	-1.0	-0.8
Police staff and PCSOs	£37k	£37k	£38k	0.0	-0.2

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17





Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigative support

What does the force spend on the different areas within investigative support compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population		1,056k							
				Averages		Diff* £m		%	
		£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Off**	MSG Average
Scenes of crime officers		1.4	1.3	1.4	1.3	-0.1	0.0	0%	2%
External forensic costs		0.8	0.8	1.1	1.0	-0.3	-0.2	0%	0%
Other forensic services		1.1	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.0	0.2	5%	3%
Fingerprint/internal forensic		0.2	0.2	0.5	0.5	-0.4	-0.3	0%	0%
Photographic image recovery		0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.0	0%	4%
Command team and support		0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0%	5%
<b>Investigative support</b>		<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>-0.8</b>	<b>-0.3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure.






Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigative support - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within investigative support compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	1	0.00	0.00	0.00	-2	-1
Police staff and PCSOs	48	0.05	0.07	0.06	-26	-20

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	-0.2	0.0
Police staff and PCSOs	2.1	2.0	2.7	2.5	-0.7	-0.5
Non-staff costs	1.7	1.6	2.0	1.6	-0.4	0.0
Earned income	0.0	0.0	-0.4	-0.2	0.4	0.2
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>-0.8</b>	<b>-0.3</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£55k	£62k	£57k	0.0	0.0
Police staff and PCSOs	£45k	£38k	£38k	0.3	0.3

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17











Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Support functions

What does the force spend on the different areas within support functions compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population 1,056k

			Averages		Diff* £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
ICT	7.7	7.3	9.1	8.0	-1.9	-0.7
Estates / central building	5.0	4.7	7.8	6.0	-3.3	-1.3 <<
Fleet services	2.2	2.0	3.1	2.7	-1.1	-0.7 <<
Training	2.9	2.8	3.5	3.3	-0.8	-0.6
Performance review	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.2	-0.4	-0.3
Administration support	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.2	0.0	-0.1
Human resources	2.7	2.6	2.1	2.1	0.5	0.5
Professional standards	1.9	1.8	1.4	1.3	0.4	0.6
Finance	0.9	0.9	1.2	1.1	-0.4	-0.3
All other support functions	3.5	3.3	4.1	3.4	-0.9	0.0
<b>Support functions</b>	<b>31.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>36.7</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>-7.7</b>	<b>-3.0 &lt;&lt;</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17


Leicestershire



## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Support functions - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within support functions compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.







Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	68	0.06	0.06	0.06	1	6
Police staff and PCSOs	416	0.39	0.34	0.34	58	59

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	3.9	3.7	4.1	3.8	-0.5	-0.2
Police staff and PCSOs	14.5	13.7	12.2	12.0	1.6	1.8
Non-staff costs	19.4	18.4	22.0	18.3	-3.9	0.0
Earned income	-6.7	-6.3	-1.7	-1.8	-4.9	-4.7
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>31.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>36.7</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>-7.7</b>	<b>-3.0</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£57k	£65k	£65k	-0.6	-0.6
Police staff and PCSOs	£35k	£36k	£36k	-0.5	-0.3

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.



## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Support functions - Use of resources

These charts provide a detailed breakdown of support service functions as a cost per FTE and a percentage of total NRE.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.

### POA 2016/17 estimates (including national policing functions)

Total FTE*	3,504
Officer FTE	1,919
Total NRE (£m)	178.3






\*Officers, staff and PCSOs

	Cost £m	per FTE	All Avg	Diff** £m
ICT	7.7	£2,209	£2,900	-2.4
Estates	5.0	£1,425	£2,474	-3.7
Training	2.9	£838	£1,118	-1.0
Human resources	2.7	£774	£667	0.4
Finance	0.9	£265	£390	-0.4






	% NRE	All Avg	Diff** £m
ICT	4.3%	5.0%	-1.2
Estates	2.8%	4.3%	-2.6
Training	1.6%	1.9%	-0.5
Human resources	1.5%	1.2%	0.6
Finance	0.5%	0.7%	-0.3

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all forces.

### Cost per FTE



### Percent NRE



Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)/Local policing bodies

What is the expenditure of the local policing body on its own office and non-policing commissioned services?







Broadly, 'Cost of PCC/Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime' includes salary and associated costs (including expenses and training) of the PCC, deputy PCC and any appointed deputies and special advisers. For the Metropolitan Police Service this relates to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and similar staff and costs. PCC salaries are set by the Senior Salaries Review Body.

'Office of PCC/local policing body & other costs' includes salary and associated costs of the Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer and any other staff employed to support the PCC/ Deputy Mayor as well as office-running costs. It also includes other local policing body costs such as external audit and council tax leaflets.

PCC Commissioned services includes

- services previously commissioned under the community safety fund grant;
- victim and witness services including restorative justice (RJ); and
- services directly commissioned by the PCC.

The split between Community Safety and Victims/Witnesses/RJ/Other costs is based on percentage of gross PCC Commissioned Services spent on Community Safety.



Population 1,056k

	£m	£/head	Averages	
			All	MSG
Community Safety	3.28	3.11	1.36	1.28
Victims & witnesses, restorative justice & other	1.42	1.34	1.64	1.26
<b>PCC/local policing body commissioned services</b>	<b>4.70</b>	<b>4.45</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.53</b>
Cost of PCC/Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime	0.09	0.09	0.15	0.10
Office of PCC/local policing body & other costs	0.87	0.83	1.03	0.97
<b>PCC/Local policing body cost</b>	<b>5.67</b>	<b>5.37</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>3.61</b>

	Diff* £m
All	MSG
Community Safety	1.85 1.94
Victims & witnesses, restorative justice & other	-0.32 0.09
<b>PCC/local policing body commissioned services</b>	<b>1.53 2.03</b>
Cost of PCC/Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime	-0.06 -0.02
Office of PCC/local policing body & other costs	-0.21 -0.15 <<
<b>PCC/Local policing body cost</b>	<b>1.26 1.86</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG PCCs/local policing bodies.

Data on the office of the PCC should be read with caution as staff numbers will vary according to the local context. Some staff within the OPCC may be providing a dual service to the force, e.g., finance, communications or analysis teams.

Note that HMIC do not inspect expenditure incurred by local policing bodies/PCCs.



## Income and expenditure - Criminal justice costs

How much does the force spend per charge compared with others? What is the size of its workforce that deals with criminal justice?

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.

Note that charges data is from 2015/16 whereas FTE and cost figures are from 2016/17 estimates.



Charges		6,925			
	Force	Per 100 charges	Averages		MSG Diff
			All	MSG	
Criminal justice FTE	94	1.4	1.0	1.2	14 *
Criminal justice cost	£2.1m	£30k	£29k	£32k	-£0.1m **

\* Net difference in the number of FTEs compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17 (costs/FTE) and Home Office Crime Statistics 2015/16 (charges)

Leicestershire





## Workforce - Summary

How large is the force's workforce relative to it's population compared with others? How many officers, staff, PCSOs and special constables do they employ per 1,000 population?

Figures in the charts give the total number (including those within national policing) of FTEs (or head count for special constables) per 1,000 population.

All data is from POA except for contractors - which comes from ADR and is 2015/16 FTE. Special constables data, taken from POA, is average head count across the year.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect staff/non-staff costs for certain forces.



Population 1,056k

	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	All Avg	Diff* FTE	% of total workforce	
					Force	Avg
Police officers	1,919	1.82	1.83	-11	55%	57%
PCSOs	251	0.24	0.20	37	7%	6%
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>2,170</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>64%</b>
Police staff	1,333	1.26	1.15	118	38%	36%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,504</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Special constables **	280	0.27	0.24	22		

\* Net difference in the number of officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all forces.

\*\* Headcount

Source: POA estimates 2016/17, ADR 502 for special constables as at March 2016

Leicestershire






## Workforce - Officers/PCSOs by rank

How are officers in the force split amongst the ranks compared with other forces? What is the supervisory ratio of sergeants to constables (and PCSOs) compared with others?

Charts show the proportion of the total officer/PCSO workforce at each rank. The chart for superintendents includes chief superintendents, and the chart for inspectors includes chief inspectors. National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) are officers above the rank of chief superintendents.

Two further charts show numbers of constables (and PCSOs) per sergeant giving an indication of the average supervision requirement for each sergeant.



Note that this is ADR data for all officers and so totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.



Officers and PCSOs	FTE	%	All Avg
NPCC ranks	4	0.2%	0.2%
Chief superintendents	4	0.2%	0.3%
Superintendents	8	0.4%	0.7%
Chief inspectors	22	1.1%	1.3%
Inspectors	70	3.4%	4.4%
Sergeants	293	14.2%	14.2%
Constables	1,458	70.5%	69.4%
PCSOs	210	10.1%	9.5%
<b>Force total</b>	<b>2,069</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Supervision ratio	Force	All Avg
Constables per sergeant	5.0	4.9
Constables and PCSOs per sergeant	5.7	5.6

### Supervision ratio



Source: ADR 502 March 2016

Leicestershire

## Workforce - Officers/staff by back office function


In functions where officers and staff can fulfil similar roles, what proportion of these functions are made up of police staff compared with other forces? How has that changed?

HMIC split police workforce roles into three categories using the ADR601 functions: operational front line (including visible and non-visible), frontline support\* and business support.

ADR601 categories are mapped to the POA data for use here. For consistency to elsewhere in the profile, counter terrorism/special branch (a national policing function) has been removed from the front line. Due to this, and the fact that ADR601 data deals with officers in post as of 31 March whereas POA data is of budgeted posts for the whole financial year, proportions will not necessarily match to other published figures. Annex 4 shows a list of POA functions and their classification.

Note that PCSOs are not included here as they, almost exclusively, work in visible frontline roles.

\* In PEELPolice efficiency 2015, HMIC define this role as operational support. Since this is the name of a POA category, frontline support is used here to avoid confusion.



	2012/13 Estimates					2016/17 Estimates					Percentage point change in % roles fulfilled by staff	
	Police officers	Police Staff	% Staff	All Avg	Diff* FTE Off	Police officers	Police Staff	% Staff	All Avg	Diff* FTE Off	Force	All avg
Criminal justice	13	129	91%	89%	-3	2	92	98%	89%	-8	6.9	0.2
Local call centres / front desk	0	49	100%	92%	-4	0	32	100%	98%	-1	0.0	5.9
Intelligence analysis	57	122	68%	62%	-12	41	117	74%	68%	-10	6.1	6.6
Intelligence gathering	47	11	19%	26%	4	66	17	20%	32%	9	1.5	5.3
Scenes of crime officers	0	31	100%	95%	-1	0	27	100%	99%	0	0.0	3.8
Central communications unit	40	219	85%	83%	-5	19	194	91%	82%	-20	6.6	-0.7
Custody	47	47	50%	44%	-6	33	3	8%	44%	13	-41.7	0.2
Training	50	57	53%	46%	-8	26	62	70%	47%	-21	17.1	1.6
Human resources	0	70	100%	98%	-2	0	59	100%	99%	-1	0.0	1.4
Administration support	0	57	100%	97%	-2	0	74	100%	96%	-3	0.0	-0.7
<b>Total (of above functions)</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>791</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>-37</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>676</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>-38</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.8</b>

\* Net difference in the number of officers if the force had the average proportion of staff of all forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17 & 2012/13

Leicestershire

## Workforce - Workforce numbers by function

What are the numbers of police officers, staff and PCSOs across various functions? How has this changed since last year?

Population	1,056k			
	Workforce FTE 2016/17	Workforce FTE 2015/16	Diff from last year, FTE	% change from last year
Neighbourhood policing	601	598	3	0%
Incident (response) management	380	403	-23	-6%
Local investigation / prisoner support*	415	403	12	3%
Other local policing	80	136	-56	-41%
Local policing	1,476	1,540	-64	-4%
Investigation - public protection	246	231	15	6%
Investigations exc local investigations	246	215	30	14%
Dealing with the public	250	253	-4	-1%
Operational support	127	135	-8	-6%
Intelligence	251	246	6	2%
Investigative support	49	44	6	13%
Road policing	93	101	-7	-7%
Custody	36	77	-41	-53%
Other criminal justice arrangements	145	157	-12	-7%
Criminal justice arrangements	181	234	-53	-23%
Information communication technology	51	49	2	4%
Human Resources	59	56	3	5%
Finance	28	29	-1	-3%
Other support functions	346	341	5	1%
Support functions	484	475	9	2%
Police and Crime Commissioner**	14	17	-3	-18%
<b>Total exc national policing and central costs</b>	<b>3,418</b>	<b>3,491</b>	<b>-73</b>	<b>-2%</b>
Central costs	0	0	0	
National policing	86	85	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,504</b>	<b>3,575</b>	<b>-72</b>	<b>-2%</b>

\* Note that workforce under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' not 'investigation'.

\*\* Previously called Police Authority/Crime Commissioner in 2012/13 POA.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17, 2015/16

Leicestershire



## Workforce - Leavers

What proportion of the workforce left the force last year and how does that compare with other forces?






These charts show the number and percentage of the workforce (FTEs) that left the force between 31 March 2015 and 2016 (using 31 March 2015 totals figures to calculate percentage of workforce).

Officers are broken down into those who transferred or left the service. We have costed the salary impact of the workforce leaving the service to give context.

Note that PCSOs leaving forces may return as police officers.

Note that ADR data is used and workforce totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.

Note that data for some forces may not match published data sources due to data resubmissions.



	Strength*	Leavers	% w'force	All Avg	Salary** £m
Police officers	1,955				
Leaving force		119	6.1%	6.4%	5.9
Transfers		10	0.5%	0.5%	0.5
Officers exc transfers		109	5.6%	5.9%	5.4
PCSOs	234	26	11.2%	14.2%	0.8
Police staff	1,254	123	9.8%	11.6%	4.2
<b>Force total</b>	<b>3,443</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>10.4</b>

\* as at 31 March 2015

\*\* Salary calculated using leaver FTE multiplied by average officer/staff/PCSO cost excluding overtime (POA data).

Source (leavers): ADR531 (31 March 2015 & 31 March 2016). Source (strength): ADR502 (as at 31 March 2015). Source (salary): POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire






## Workforce - Joiners

What proportion of the workforce joined the force last year and how does that compare with others?

These charts show the number and percentage of the workforce (FTEs) that joined the force between 31 March 2015 and 2016 using 31 March 2015 as the baseline.

Note that ADR data is used and totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.

Note that data for some forces may not match published data sources due to data resubmissions.



	Strength*	Joiners	% w'force	All Avg	Salary** £m
Police officers	1,955				
Officers exc transfers		25	1.3%	3.2%	1.2
Transfers		1	0.1%	0.6%	0.0
Joining force		26	1.3%	3.8%	1.3
PCSOs	234	10	4.3%	6.7%	0.3
Police staff	1,254	119	9.5%	10.2%	4.1
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3,443</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>5.7</b>

\* as at 31 March 2015

\*\* Salary calculated using leaver FTE multiplied by average officer/staff/PCSO cost excluding overtime (POA data).

Source (joiners): ADR521 (31 March 2015 & 31 March 2016). Source (strength): ADR502 (as at 31 March 2015).

Leicestershire

## Workforce - Sickness and recuperative/restricted duty

What proportion of the force's workforce are absent and what proportion of officers are on restricted/recuperative duty? How do these rates compare with other forces?

These charts show sickness 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 factors, 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.

Note that gaps towards the left of some charts indicate that data is not available or has not been included; zero absence levels have been excluded as it is likely to be due to data inaccuracies.





Note that ADR data is used and workforce totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.

	Strength	FTE	% of total	All Avg
<b>Officers</b>	1,859			
Long-term sickness		32	1.7%	2.1%
Short/medium sickness		36	1.9%	2.0%
<b>PCSOs</b>	210			
Long-term sickness		2	0.8%	1.8%
Short/medium sickness		6	2.7%	2.3%
<b>Staff</b>	1,237			
Long-term sickness		22	1.8%	1.8%
Short/medium sickness		33	2.7%	2.0%





Long-term sickness during 2015/16 Q4

	Strength	Head count	% of total	All Avg
<b>Officers</b>	1,859			
Restricted duty		159	8.6%	4.1%
Recuperative duty		46	2.5%	3.4%

### Long-term sickness



### Short and medium term sickness



Note that ADR 554 figures (restricted and recuperative duty) are headcount not FTE.

Source: ADR 502 (strength and short/medium term sickness); 551 (long term); and 554 (recuperative/restricted duty) - as at 31 March 2016


Leicestershire

## Workforce - Officers' length of service

What is the age profile of officers in the force compared with others? How many officers are projected to retire over the next few years and what are the estimated savings from them doing so?

The projected number of retirees is shown for officers with 25-30 years' service.\* The estimated saving of them retiring is also provided, calculated from the average cost of a police officer. This does not take into account replacements. Data is given as headcount.

### All officers




### March 2016 Headcount

254      330      502      314      283      235

Total  
1,918

### Officers with 25 years' service or more - Projected retirement



### March 2016 Headcount

11      34      41      39      57      53

Total  
235

### Salary cost\*\*

£0.5m      £1.7m      £2.0m      £1.9m      £2.8m      £2.6m

£11.6m

\* Please note that typically officers cannot retire until they have completed 30 years service.

\*\* Headcount multiplied by average salary cost per FTE excluding overtime.

Source (officer head count): ADR582 (31 March 2016 ); Source (salary): POA estimates 2016/17

Leicestershire

## Demand - Crime trends



How is the number of crimes and charges per officer changing over time in the force and how does this compare with others?

Total crime (excluding fraud) is included but not broken down into the different crime-types to ensure there is sufficient data to show a robust series.


Note that PCSOs are not included and officer/staff numbers are given in FTEs. This data is from ADR (end-of-year actuals as at 31 March) and so will not match the POA data (estimates) given elsewhere.

Note that recorded crime and charges data on this page is from a live (refreshed) database and therefore will not match the data given elsewhere taken from the March publication snapshot.

The series have been plotted as indices to enable comparison of the change over time in each series.



	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
Police officers	2,317	2,211	2,142	2,089	2,043	1,955	1,859
Police staff	1,272	1,156	1,133	1,249	1,266	1,254	1,237
All crime excl fraud	79,866	70,064	67,234	58,342	60,834	59,220	60,747
Charges*	9,574	9,862	9,832	9,935	9,306	9,357	6,925
Crimes/officer	34.5	31.7	31.4	27.9	29.8	30.3	32.7
All average	31.6	30.9	31.0	28.5	29.0	30.2	33.9
Charges*/officer	4.1	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.8	3.7
All average	5.0	5.2	5.3	5.0	5.3	5.3	5.1



\*Total charges recorded during the period. Note the charges in section two refer to the number of outcomes for only those offences which were recorded during the period.

Source: ADR 502 March 2016; Home Office (charges) / ONS Crime statistics 2015/16.




Leicestershire

## Demand - Recorded crimes per visible officers

How does the number of crimes per visible police officer in the force compare with others?

While police officers are not just dealing with crime, the numbers of crimes per visible police officer gives some indication of how the measurable crime workload for this force's visible officers compares with other forces.

Note that PCSOs are not included. Visible roles are defined in Annex 4.



Visible police officers	907
-------------------------	-----

Recorded crime	Force	Per vis. officer	Averages		MSG Diff*
			All	MSG	
Victim-based	55,912	61.6	52.7	61.7	-0.1
Other crimes against society	4,496	5.0	6.2	7.3	-2.4
<b>Crimes (exc fraud)</b>	<b>60,408</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>58.9</b>	<b>69.1</b>	<b>-2.5</b>

\* Net difference in the number of crimes per visible officer compared to if force had the MSG average number of crimes.

Sources: POA estimates 2016/17 ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16.

Leicestershire






## Demand - Crime outcomes per visible officer

How does the force respond to crimes compared with others?

What are the number of cases with suspect identified, action taken and charges per visible police officer?

Please refer to 'Offences and outcomes introduction' section for the definition of 'suspect identified' and 'action taken'.

This page includes both victim-based crime and other crimes against society.



Visible police officers	907
Crimes (exc fraud)	60,408

	Force	Per vis. officer	MSG Avg	MSG Diff*
Suspect identified	23,373	25.8	33.3	-7.5
Action taken	10,008	11.0	13.8	-2.8
Charged/Summonsed	7,134	7.9	8.7	-0.8
No action	13,365	14.7	19.4	-4.7
Not charged	2,874	3.2	5.2	-2.0

\* Net difference in the number of outcome per visible officer compared to if force had the MSG average.

Sources: Detections: Home Office Outcome Statistics 2015/16, Visible officers: POA estimates 2016/17 Crime data: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16.

Leicestershire

## Demand - 999 calls

What is the level of demands on the force from 999 calls compared with others? How much does dealing with these calls cost compared with others and what is the level of workforce required to deal with them?


Costs and workforce levels are calculated across central communications units (CCU) and also within CCU and front desk combined to account for differences in force structure.

Note that

- for consistency with elsewhere in this section, the horizontal lines in the bar charts represent the average of all forces, not the MSG average.

- staff in CCU and front desk perform a range of functions and may spend differing amounts of their time dealing with emergency calls.

- Collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.





Population	1,056k
999 Calls received	127,614

FTE workforce	212
Gross cost	£8.5m

	Force	MSG Avg	All Avg
FTE per 1,000 pop	0.20	0.23	0.24
Calls per FTE	602	556	666
Calls per 1000 pop	121	130	122
<b>Cost per call</b>	<b>£67</b>	<b>£69</b>	<b>£83</b>

### Central communications unit only



LIN = Lincolnshire




CLE = Cleveland

FTE workforce	244
Gross cost	£9.4m

	Force	MSG Avg	All Avg
FTE per 1,000 pop	0.23	0.27	0.27
Calls per FTE	523	483	606
Calls per 1,000 pop	121	130	122
<b>Cost per call</b>	<b>£74</b>	<b>£79</b>	<b>£94</b>

\* Net difference in number of FTEs/999 calls compared to if force matched average of MSG forces

### Central communications unit and front desk



	Diff*
MSG	All
	-41
	-43
	-20
	33
	-9,640
	-1,204



## Demand - Emergency incidents

What is the level of emergency calls in the force compared with others? How have these levels changed?







An emergency response occurs when the police call handler assesses that there is a degree of importance or urgency associated with the incident and an emergency response is required.

All police forces record incidents in accordance with the provisions of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). These figures are not subject to the same level of quality assurance as recorded crime data.

Incident counts should be interpreted only as incidents recorded by the police, and may under estimate the true level of incidents.

Incidents are separated into anti-social behaviour (ASB) incidents, crimes (notifiable, classified command and control) incidents and other command and control incidents.

The charts on the right side of the page show the percentage change in each type of incident over the past 12 months.



Population 1,056k

Force	Incidents per 1,000 pop	Averages	
		All	MSG
Crime incidents	6,598	6	9
ASB incidents	388	0	4
Other incidents	16,448	16	32
<b>Total emergency incidents</b>	<b>23,434</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>41</b>

Differences*		Change in emergency incidents		
All	MSG	Force	All	MSG
-3,174	-2,694	28%	31%	16%
-4,141	-3,677	-26%	82%	31% <<
-17,559	-13,430	-6%	31%	7%
-24,873	-19,800	1%	0%	10%

\* Net difference in the number of incidents compared to if the force had the average number per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: ADR 342 2015/16

HMIC

page 53

Leicestershire

## Demand - Priority incidents

What is the level of priority calls in the force compared with others? How have these levels changed?








A priority response occurs when the police call handler assesses that there is a degree of importance or urgency associated with the incident but an emergency response is not required.

All police forces record incidents in accordance with the provisions of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). These figures are not subject to the same level of quality assurance as recorded crime data.

Incident counts should be interpreted only as incidents recorded by the police, and may under estimate the true level of incidents.

Incidents are separated into anti-social behaviour (ASB) incidents, crimes (notifiable, classified command and control) incidents and other command and control incidents.

The charts on the right side of the page show the percentage change in each type of incident over the past 12 months.



Population 1,056k

	Force	Incidents per 1,000 pop	Averages		Differences*		Change in priority incidents		
			All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	All	MSG
Crime incidents	11,673	11	13	12	-2,073	-571	1%	-3%	-15%
ASB incidents	7,811	7	12	9	-4,345	-1,223	-21%	-14%	-24%
Other incidents	46,526	44	44	35	77	9,318	-7%	-8%	-20%
<b>Total priority incidents</b>	<b>66,010</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>-6,341</b>	<b>7,524</b>	<b>-8%</b>	<b>-9%</b>	<b>-19%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of incidents compared to if the force had the average number per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: ADR 342 2015/16

Leicestershire

## Demand - All incidents

How has the categorisation of incidents changed over time and how does the most recent year compare to the MSG?

All police forces record incidents in accordance with the provisions of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). These figures are not subject to the same level of quality assurance as recorded crime data.


Incident counts should be interpreted only as incidents recorded by the police, and may under estimate the true level of incidents.

Large changes between years may be due to the force changing their internal recording categories

Scheduled are appointment where a contact does not require an immediate or priority response but still requires police attendance, it will result in a scheduled response.

Resolution without deployment can occur where the needs of the caller can be adequately met through provision of advice, information, helpdesk or telephone investigation function or signposting to another lead agency/service.

**Breakdown of all incidents per 1,000 population**



	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2015/16 MSG	Diff %
Emergency	22	21	22	22	41	-46%
Priority	88	80	68	63	55	13%
Scheduled	51	62	45	35	42	-16%
Resolved (w/o deployment)	78	79	49	64	78	-19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>-15%</b>

## Section two – offences and outcomes

This section focuses on criminal offences recorded by each force and resulting outcomes from those offences over the 12 month period to March 2016. These pages use the ONS published data on police recorded crime alongside Home Office data on outcome types. Definitions of offences in each crime category can be found in Annex 1. Data covering all outcome types (1-21) in the new outcome framework are available from 2014/15. This publication uses the outcomes definitions on page 58 below to analyse outcomes. Definitions of outcome type (1-18) in each group can be found in Annex 2.

The following pages present the volumes and changes in recorded crime for top-level crime categories as well as the change since 2014/15. They also present the proportion of recorded crimes where a suspect was identified and where action was taken based the new outcome framework. The following categories from the outcome framework were used to identify if a suspect was identified and or action taken (please see page 58).

- Suspect Identified – is defined as an outcome where an offender is identified enabling actions such as a charge, formal or informal sanction or an offence to be taken into consideration by the court. Also included are outcomes where a suspect is identified but evidential difficulties prevent prosecution or prosecution is not in the public interest.
- Action Taken - Defined as an outcome where an offender receives a charge or summons, an out-of-court formal outcome, an out-of-court informal outcome or who asks the offence to be taken into consideration.

Further analysis on pages 80 to 85 provides the volume of key outcomes for more detailed crime categories and presents the difference from the expected volume of that outcome based on the England and Wales average. Users may want to question why there are differences from the expected volumes, why a force might have higher than expected outcomes for some crimes, or lower than expected outcomes in others.

## Also to Note


- Outcome 20 "action undertaken by another body/agency" was introduced from April 2015 and outcome 21 "further investigation to support formal action not in the public interest" was introduced from January 2016 (on a voluntary basis). Together, these outcomes account for 0.5% of total offences and have been offences with these outcomes have been excluded from the pages 60-85 of the profiles. For this reason
- some figures may appear different to those published by the Home Office and HMIC's PEEL reports.
- Pages 60-85 report on the outcomes for offences recorded during the period to 31 March 2016 and will differ from page 49 data on charges, which presents all charges recorded during the period, even if the offence to which it relates was not recorded in the period.
- On pages 80-85 England and Wales percent of outcomes is not provided for broad offence categories (violence against person, sexual offences etc) as the profile of component offence subcategories will differ by forces and comparison would be unreliable.
- Changes over time for crimes are measured against a baseline of 2014/15.
- Crimes against children are included in overall crime data.
- Fraud is excluded from all crime to make comparisons between forces more meaningful. Fraud offences are now recorded by the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau.
- Categories with fewer than 50 cases are not included in analysis such as crime rate or trend as small volumes will not provide robust estimates.
- For recorded crime and outcomes, MSG (simple, unweighted) averages are used. With the exception of pages 80 to 85, horizontal lines in the plots show the MSG.

## Section two - Offences and outcomes

### Introduction

The offences described in this section are presented as a crime tree as shown below. The tree distinguishes between victim based crimes and other crimes against society where there is no victim but a criminal offence has been committed. Fraud is shown separately with a dotted line because a practical and reliable method for collecting force-level data has not been developed. Nevertheless, this profile provides the latest ONS information.


### The ONS crime tree



Note: Definitions of offences in each category can be found in Annex 1.

## Crime committed against children


This year, the profiles include a section on crime committed against children and the resulting outcomes. This includes crimes where the victims are specifically stated as children or victims are highly likely to be children (see crime tree below) There are other crime categories that may include child victims, but it is not possible to distinguish between adult and child victims (e.g. theft). These categories are not included in this section. Although not a perfect measure, these crimes give a good indication of the scale of crimes committed specifically against children within the force.



Note: Definitions of offences in each category can be found in Annex 1.

## Outcome terminology

The Home Office introduced a new way of classifying the results of police investigations in April 2013. New classifications called 'outcomes' are associated with all recorded crimes, providing a more detailed picture of how the police deal with investigations. The following outcome groups are used in this section:



Note

Definitions of outcome types in each category can be found in Annex 2.



Outcome 20 "action undertaken by another body/agency" was introduced from April 2015 and outcome 21 "further investigation to support formal action not in the public interest" was introduced from January 2016 (on a voluntary basis). Together, these outcomes account for 0.5% of total offences and have been excluded from the profiles. For this reasons some figures may appear different to those published by the Home Office and HMIC's PEEL reports.

This page has been intentionally left blank.

## Offences and outcomes - Crimes - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for crimes (excluding fraud) in the force and how does this compare with others?

How does the Recorded offence rate compare with last year and how does the change compare with others?




Offences	per 1,000 pop***	MSG Avg	Difference
3,088	2.92	3.62	-738

Fraud data are experimental statistics published as part of ONS crime statistics and are in the testing phase and not yet fully developed.

The figures presented here for police force areas are based on victims' address information. This is in contrast with traditional crimes which are based on where the offence took place (which in the case of fraud is often hard to define).

Offences where the victim's police force area is unknown relate to cases where it has not been possible to attribute offences to a police force area, for example, due to missing address information, or where the offence occurred outside the UK. There were 24,593

### Recorded offence rate



Population	1,056k
------------	--------

	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
<b>2015/16</b>					
Victim-based crime	55,912	52.9	54.1	-1,206	-2%
Other crimes against society	4,496	4.3	6.4	-2,283	-34%
<b>Crimes (excl fraud)</b>	<b>60,408</b>	<b>57.2</b>	<b>60.5</b>	<b>-3,489</b>	<b>-5%</b>



	Offences	% change**	
<b>2014/15</b>		Force	MSG Avg
Victim-based crime	54,075	3%	6%
Other crimes against society	5,145	-13%	7%
<b>Crimes (excl fraud)</b>	<b>59,220</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>6%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

\*\*\*Uses the same population figure as the rest of the profile and may not match ONS figures

### Percent change from 2014/15



Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Leicestershire







## Offences and outcomes - Crimes (excluding fraud) - Outcome

What are the outcomes for crimes (excluding fraud) and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Crimes against society include those with no identifiable victim, such as drug offences. The proportion of cases which have an identified suspect has not been reported as there is little variation between forces.



	Total offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg*	Force	%	MSG Avg*
Victim-based crime	55,912	19,879	36%	44%	8,026	14%	17%
Other crimes against society	4,496	3,494	78%	82%	1,982	44%	50%
<b>Crimes (excl fraud)</b>	<b>60,408</b>	<b>23,373</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>10,008</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>20%</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire

## Offences and outcomes - Victim-based crime - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for victim-based crime in the force and how does this compare with others?



Population	1,056k				
2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Violence against the person	12,248	11.6	16.0	-4,691	-28%
Sexual offences	1,448	1.4	1.6	-245	-14%
Robbery	593	0.6	0.6	4	1%
Theft offences	32,390	30.7	27.1	3,792	13%
Criminal damage and arson	9,233	8.7	8.8	-66	-1%
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>55,912</b>	<b>52.9</b>	<b>54.1</b>	<b>-1,206</b>	<b>-2%</b>






2014/15	Offences	% change**	MSG Avg
Violence against the person	10,851	13%	22%
Sexual offences	1,314	10%	14%
Robbery	710	-16%	1%
Theft offences	32,495	0%	-2%
Criminal damage and arson	8,705	6%	5%
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>54,075</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>6%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.






\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

### Recorded offence rate



### Percent change from 2014/15




Leicestershire

Offences and outcomes - Victim-based crime - Outcome





What are the outcomes for victim-based crime and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.








Offences	Suspect Identified				Action Taken			
	Force	%	MSG Avg*		Force	%	MSG Avg*	
Violence against the person	12,248	9,876	81%	82%	3,066	25%	24%	
Sexual offences	1,448	973	67%	63%	174	12%	11%	
Robbery	593	295	50%	47%	94	16%	17%	
Theft offences	32,390	6,453	20%	25%	3,683	11%	14%	
Criminal damage and arson	9,233	2,282	25%	28%	1,009	11%	13%	
Victim-based crime	55,912	19,879	36%	44%	8,026	14%	17%	

Percentage with Suspect Identified



Percentage with Action Taken




Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

## Offences and outcomes - Violence against the person - Recorded offences


What is the Recorded offence rate for violence against the person in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate compare with last year?

As homicide numbers are so small, care should be taken when making comparisons between forces. For this reason, a plot has not been included for homicide.




Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be shown as "n/a".



Recorded offence rate



Percent change from 2014/15



Population	1,056k				
	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
2015/16					
Homicide	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Violence with injury	4,187	4.0	6.9	-3,067	-42%
Violence without injury	8,050	7.6	9.2	-1,626	-17%
<b>Violence against the person</b>	<b>12,248</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>-4,691</b>	<b>-28%</b>

	Offences	% change**	
2014/15		Force	MSG Avg
Homicide	6	83%	44%
Violence with injury	4,884	-14%	9%
Violence without injury	5,961	35%	34%
<b>Violence against the person</b>	<b>10,851</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>22%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15


Leicestershire

## Offences and outcomes - Violence against the person - Outcome

What are the outcomes for violence against the person and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

As homicide numbers are so small, care should be taken when making comparisons between forces. For this reason, a plot has not been included for homicide.



	Offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg*	Force	%	MSG Avg*
Homicide	11	8	n/a	n/a	8	n/a	n/a
Violence with injury	4,187	3,430	82%	82%	1,203	29%	28%
Violence without injury	8,050	6,438	80%	83%	1,855	23%	22%
<b>Violence against the person</b>	<b>12,248</b>	<b>9,876</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>3,066</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>24%</b>





Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire

## Offences and outcomes - Sexual offences - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for sexual offences in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate for sexual offences compare to last year and how does it compare with others?

Note that due to the complex nature of these crimes, particularly rape, care should be taken when comparing crime rates across forces as there are many factors which can affect the level of recorded crime. For example, victims being encouraged to report crimes or cultural differences.



Population		1,056k			
	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
2015/16					
Rape	494	0.5	0.58	-114	-19%
Other sexual offences	954	0.9	1.03	-131	-12%
<b>Sexual offences</b>	<b>1,448</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>-245</b>	<b>-14%</b>

	Offences	% change**	
2014/15		Force	MSG Avg
Rape	437	13%	19%
Other sexual offences	877	9%	12%
<b>Sexual offences</b>	<b>1,314</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>14%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16


Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Leicestershire

Offences and outcomes - Sexual offences - Outcome

What are the outcomes for sexual offences and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from page 56) for definitions.



	Offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg*	Force	%	MSG Avg*
Rape	494	356	72%	64%	39	8%	6%
Other sexual offences	954	617	65%	61%	135	14%	13%
<b>Sexual offences</b>	<b>1,448</b>	<b>973</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>11%</b>


Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

## Offences and outcomes - Robbery - Recorded offences


What is the Recorded offence rate for robbery in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate for robbery compare with last year and how does this compare with others?

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be suppressed.

Recorded offence rate



Percent change from 2014/15



Population 1,056k

2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Robbery	593	0.6	0.6	4	1%

2014/15	Offences	% change**	
		Force	MSG Avg
Robbery	710	-16%	1%

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Leicestershire




## Offences and outcomes - Robbery - Outcome

What are the outcomes for robbery and how does this compare with others?


The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from page 56) for definitions.

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be suppressed.

Percentage with Suspect Identified



Percentage with Action Taken




		Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
	Offences	Force	%	MSG Avg*	Force	%	MSG Avg*
Robbery	593	295	50%	47%	94	16%	17%

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire

## Offences and outcomes - Theft offences - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for theft offences in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate compare with last year?



Population		1,056k			
2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Burglary	7,979	7.6	6.2	1,437	22%
Vehicle offences	8,261	7.8	6.0	1,935	31%
Bicycle theft	2,002	1.9	1.4	567	40%
Theft from the person	807	0.8	0.8	-52	-6%
Shoplifting	6,120	5.8	5.7	143	2%
All other theft offences	7,221	6.8	7.1	-239	-3%
<b>Theft offences</b>	<b>32,390</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>3,792</b>	<b>13%</b>






2014/15	Offences	% change **	
		Force	MSG Avg
Burglary	7,939	1%	-7%
Vehicle offences	7,710	7%	6%
Bicycle theft	2,326	-14%	-12%
Theft from the person	901	-10%	0%
Shoplifting	5,778	6%	2%
All other theft offences	7,841	-8%	-4%
<b>Theft offences</b>	<b>32,495</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>-2%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.






\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

### Recorded offence rate



### Percent change from 2014/15



Leicestershire

## Offences and outcomes - Theft offences - Outcome

What are the outcomes for theft offences and how does this compare with others?





The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Percentage with Suspect Identified









	Offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Burglary	7,979	984	12%	14%	448	6%	7%
Vehicle offences	8,261	681	8%	11%	280	3%	5%
Bicycle theft	2,002	191	10%	11%	90	4%	4%
Theft from the person	807	105	13%	12%	32	4%	3%
Shoplifting	6,120	3,149	51%	59%	2,418	40%	45%
All other theft offences	7,221	1,343	19%	25%	415	6%	7%
<b>Theft offences</b>	<b>32,390</b>	<b>6,453</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>3,683</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>14%</b>

Percentage with Suspect Identified



Percentage with Action Taken




Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire

## Offences and outcomes - Criminal damage and arson - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for criminal damage and arson in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate compare with last year and how does this compare with others?



Population 1,056k

	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
2015/16					
Criminal damage	8,959	8.5	8.5	-27	0%
Arson	274	0.3	0.3	-39	-13%
<b>Criminal damage and arson</b>	<b>9,233</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>-66</b>	<b>-1%</b>

	Offences	% change **	
2014/15		Force	MSG Avg
Criminal damage	8,433	6%	5%
Arson	272	1%	6%
<b>Criminal damage and arson</b>	<b>8,705</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>5%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16


Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Leicestershire

Offences and outcomes - Criminal Damage and Arson - Outcome

What are the outcomes for criminal damage and arson and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from page 56) for definitions.




	Offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Criminal damage	8,959	2,205	25%	28%	988	11%	13%
Arson	274	77	28%	25%	21	8%	10%
Criminal damage and arson	9,233	2,282	25%	28%	1,009	11%	13%

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

## Offences and outcomes - Other crimes against society - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for other crimes against society in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rates compare with last year?



**Population** 1,056k





	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
<b>2015/16</b>					
Trafficking of drugs	438	0.4	0.4	36	9%
Possession of drugs	806	0.8	1.6	-866	-52%
Public order offences	1,986	1.9	3.0	-1,222	-38%
Possession of weapons	395	0.4	0.4	-78	-16%
Misc crimes against society	871	0.8	1.0	-154	-15%
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>-2,283</b>	<b>-34%</b>

	Offences	% change**	
<b>2014/15</b>		Force	MSG Avg
Trafficking of drugs	464	-6%	-8%
Possession of drugs	1,380	-42%	-20%
Public order offences	2,186	-9%	26%
Possession of weapons	326	21%	19%
Misc crimes against society	789	10%	11%
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>5,145</b>	<b>-13%</b>	<b>7%</b>






\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

### Recorded offence rate



### Percent change from 2014/15



Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15


Leicestershire

## Outcomes - Other crimes against society

What are the outcomes for other crimes against society and how does this compare with others?




The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Percentage with Suspect Identified



	Total offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Trafficking of drugs	438	309	71%	80%	234	53%	70%
Possession of drugs	806	707	88%	96%	576	71%	86%
Public order offences	1,986	1,537	77%	78%	690	35%	31%
Possession of weapons	395	326	83%	90%	209	53%	64%
Misc crimes against society	871	615	71%	71%	273	31%	36%
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>3,494</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>1,982</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>50%</b>


Percentage with Action Taken



## Offences and outcomes - Crime against children - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for crime against children in the force and how does this compare with others and with last year?

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be shown as "n/a".






Population - Child under 16		200k			
2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Rape	143	0.7	1.0	-49	-26%
Sexual offences / abuse	327	1.6	2.2	-107	-25%
Cruelty / other	69	0.3	0.6	-56	-45%
<b>Crime against children</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>-212</b>	<b>-28%</b>

2014/15	Offences	% change **	
		Force	MSG Avg
Rape	161	-11%	19%
Sexual offences / abuse	321	2%	9%
Cruelty / other	54	28%	27%
<b>Crime against children</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>13%</b>



\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

### Recorded offence rate



### Percent change from 2014/15





## Offences and outcomes - Crime against children - Outcome

What are the outcomes for crime against children and how does this compare with others?


The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be shown as "n/a".


Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Action Taken




Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Action Taken



Percentage with Suspect Identified



Percentage with Action Taken



Offences	Suspect Identified				Action Taken			
	Force	%	MSG Avg*		Force	%	MSG Avg*	
Rape	143	102	71%	55%	18	13%	9%	
Sexual offences / abuse	327	197	60%	57%	36	11%	11%	
Cruelty / other	69	39	57%	53%	15	22%	22%	
<b>Crime against children</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>12%</b>	

\* E&W average for 30 forces that submitted tracked outcome data.

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire








## Offences and outcomes - Outcome percentage - Victim-based crime

What proportion of offences result in each outcome for victim-based crime and how does this compare with the other forces?

Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.  
The percentage takes into account the volume difference between crime types.

Note that

- Out of court (formal) includes caution and penalty notices for disorder.
- Out of court (informal) includes cannabis/khat warning and community resolution.
- Suspect identified - no action includes evidential difficulties (victim supports action and victim does not support action) and prosecution prevented or not in the public interest.



Note: It is imperative to look at the allocation of outcomes in their totality to get the complete picture of how a force is handling their crime demand, including crimes which have not yet been assigned an outcome. Forces with high proportions of crimes categorised as 'not yet assigned an outcome' may appear as outliers in the branches of suspect identified and in no suspect identified. A full breakdown of outcomes is available from page 80.

## Offences and outcomes - Outcome percentage - Other crimes against society

What proportion of offences result in each outcome for crimes against society and how does this compare with the other forces?

Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions. Thirty forces provided tracked outcome data.




The percentage takes into account the volume difference between crime types.

Crimes against society include those with no identifiable victim, such as drug offences. The proportion of cases which have an identified suspect has not been reported as there is little variation between forces.

Note that

- Out of court (formal) includes caution and penalty notices for disorder.
- Out of court (informal) includes cannabis/khat warning and community resolution.

A full breakdown of outcomes is available from page 80.





## Offences and outcomes - Charged/Summonsed

What proportion of offences result in charges and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the charge rates for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's actual charges divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting charges/summons for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	11	8	73%	63%	7	1
Violence with Injury	4,187	921	22%	21%	890	31
Violence without Injury	8,050	1,325	16%	16%	1,252	73
Violence against the person	12,248	2,254	18%		2,149	105
Rape	494	38	8%	9%	45	-7
Other Sexual Offences	954	117	12%	13%	119	-2
Sexual offences	1,448	155	11%		165	-10
Robbery	593	90	15%	18%	108	-18
Burglary	7,979	362	5%	6%	489	-127
Vehicle offences	8,261	255	3%	4%	360	-105
Theft from the Person	807	18	2%	3%	23	-5
Bicycle Theft	2,002	70	3%	3%	58	12
Shoplifting	6,120	1,654	27%	31%	1,927	-273
Other Theft Offences	7,221	269	4%	4%	307	-38
Theft offences	32,390	2,628	8%		3,164	-536
Criminal damage	8,959	635	7%	8%	686	-51
Arson	274	20	7%	7%	19	1
Criminal damage & arson	9,233	655	7%		706	-51
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>55,912</b>	<b>5,782</b>	<b>10%</b>		<b>6,291</b>	<b>-509</b>
Trafficking of drugs	438	175	40%	58%	256	-81
Possession of drugs	806	258	32%	32%	259	-1
Possession of weapons offences	395	172	44%	53%	207	-35
Public Order Offences	1,986	510	26%	23%	463	47
Miscellaneous crimes	871	237	27%	32%	276	-39
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>1,352</b>	<b>30%</b>		<b>1,461</b>	<b>-109</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>60,408</b>	<b>7,134</b>	<b>12%</b>		<b>7,772</b>	<b>-638</b>



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire



## Offences and outcomes - Out-of-court (formal)

What proportion of offences result in out-of-court (formal) outcomes and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of out-of-court (formal) outcomes for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's out-of-court (formal) outcomes divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting in out-of-court (formal) outcomes for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	11	0	0%	0%	0	0
Violence with Injury	4,187	142	3%	5%	217	-75
Violence without Injury	8,050	207	3%	4%	319	-112
Violence against the person	12,248	349	3%		536	-187
Rape	494	1	0%	0%	0	1
Other Sexual Offences	954	8	1%	2%	16	-8
Sexual offences	1,448	9	1%		17	-8
Robbery	593	3	1%	0%	2	1
Burglary	7,979	17	0%	0%	24	-7
Vehicle offences	8,261	12	0%	0%	24	-12
Theft from the Person	807	8	1%	0%	3	5
Bicycle Theft	2,002	9	0%	0%	9	0
Shoplifting	6,120	118	2%	6%	379	-261
Other Theft Offences	7,221	53	1%	1%	79	-26
Theft offences	32,390	217	1%		518	-301
Criminal damage	8,959	153	2%	3%	231	-78
Arson	274	1	0%	1%	3	-2
Criminal damage & arson	9,233	154	2%		234	-80
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>55,912</b>	<b>732</b>	<b>1%</b>		<b>1,306</b>	<b>-574</b>
Trafficking of drugs	438	28	6%	11%	50	-22
Possession of drugs	806	90	11%	24%	192	-102
Possession of weapons offences	395	30	8%	10%	39	-9
Public Order Offences	1,986	78	4%	6%	121	-43
Miscellaneous crimes	871	17	2%	4%	35	-18
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>5%</b>		<b>437</b>	<b>-194</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>60,408</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>2%</b>		<b>1,743</b>	<b>-768</b>



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire



## Offences and outcomes - Out-of-court (informal)

What proportion of offences result in out-of-court (informal) outcomes and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the charge rates for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's actual charges divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting charges/summons for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	11	0	0%	0%	0	0
Violence with Injury	4,187	139	3%	5%	215	-76
Violence without Injury	8,050	323	4%	5%	366	-43
Violence against the person	12,248	462	4%		581	-119
Rape	494	0	0%	0%	0	-0
Other Sexual Offences	954	10	1%	1%	9	1
Sexual offences	1,448	10	1%		10	0
Robbery	593	1	0%	0%	2	-1
Burglary	7,979	13	0%	0%	19	-6
Vehicle offences	8,261	7	0%	0%	20	-13
Theft from the Person	807	5	1%	1%	4	1
Bicycle Theft	2,002	10	0%	1%	18	-8
Shoplifting	6,120	492	8%	10%	586	-94
Other Theft Offences	7,221	84	1%	2%	152	-68
Theft offences	32,390	611	2%		800	-189
Criminal damage	8,959	199	2%	4%	327	-128
Arson	274	0	0%	2%	5	-5
Criminal damage & arson	9,233	199	2%		331	-132
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>55,912</b>	<b>1,283</b>	<b>2%</b>		<b>1,724</b>	<b>-441</b>
Trafficking of drugs	438	31	7%	1%	6	25
Possession of drugs	806	228	28%	33%	263	-35
Possession of weapons offences	395	7	2%	4%	17	-10
Public Order Offences	1,986	102	5%	5%	94	8
Miscellaneous crimes	871	17	2%	2%	21	-4
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>9%</b>		<b>401</b>	<b>-16</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>60,408</b>	<b>1,668</b>	<b>3%</b>		<b>2,124</b>	<b>-456</b>



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire



## Offences and outcomes - Suspect identified - no action taken

What proportion of offences have not had any action taken and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of offences of which a suspect has been identified but no action has been taken for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's offences of which no action has been taken divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting in no action being taken for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	11	0	0%	11%	1	-1
Violence with Injury	4,187	2,227	53%	50%	2,097	130
Violence without Injury	8,050	4,583	57%	59%	4,730	-147
Violence against the person	12,248	6,810	56%		6,829	-19
Rape	494	317	64%	56%	275	42
Other Sexual Offences	954	482	51%	48%	462	20
Sexual offences	1,448	799	55%		736	63
Robbery	593	201	34%	25%	146	55
Burglary	7,979	536	7%	7%	576	-40
Vehicle offences	8,261	401	5%	5%	451	-50
Theft from the Person	807	73	9%	9%	73	-0
Bicycle Theft	2,002	101	5%	6%	124	-23
Shoplifting	6,120	731	12%	12%	714	17
Other Theft Offences	7,221	928	13%	17%	1,215	-287
Theft offences	32,390	2,770	9%		3,154	-384
Criminal damage	8,959	1,217	14%	14%	1,277	-60
Arson	274	56	20%	12%	34	22
Criminal damage & arson	9,233	1,273	14%		1,311	-38
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>55,912</b>	<b>11,853</b>	<b>21%</b>		<b>12,175</b>	<b>-322</b>
Trafficking of drugs	438	75	17%	10%	42	33
Possession of drugs	806	131	16%	8%	61	70
Possession of weapons offences	395	117	30%	23%	90	27
Public Order Offences	1,986	847	43%	42%	842	5
Miscellaneous crimes	871	342	39%	36%	312	30
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>1,512</b>	<b>34%</b>		<b>1,347</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>60,408</b>	<b>13,365</b>	<b>22%</b>		<b>13,549</b>	<b>-184</b>



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire



## Offences and outcomes - Investigation complete – no suspect identified

What proportion of offences result in no suspect being identified and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of offences which have no suspect identified for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual % expected plot shows the force's offences which no suspect identified divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting in non suspect being identified for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	11	1	9%	2%	0	1
Violence with Injury	4,187	440	11%	14%	598	-158
Violence without Injury	8,050	755	9%	13%	1,027	-272
Violence against the person	12,248	1,196	10%		1,625	-429
Rape	494	13	3%	7%	34	-21
Other Sexual Offences	954	154	16%	19%	179	-25
Sexual offences	1,448	167	12%		213	-46
Robbery	593	238	40%	50%	297	-59
Burglary	7,979	6,456	81%	82%	6,538	-82
Vehicle offences	8,261	7,021	85%	87%	7,187	-166
Theft from the Person	807	613	76%	84%	682	-69
Bicycle Theft	2,002	1,642	82%	88%	1,757	-115
Shoplifting	6,120	2,432	40%	36%	2,227	205
Other Theft Offences	7,221	5,209	72%	72%	5,206	3
Theft offences	32,390	23,373	72%		23,597	-224
Criminal damage	8,959	5,887	66%	69%	6,220	-333
Arson	274	162	59%	74%	203	-41
Criminal damage & arson	9,233	6,049	66%		6,423	-374
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>55,912</b>	<b>31,023</b>	<b>55%</b>		<b>32,155</b>	<b>-1,132</b>
Trafficking of drugs	438	9	2%	5%	23	-14
Possession of drugs	806	3	0%	1%	7	-4
Possession of weapons offences	395	22	6%	6%	23	-1
Public Order Offences	1,986	225	11%	20%	389	-164
Miscellaneous crimes	871	83	10%	15%	132	-49
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>8%</b>		<b>574</b>	<b>-232</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>60,408</b>	<b>31,365</b>	<b>52%</b>		<b>32,664</b>	<b>-1,299</b>



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire





## Offences and outcomes - Not yet assigned an outcome

What proportion of offences have not yet been assigned an outcome and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of offences which have not yet been assigned an outcomes for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's offences which have not yet been assigned outcomes divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are not yet being assigned outcomes for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	11	2	18%	24%	3	-1
Violence with Injury	4,187	317	8%	4%	169	148
Violence without Injury	8,050	857	11%	4%	355	502
Violence against the person	12,248	1,176	10%		527	649
Rape	494	125	25%	28%	140	-15
Other Sexual Offences	954	183	19%	18%	167	16
Sexual offences	1,448	308	21%		307	1
Robbery	593	60	10%	6%	39	21
Burglary	7,979	539	7%	4%	280	259
Vehicle offences	8,261	559	7%	2%	181	378
Theft from the Person	807	89	11%	3%	21	68
Bicycle Theft	2,002	169	8%	2%	32	137
Shoplifting	6,120	539	9%	3%	179	360
Other Theft Offences	7,221	669	9%	3%	248	421
Theft offences	32,390	2,564	8%		942	1,622
Criminal damage	8,959	867	10%	2%	206	661
Arson	274	35	13%	4%	10	25
Criminal damage & arson	9,233	902	10%		216	686
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>55,912</b>	<b>5,010</b>	<b>9%</b>		<b>2,030</b>	<b>2,980</b>
Trafficking of drugs	438	120	27%	14%	61	59
Possession of drugs	806	96	12%	3%	24	72
Possession of weapons offences	395	47	12%	5%	18	29
Public Order Offences	1,986	224	11%	4%	77	147
Miscellaneous crimes	871	173	20%	11%	94	79
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>15%</b>		<b>274</b>	<b>386</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>60,408</b>	<b>5,670</b>	<b>9%</b>		<b>2,319</b>	<b>3,351</b>



Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Leicestershire

## **HMIC Value for Money Profile 2016 - Annexes 1 - 4**

	page
<b>Annex 1 - Crime codes</b>	87
<b>Annex 2 - Outcome types</b>	91
<b>Annex 3 - POA categories</b>	93
<b>Annex 4 - Coding of POA categories</b>	94

## Annex 1 - Crime Codes

Offences included in each category

### 1. Victim-based crime

#### 1.1. Violence against the person

##### 1.1.1. Homicide

- 1 Murder
- 4.1 Manslaughter

- 4.10 Corporate manslaughter
- 4.2 Infanticide

##### 1.1.2. Violence with injury

- 2 Attempted murder
- 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
- 4.9 Causing death or serious injury by driving: unlicensed drivers etc.
- 5A Wounding or carrying out an act endangering life (outcomes only)
- 5B Use of substance or object to endanger life (outcomes only)
- 5C Possession of items to endanger life(outcomes only)
- 5D Assault with intent to cause serious harm

- 5E Endangering life
- 6 Endangering railway passengers (outcomes only)
- 7 Endangering life at sea (outcomes only)
- 8F Inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent (outcomes only)
- 8G Actually bodily harm and other injury(outcomes only)
- 8H Racially or religiously aggravated inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent (outcomes only)
- 8J Racially or religiously aggravated actual bodily harm and other injury (outcomes only)
- 8K Poisoning or female genital mutilation (outcomes only)
- 8N Assault with injury
- 8P Racially or religiously aggravated assault with injury
- 37.1 Causing death by aggravated vehicle taking

##### 1.1.3. Violence without injury

- 3A Conspiracy to murder
- 3B Threats to kill
- 8L Harassment
- 8M Racially or religiously aggravated harassment
- 8Q Stalking
- 11 Cruelty to and neglect of children (outcomes only)
- 11A Cruelty to children/young persons
- 12 Abandoning child under two years (outcomes only)

- 13 Child abduction
- 14 Procuring illegal abortion
- 36 Kidnapping
- 104 Assault without injury on a constable
- 105A Assault without injury
- 105B Racially or religiously aggravated assault without injury
- 106 Modern slavery

#### 1.2. Sexual offences

##### 1.2.1. Rape

- 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

(cont.)

1.2.2. Other sexual offences			
17A	Sexual assault on a male aged 13 and over	70	Sexual activity etc with a person with a mental disorder
17B	Sexual assault on a male child under 13	71	Abuse of children through sexual exploitation
20A	Sexual assault on a female aged 13 and over	72	Trafficking for sexual exploitation
20B	Sexual assault on a female child under 13	73	Abuse of position of trust of a sexual nature
21	Sexual activity involving a child under 13	88A	Sexual grooming
22A	Causing sexual activity without consent	88C	Other miscellaneous sexual offences
22B	Sexual activity involving child under 16	88D	Unnatural sexual offences
23	Incest or familial sexual offences	88E	Exposure and voyeurism
1.3. Robbery			
1.3.1 Robbery of business property			
34A	Robbery of business property		
1.3.2 Robbery of personal property			
34B	Robbery of personal property		
1.4. Theft offences			
1.4.1. Burglary			
1.4.1.1. Domestic burglary			
28A	Burglary in a dwelling	28D	Attempted distraction burglary in a dwelling
28B	Attempted burglary in a dwelling	29	Aggravated burglary in a dwelling
28C	Distraction burglary in a dwelling		
1.4.1.2 Non-domestic burglary			
30A	Burglary in a building other than a dwelling	31	Aggravated burglary in a building other than a dwelling
30B	Attempted burglary in a building other than a dwelling		
1.4.2. Vehicle offences			
126	Interfering with a motor vehicle	45	Theft from vehicle
37.2	Aggravated vehicle taking	48	Theft or unauthorised taking of motor vehicle
1.4.3. Theft from the person			
39	Theft from the person		
1.4.4. Bicycle theft			
44	Theft or unauthorised taking of a pedal cycle		
1.4.5. Shoplifting			
46	Shoplifting		
1.4.6. Other theft offences			
35	Blackmail	43	Dishonest use of electricity
40	Theft in a dwelling other than from an automatic machine or meter	47	Theft from automatic machine or meter
41	Theft by an employee	49	Other theft
42	Theft of mail	49A	Making off without payment

(cont.)

1.5. Criminal damage and arson			
1.5.1. Criminal damage			
58A	Criminal damage to a dwelling	58F	Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a building other than a dwelling (outcomes only)
58B	Criminal damage to a building other than a dwelling	58G	Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a vehicle (outcomes only)
58C	Criminal damage to a vehicle	58H	Racially or religiously aggravated other criminal damage (outcomes only)
58D	Other criminal damage	58J	Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage
58E	Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a dwelling (outcomes only)		
1.5.2. Arson			
56A	Arson endangering life	56B	Arson not endangering life
2. Other crimes against society			
2.1. Drug offences			
2.1.1. Trafficking of drugs			
92A	Trafficking in controlled drugs		
2.1.2. Possession of drugs			
92C	Other drug offences	92E	Possession of controlled drugs (Cannabis)
92D	Possession of controlled drugs (excl. Cannabis)		
2.2. Possession of weapons offences			
10A	Possession of firearms with intent	10D	Possession of article with blade or point
10B	Possession of firearms offences	81	Other firearms offences
10C	Possession of other weapons	90	Other knives offences
2.3. Public order offences			
9A	Public fear, alarm or distress	63	Treason felony (outcomes only)
9B	Racially or religiously aggravated public fear, alarm or distress	64	Riot (outcomes only)
62	Treason (outcomes only)	65	Violent disorder (outcomes only)
62A	Violent disorder	66	Other offences against the State or public order
2.4. Miscellaneous crimes			
15	Concealing an infant death close to birth	76	Aiding suicide
24	Exploitation of prostitution	78	Immigration Acts (outcomes only)
26	Bigamy	79	Perverting the course of justice
27	Soliciting for the purposes of prostitution	80	Absconding from lawful custody
33	Going equipped for stealing, etc	802	Dangerous driving
33A	Making, supplying or possessing articles for use in fraud	814	Fraud, forgery etc associated with vehicle or driver records
38	Profiting from or concealing knowledge of the proceeds of crime	82	Customs and Revenue offences (outcomes only)
53H	Making or supplying articles for use in fraud (outcomes only)	83	Bail offences
53J	Possession of articles for use in fraud (outcomes only)	84	Trade descriptions etc (outcomes only)
54	Handling stolen goods	85	Health and Safety offences (outcomes only)
59	Threat or possession with intent to commit criminal damage	86	Obscene publications etc
60	Forgery or use of false drug prescription	87	Protection from eviction (outcomes only)
61	Other forgery	89	Adulteration of food (outcomes only)
61A	Possession of false documents	91	Public health offences (outcomes only)
67	Perjury	94	Planning laws (outcomes only)
68	Libel (outcomes only)	95	Disclosure, obstruction, false or misleading statements etc
69	Offender Management Act offences	96	Wildlife
75	Betting, gaming and lotteries (outcomes only)	99	Other notifiable offences

(cont.)

### 3. Fraud offences

51	Fraud by company director (outcomes only)	53D	Fraud by false representation: other frauds (outcomes only)
52	False accounting (outcomes only)	53E	Fraud by failing to disclose information (outcomes only)
53B	Preserved other fraud and repealed fraud offences (pre Fraud Act 2006) (outcomes only)	53F	Fraud by abuse of position (outcomes only)
53C	Fraud by false representation: cheque, plastic card and online bank accounts (not PSP) (outcomes only)	55	Bankruptcy and insolvency (outcomes only)

*\* At March 2013 ONS publication crime code 53B was categorised under fraud offences.*

## Crime committed against children

### Offences included in each category

#### Crime against children

##### Rape

19D	Rape of a female child under 16
19E	Rape of a female child under 13
19G	Rape of a male child under 16
19H	Rape of a male child under 13

##### Sexual offences / abuse

17B	Sexual assault on a male child under 13
20B	Sexual assault on a female child under 13
21	Sexual activity involving a child under 13
22B	Sexual activity involving child under 16
71	Abuse of children through sexual exploitation
73	Abuse of position of trust of a sexual nature
88A	Sexual grooming

##### Cruelty / other

11	Cruelty to and neglect of children (outcomes only)
11A	Cruelty to children/young persons
4.3	Intentional destruction of a viable unborn child
4.7	Causing or allowing death of child or vulnerable person
12	Abandoning child under two years (outcomes only)
13	Child abduction
15	Concealing an infant death close to birth

### Other offences against children not included

(It is not possible to distinguish between adult and child victims within these crime types.)

23	Incest or familial sexual offences
86	Obscene publications etc
99	Other notifiable offences

## Annex 2 - Outcome Types

Outcome group / type	
1	<b>Charged/Summonsed</b>
4	<b>Taken into consideration</b>
	<b>Out-of-court (formal)</b>
2	Caution - youths
3	Caution - adults
6	Penalty Notices for Disorder
	<b>Out-of-court (informal)</b>
7	Cannabis/Khat warning
8	Community resolution
<b>Prosecution prevented or not in the public interest</b>	
5	Offender died
9	Not in public interest (CPS)
10	Not in public interest (Police)
11	Prosecution prevented – suspect under age
12	Prosecution prevented – suspect too ill
13	Prosecution prevented – victim/key witness dead/too ill
17	Prosecution time limit expired
15	<b>Evidential difficulties (suspect identified; victim supports action)</b>
	<b>Evidential difficulties (victim does not support action)</b>
14	Evidential difficulties: suspect not identified; victim does not support further action
16	Evidential difficulties: suspect identified; victim does not support further action
18	<b>Investigation complete - no suspect identified</b>
20	<b>Action undertaken by another body/agency</b>

Outcomes 20 (action undertaken by another body/agency) and 21 (further investigation to support formal action not in the public interest) have been excluded.

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016, as published October 2016

## Outcome Types

<b>Outcome 1</b>	Charge / Summons: A person has been charged or summonsed for the crime (irrespective of any subsequent acquittal at Court).
<b>Outcome 2</b>	Caution – youths: A youth offender has been cautioned by the police.
<b>Outcome 3</b>	Caution – adults: An adult offender has been cautioned by the police.
<b>Outcome 4</b>	Taken into Consideration (TIC): The offender admits the crime by way of a formal police interview and asks for it to be taken into consideration by the court. There must be an interview where the suspect has made a clear and reliable admission of the offence and which is corroborated with additional verifiable auditable information connecting the suspect to the crime.
<b>Outcome 5</b>	Offender died: The offender has died before proceeding could be initiated.

(cont.)

<b>Outcome 6</b>	Penalty Notices for Disorder: A Penalty Notice for Disorder (or other relevant notifiable offence) has been lawfully issued under Section 1 – 11 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001.
<b>Outcome 7</b>	Cannabis/Khat Warning: A warning for cannabis or khat possession has been issued in accordance with College of Policing guidance. Note: Khat warnings were introduced from 24 June 2014 and numbers are likely to be small.
<b>Outcome 8</b>	Community Resolution: A Community Resolution (with or without formal (Restorative Justice) has been applied in accordance with College of Policing guidance.
<b>Outcome 9</b>	Not in public interest (CPS): Prosecution not in the public interest (CPS decision). The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) by virtue of their powers under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 decides not to prosecute or authorise any other formal action.
<b>Outcome 10</b>	Not in public interest (Police) (from April 2014): Formal action against the offender is not in the public interest (Police decision).
<b>Outcome 11</b>	Prosecution prevented – suspect under age (from April 2014): Prosecution prevented – named suspect identified but is below the age of criminal responsibility.
<b>Outcome 12</b>	Prosecution prevented – suspect too ill (from April 2014): Prosecution prevented – Named suspect identified but is too ill (physical or mental health) to prosecute.
<b>Outcome 13</b>	Prosecution prevented – victim/key witness dead/too ill (from April 2014): Named suspect identified but victim or key witness is dead or too ill to give evidence.
<b>Outcome 14</b>	Evidential difficulties: suspect not identified; victim does not support further action (from April 2014): Evidential difficulties victim based – named suspect not identified. The crime is confirmed but the victim declines or is unable to support further police action to identify the offender.
<b>Outcome 15</b>	Evidential difficulties (suspect identified; victim supports action) (from April 2014): Evidential difficulties named suspect identified – the crime is confirmed and the victim supports police action but evidential difficulties prevent further action. This includes cases where the suspect has been identified, the victim supports action, the suspect has been circulated as wanted but cannot be traced and the crime is finalised pending further action.
<b>Outcome 16</b>	Evidential difficulties: suspect identified; victim does not support further action (from April 2014): Evidential difficulties victim based – named suspect identified. The victim does not support (or has withdrawn support from) police action.
<b>Outcome 17</b>	Prosecution time limit expired (from April 2014): Suspect identified but prosecution time limit has expired (from April 2014).
<b>Outcome 18</b>	Investigation complete –no suspect identified (from April 2014): The crime has been investigated as far as reasonably possible – case closed pending further investigative opportunities becoming available.
<b>Outcome 19</b>	National Fraud Intelligence Bureau filed (NFIB only) (from April 2014): A crime of fraud has been recorded but has not been allocated for investigation because the assessment process at the NFIB has determined there are insufficient lines of enquiry to warrant such dissemination.
<b>Outcome 20</b>	Action undertaken by another body/agency (from April 2015): Further action resulting from the crime report will be undertaken by another body or agency other than the police, subject to the victim (or person acting on their behalf) being made aware of the action being taken. Note: during 2014/15 (and therefore in this publication), these were included within outcome 18.
<b>Outcome 21</b>	Not in the public interest – suspect identified (from January 2016) Further investigation resulting from the crime report that could provide evidence sufficient to support formal action being taken against the suspect is not in the public interest – police decision.



### Annex 3 – POA Categories

POA data are split into 12 categories, which sub-divide into headings as follows:

POA estimates are used for all cost and workforce data unless stated otherwise. These data are taken

- a. Neighbourhood policing
  - b. Incident (response) management
  - c. Local investigation \*
  - d. Specialist community liaison
  - e. Local policing command team and support overheads
- 2) Dealing with the public
- a. Front desk
  - b. Central communications unit
  - c. Dealing with the public command team and support overheads
- 3) Criminal justice arrangements
- a. Custody (*now include other custody costs*)
  - b. Police doctors/nurses and surgeons
  - c. Interpreters and translators
  - d. Criminal justice
  - e. Police national computer
  - f. Criminal record bureau
  - g. Coroner assistance
  - h. Fixed penalty schemes (central ticket office)
  - i. Property officer / stores
  - j. 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
- 9) National policing
- a. Secondments (out of force)
  - b. Counter terrorism / special branch
  - c. NPCC 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. Social club support and force band
  - p. Insurance / risk management
  - q. Catering

- 5) Operational support
- a. Operational Support Command Team and Support Overheads
  - b. Air operations
  - c. Mounted police
  - d. Specialist terrain
  - e. Dogs section
  - f. Advanced public order
  - g. Airport and ports policing unit
  - h. Firearms unit
  - i. Civil Contingencies
  - j. Event
- 6) Intelligence
- a. Intelligence command team and support overheads
  - b. Intelligence analysis / threat assessments
  - c. Intelligence gathering
- 7) Investigations
- a. Investigations command team and support overheads
  - b. Major investigation unit
  - c. Economic crime (including regional asset recovery team)
  - d. Specialist investigation units
  - e. Serious and organised crime unit
  - f. Local investigation/ prisoner processing\*
  - g. Cyber crime
- 8) Investigative support
- a. Scenes of crime officers
  - b. External forensic costs
  - c. Fingerprint / internal forensic costs
  - d. Photographic image recovery
  - e. Other forensic services
  - f. Investigative support command team and support overheads
- 11) Police & Crime Commissioner
- a. Cost of the democratic process
  - b. Office of Police Crime Commissioner
  - c. Share of any Formal Shared Service Arrangement
  - d. Commissioned services
- 12) Central costs
- a. Revenue contribution to capital
  - b. Capital financing
  - c. Pensions and exit costs
- 13) Public protection (*previously 7f*)
- a. Witness protection
  - b. Child protection
  - c. Adult protection

\* Local investigation is included under local policing rather than investigations

## Annex 4 - Coding of POA categories

### Local policing

- V Neighbourhood policing
- V Incident (response) management
- V Specialist community liaison
- V Local command team and support overheads

### Dealing with the public

- F Local call centres / front desk
- F Central communications unit
- F Contact management units
- F Command team and support overheads

### Road policing

- V Traffic units
- V Traffic wardens / PCSOs - traffic
- F Vehicle recovery
- F Casualty reduction partnership
- F Command team and support overheads

### Operational support

- F Command team and support overheads
- F Air operations
- V Mounted police
- F Specialist terrain
- V Dogs section
- F Advanced public order
- F Airports and ports policing unit
- V Firearms unit
- O Civil contingencies
- V Events

### Intelligence

- O Command team and support overheads
- O Intelligence analysis / threat assessments
- F Intelligence gathering

### Public protection

- F Witness protection
- F Child protection
- F Adult protection

### Investigations

- F Command team and support overheads
- F Major investigations unit
- F Economic crime (including regional asset recovery team)
- F Specialist investigation units
- F Serious and organised crime unit
- F Local investigation/ prisoner processing\*
- F Cyber crime

### Investigative support

- F Scenes of crime officers
- O External forensic costs
- O Fingerprint / internal forensic costs
- O Photographic image recovery
- O Other forensic services
- O Command team and support overheads

### Criminal justice arrangements

- F Custody
- F Police doctors / nurses and surgeons
- F Interpreters and translators
- F Other custody costs
- O Criminal justice
- O Police national computer
- O Criminal records bureau
- O Coroner assistance
- O Fixed penalty schemes (central ticket office)
- B Property officer / stores
- O Command team and support overheads

### Support functions

- B Human resources
- B Finance
- B Legal services
- B Fleet services
- B Estates / central building costs
- B Information communication technology
- O Professional standards
- B Press and media
- B Performance review / corporate development
- B Procurement
- B Training
- B Administration support
- O Force command
- B Support to associations and trade unions
- B Social club support and force band
- B Insurance / risk management
- B Catering

### Police and Crime Commissioner

- X Cost of police crime commissioner
- X Office of police crime commissioner
- X Other costs

### Central costs

- X Revenue contribution to capital
- X Capital financing
- X Pensions and exit costs

### National policing

- X Secondments (out of force)
- X Counter terrorism / special branch
- X ACPO projects / initiatives
- X Hosting national services
- X Other national policing requirements

V = Visible operational front line  
 F = Non-visible front line  
 O = Frontline support  
 B = Business support  
 X = Excluded (not coded)

\* Local investigation is included here under local policing rather than investigations

## Outliers

This page provides the areas in which the force is an outlier in costs. The force's figures are compared to the spend of other forces. To be flagged as an outlier, the spend must be one of the highest 10% or lowest 10% of any force and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population. The difference (Diff) calculations are the net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all forces.

	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff £m		£m	£/head	Avg	Diff £m
<b>OVERALL COSTS</b>					<b>Police and Crime Commissioner</b>				
Earned income	-17.4	-16.5	-8.4	-8.6	PCC/local policing body commissioned servi	4.7	4.5	3.0	1.5
<b>Pay</b>		<b>£000/FTE</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>Diff £m</b>					
Police officers		49.4	52.5	-5.8					
<b>Non Staff Costs</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>% staff cost</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>Diff £m</b>					
Premises related expenses	5.1	3.5	5.0	-2.2					
<b>Earned Income</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£/head</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>Diff £m</b>					
Total earned income	-17.4	-16.5	-8.4	-8.6					
<b>COSTS BY OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£/head</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>Diff £m</b>					
<b>NRE by objective group</b>									
Criminal justice arrangements	8.6	8.1	11.2	-3.2					
Operational support	5.7	5.4	7.2	-1.9					
Support functions	31.1	29.5	36.7	-7.7					
<b>Local policing</b>									
Local investigation/prisoner processing***	19.4	18.4	11.8	6.9					
Policing command team & support	0.3	0.3	1.8	-1.6					
<b>Criminal justice</b>									
Custody subtotal	4.5	4.2	6.3	-2.1					
<b>Public protection</b>									
Child protection	5.7	5.4	2.4	3.1					
<b>Investigations</b>									
Economic crime	2.3	2.2	1.0	1.2					
<b>Support functions</b>									
Estates / central building	5.0	4.7	7.8	-3.3					
Fleet services	2.2	2.0	3.1	-1.1					
Support functions	31.1	29.5	36.7	-7.7					