

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LEICESTERSHIRE

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Report of	OFFICE OF POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER
Subject	HMICFRS RE-INSPECTION LEICESTERSHIRE POLICE: CRIME DATA INTEGRITY RE-INSPECTION 2018
Date	FRIDAY 1 FEBRUARY 2019 – 10:00 a.m.
Author	ANGELA PERRY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel of the outcome of Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Service (HMICFRS) re-inspection of Leicestershire Police in relation to Crime Data Integrity Recording and the Force response to the recommendations.

Recommendation

2. It is recommended that members comment on the contents of the report.

Background

3. In 2017, HMICFRS conducted a crime data integrity inspection of Leicestershire Police. HMICFRS published the report of this inspection in June 2017 and concluded that the crime-recording arrangements in the Force were inadequate with an overall compliance of 75.8%. The 2017 report made a series of recommendations and areas for improvement of crime-recording.
4. The Force has since been re inspected in October 2018. The latest report, published on Monday 15 January 2019, assessed the progress made by Leicestershire Police during the intervening period. A copy of the latest report is attached at APPENDIX 'A'.

Crime Data Integrity Inspection Report 2017

5. The report included 7 recommendations for Leicestershire Police as follows:-
 1. Immediately, the force should review the operating arrangements of its contact management department, including the use of appointments, and ensure that these arrangements secure the recording of all reported crimes at the first point of report when sufficient information exists to do so and in any event within 24 hours of receipt of report.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

2. Immediately, the force should take steps to identify and address gaps in its systems and processes for identifying and recording all reports of crime. This work should include a review of the means by which the Crime Bureau identifies crimes needing to be recorded, and also provide a consistent and structured approach to call-handling quality assurance processes that includes checking compliance with the National Crime Recording Standards.
3. Immediately, the force should take steps to ensure that reports of crime received in respect of vulnerable adults and children from other agencies or disclosed during investigation are recorded as crimes at the point or reporting. This is now COMPLETED.
4. Immediately, and in accordance with the crime-recording rules, the force should transfer to the force crime registrar (FCR) the responsibility for the development and oversight of the crime-recording audits conducted within force, and ensure that these audits are conducted in accordance with national standards. This is now COMPLETED.
5. Within 3 months, the force should develop and implement procedures for the effective supervision of crime-recording decisions throughout the whole force.
6. Within 3 months, the force should put in place arrangements to ensure that: at the point of report, greater emphasis is placed on the initial accounts of victims; and where more than one crime is disclosed within an incident record, or identified as part of other recorded crime investigations, these are recorded. This is now COMPLETED.
7. Within 6 months, the force should design and provide training for all staff who make crime recording decisions with regard to : the extent of the information required to provide for crime-recording decision, the expectation that reported crime is recorded at the first point that sufficient information exists to record a crime, the importance of believing the first account of the victim, the proper use of N100 for reports of rape and recording crimes of rape involving multiple offenders and from third party reports, offences involving public order act, malicious communications, harassment and common assault and the additional verifiable information required in order to make crime- cancellation decisions. This is now COMPLETED and training is ongoing.
6. The force also introduced a crime data integrity delivery plan. This plan is comprehensive and contains 55 actions to help the force improve its crime-recording standards. 12 actions remain ongoing.
7. In February 2018, the force started to roll out generic crime recording training. It has trained the majority of officers and staff. Alongside this, the force also developed and provided bespoke crime recording training tailored for relevant departments.

Crime Data Integrity Inspection Report 2018

8. Overall the force were assessed as Inadequate with 84.1% compliance rate. The national average after 26 forces have been inspected is 87.7% compliance. The Inspectors recognised that the force has made significant progress with its crime-recording arrangements since the 2017 report.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Particular praise was made of the leadership associated with addressing the issues raised through the earlier inspection. This was graded as good. It has:

- Improved its overall recording of crime, including violence and sexual offences;
 - significantly increased how often it records crime reports at the first point of contact;
 - developed and implemented a crime data integrity delivery plan;
 - appointed a senior lead to oversee the delivery plan; and
 - commenced crime-recording training for officers and staff responsible for making crime-recording decisions.
9. Inspectors also found a statistically significant improvement of 8.3 percentage points when compared to the 2017 findings. This improvement means that the force recorded an additional 8,300 crimes for the year covered by the re-inspection audit period. Therefore more victims now have their crimes recorded ensuring that they have access to the victim support service, Victim First.
10. Inspectors also noted the following progress with its crime-recording arrangements since the 2017 report as follows:-
- stopped using diary appointments because the process wasn't working;
 - created a Crime Bureau so it records more crime reports as soon as enough information exists to do so, vastly improving the amount of crimes it records within 24 hours;
 - introduced call-handling quality assurance processes that include checking compliance with the National Crime Recording Standards;
 - created an incident review team to quality assure incidents and identify actions to address unrecorded crime reports;
 - given the Force Crime Registrar responsibility for crime recording audits;
 - introduced a process whereby designated decision makers (DDMs) review the previous 24 hours non-crime domestic abuse and vulnerable victim reports, rape reports and incidents opened as a sexual offence to check for unrecorded reports of crime:
 - set up a Crime Data Integrity helpline so that officers and staff can call for real time advice; and
 - fully implemented four out of seven recommendations from the 2017 report.
11. In addition, inspectors welcomed the fact that the force had written a revised audit strategy which included feedback to individuals and an organisational learning process.
12. At the time of publication of the 2018 report, Zoe Billingham, HMIC issues a media statement. This is attached at APPENDIX 'B' to the report.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

13. The force has raised issues over some of the reporting methodology in particular within the section on vulnerability at section A-12. This refers to vulnerable victims. The Panel will be reassured that of the 50 vulnerable victim records audited 47 were found to be correct.

Conclusion

14. To further address the areas of improvement required the proposed budget for 2019/20, submitted to the Panel earlier on this agenda, has included a number of areas where funds will be directed which will directly impact on performance in the area of crime recording. Subsequent to the autumn 2017 report the force has increased the number of dedicated decision makers involved in the crime recording process from 3 to 12. The growth is 7 police officer posts and two temporary police staff posts at a total cost of £419,000.
15. The Commissioner will continue to oversee progress against both inspection reports by receiving updates of progress to meetings of his Strategic Assurance Board throughout the year. A copy of the Commissioner's media statement made at the time of publication of the 2018 report is attached at APPENDIX 'C'.
16. Investigators welcomed the fact that Leicestershire Police had made significant progress with improving its crime-recording standards since the 2017 report. They commented that more work was required to address the outstanding areas for improvement identified in this and the 2017 report however inspectors were confident that the leadership and governance arrangements that it now has will enable this to happen. In this respect inspectors found good leadership from senior officers toward crime recording and officers and staff showed an approach that placed the victim at the forefront of their crime-recording decisions.

Implications

Finance:	Any financial implications are covered in the budget report on this agenda.
Legal:	None
Equality Impact Assessment:	None.
Risks and Impact:	Reputational risk if areas for improvement are not addressed.

List of Attachments / Appendices

Appendix 'A' – HMIFRS Inspection report 2018
 Appendix 'B' – Media Statement from Zoe Billingham, HMI
 Appendix 'C' – Media Statement by the Police and Crime Commissioner

Background Papers

File PCC/2/O/2018

Persons to Contact

Angela Perry, Executive Director, (0116) 2298982
 Email: angela.perry@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk

Leicestershire Police: Crime Data Integrity re-inspection 2018

Crime Data Integrity re-inspection 2018

In May 2017, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) conducted a crime data integrity inspection of Leicestershire Police.

We published the [report of this inspection](#) in September 2017 and concluded that the force's crime-recording arrangements were not acceptable. As a result, we gave Leicestershire Police an overall judgment of **inadequate**. Of the 30 forces reported upon in this programme of inspections to date, the crime-recording standards found in Leicestershire Police in 2017 were the worst.

Our 2017 report gave numerous recommendations and areas for improvement aimed at improving crime recording in Leicestershire Police. This re-inspection, completed in October 2018, assessed the progress made since that report. The findings and our judgment resulting from this re-inspection are set out below.

1. Overall judgment
2. Summary of inspection findings
 1. Causes of concern and areas for improvement
3. How effective is the force at recording reported crime?
 1. Overall crime-recording rate
 2. Violent crimes
 3. Sexual offences
 4. Rape
4. How efficiently do the systems and processes in the force support accurate crime recording?
 1. Crime reports held on other systems
 2. Modern slavery
 3. Timeliness
 4. Cancelled crimes
 5. Equality
5. How well does the force demonstrate the leadership and culture necessary to meet the national standards for crime recording?
6. Conclusion
7. What next?

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Overall judgment

See previous findings


Inadequate

From its low base Leicestershire Police has improved its crime-recording arrangements since our 2017 crime data integrity inspection report. However, we found more still needs to be done.

We found it has:

- improved its overall recording of crime, including violence and sexual offences;
- significantly increased how often it records crime reports at the first point of contact;
- developed and implemented a crime data integrity delivery plan;
- appointed a senior lead to oversee the delivery plan; and
- commenced crime-recording training for officers and staff responsible for making crime-recording decisions.

We examined crime reports from 1 April 2018 to 30 June 2018. Based on this we estimate that the force records 84.1 percent of crimes reported to it (with a confidence interval of +/- 1.71 percent). This is a statistically significant improvement of 8.3 percentage points when compared to our 2017 inspection finding of 75.8 percent (confidence interval +/- 1.94 percent).

We estimate that, compared to the findings of our 2017 inspection, this improved accuracy meant that the force [recorded an additional 8,300 crimes](#) for the year covered by our re-inspection audit period. So, more victims will now have their reported crimes recorded. Recording these crime reports makes sure victims have access to the Leicestershire victim support service [Victim First](#), when they may otherwise not have been referred to it. The force has also improved its understanding of demand and the extent to which crime affects its communities.

But despite these improvements, the overall recording rate and the recording rates for violent crime and sexual offences are too low.

We also found that the force still doesn't record all:

- reports of rape;
- crimes associated with domestic abuse; or
- crimes committed against vulnerable people which are reported directly to its public protection department.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

The force's supervision of the crime-recording process and crime-recording decisions is still inconsistent. It doesn't have proper safeguards in place to make sure it records reported crimes.

The force also still needs to improve how it:

- understands and uses classification N100;
- records crimes reported by third party professionals (such as social services and health professionals);
- makes decisions when cancelling recorded offences; and
- informs victims of its decision to cancel their crime.

Summary of inspection findings

See previous findings

The force has made some progress with its crime-recording arrangements since our 2017 report. It has:

- stopped using diary appointments because the process wasn't working;
- created a crime bureau so it records more crime reports as soon as enough information exists to do so, vastly improving the amount of crimes it records within 24 hours;
- introduced call-handling quality assurance processes that include checking compliance with the National Crime Recording Standards;
- created an incident review team to quality assure incidents and identify actions to address unrecorded crime reports;
- given the force crime registrar responsibility for crime-recording audits;
- introduced a process whereby designated decision makers (DDMs) review the previous 24 hours' non-crime domestic abuse and vulnerable victim reports, rape reports and incidents opened as a sexual offence to check for unrecorded reports of crime;
- set up a crime data integrity helpline so that officers and staff can call for real time advice; and
- fully implemented four out of seven recommendations from our 2017 report.

The force has also introduced a crime data integrity delivery plan. This plan is comprehensive and contains 55 actions to help the force improve its crime-recording standards. It still needs to fully complete 12 of these actions.

In February 2018, the force started to roll out generic crime-recording training. It has trained the majority of officers and staff. Alongside this, the force also developed and provided bespoke crime-recording training tailored for relevant departments. This is good practice. However, some officers and staff have not yet received training. Consequently, some call handlers, response officers and supervisors still aren't always sure when to record some types of crime, such as:

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- common assault;
- harassment;
- malicious communications;
- public order; and
- professional third-party reports.

It has been conducting its own incident and crime audits in line with national standards since January 2018. So, it was already aware of some of the failings described in this report. The results of these audits are reported to monthly performance meetings and to the monthly crime data integrity operations group, both of which the senior lead chairs.

The audits identify procedural issues that may be affecting crime-recording accuracy, and instances where individual feedback will improve future crime-recording decisions. To support this the audit results are sent to department leads so that feedback can be given to officers and staff. This is good practice but there is an absence of monitoring to ensure these feedback processes are working.

We note that the force has written a revised audit strategy, which includes feedback to individuals and an organisational learning process. This is welcome.

How effective is the force at recording reported crime?

 Inadequate

Overall crime-recording rate

84.1% of reported crimes were recorded

See previous findings

The force has made some progress with its processes ensuring it now records more reports of crime in accordance with the [Home Office Counting Rules](#) (HOCR). We examined reports of crime the force received, and for which it had created an auditable record. The force told us that 94.3 percent of crime it records (except fraud) comes through an auditable route. This doesn't mean that 94.3 percent of crimes reported to Leicestershire Police come through these routes, but that 94.3 percent of crime is recorded this way.

We found that the force recorded 84.1 percent of these crimes (with a confidence interval of +/- 1.71 percent). We estimate that this means the force is recording an additional 8,300 reported crimes each year compared to the findings of our 2017 inspection. This is a statistically significant improvement of 8.3 percentage points but falls short of what is needed.

Of the 1,662 reports of crime we audited, we assessed 429 as related to domestic abuse. Of these, the force had recorded 340. Of the 89 offences not recorded, 70 were violence offences, including:

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- common assaults;
- assaults occasioning actual bodily harm;
- harassment; and
- malicious communications.

Many of these were reported directly to the force. But the force didn't record them as crimes, and we found no clear evidence or explanation as to why. We also found occasions where call handlers didn't record on the incident log full details of their conversation with the person reporting a crime. This means the attending officer doesn't always have the full information to make a crime-recording decision.

Case study

A report was made of domestic abuse, amounting to an offence of controlling and coercive behaviour. The victim was a repeat victim of domestic abuse. Police attended but did not record any offences or provide information to suggest a crime did not occur. No investigation was undertaken.

We found that in 18 of the unrecorded cases, officers didn't do a risk assessment when they attended to speak to the victim. We also found no record of the force considering safeguarding requirements in 12 of these cases, and in 34 cases it didn't carry out an investigation.

It remains a concern that the force is still under-recording crimes relating to domestic abuse incidents and failing to give many of these victims a satisfactory service.

Violent crimes

78.9% of reported violent crimes were recorded

See previous findings

We found that 78.9 percent of violent crimes reported to the force are recorded (with a confidence interval of +/- 2.72 percent). This is lower than the overall crime-recording rate above. By our estimate, compared to the findings of our 2017 inspection, this means the force is now recording an additional 3,900 reported violence crimes each year. This is a statistically significant improvement of 13.1 percentage points, but the force is still failing many victims of violent crime. As violent crime can be particularly distressing for the victim, and many of these crimes involve injury, the need for improvement in this area is particularly acute and remains a concern.

When the force doesn't record a violent crime, the principal causes are:

- misunderstanding of the crime-recording rules about some violence offences such as harassment, malicious communications and common assault;

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- failures to record multiple crimes in accordance with the HOCR;
- failures to record additional crimes disclosed during investigations;
- failures to record crimes reported by third party professionals (such as social services and health professionals); and
- inconsistent supervision of the crime-recording process and crime-recording decisions, with inadequate safeguards in place to ensure it records most crimes correctly.

Victims of violence and serious violence often need a lot of support. This should come from the reporting and investigating officers, and other appropriate organisations, such as Victim First. In these circumstances, crime recording is even more important. If the force fails to record a violent crime properly, it can mean victims aren't referred to Victim First. This deprives victims of the support they need and deserve.

Sexual offences

87.8%

of reported sex offences were recorded

See previous findings

The force records 87.8 percent of sexual offence crimes (including rape) that are reported to it (with a confidence interval of +/- 2.63 percent). Compared to the findings of our 2017 inspection, we estimate this means the force has recorded an additional 210 reported sexual offence crimes in the past year. This is a statistically significant improvement of 8.4 percentage points. These crimes may otherwise have gone unrecorded. This improvement is welcome, but more work remains to be done.

The reported sexual offence crimes that were not recorded included:

- 12 sexual assaults;
- six offences of incitement against children to engage in sexual activity; and
- a variety of other sexual offences against children.

The causes of this under-recording are similar to those identified above for violent crime.

At the point of report, officers and staff assess whether on the balance of probability an offence has been committed. It is a concern that they don't always place enough emphasis on the account of the victim, despite us highlighting this issue in our 2017 report. This is particularly evident when the victim doesn't want to pursue a prosecution, the victim is intoxicated or the person reporting the crime is a professional third party acting on the victim's behalf.

It is particularly important for victims of sexual offence crimes that they are recorded, as many of these crimes are very serious in nature and cause

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

significant harm to their victims. The force must improve its performance in this respect.

Rape

See previous findings

84 of 93 audited rape reports were accurately recorded

Rape is one of the most serious crimes a victim can experience. So, it is especially important that reports of rape are recorded accurately. It helps to make sure victims receive the service and support they deserve. And it helps the police identify the nature and extent of sexual violence in their local area.

Since our 2017 inspection, the force has improved its crime recording for reports of rape. But further improvement is needed, as the force still doesn't record all rape crimes reported to it.

We found that 84 of 93 rape crimes had been correctly recorded. Of the nine unrecorded reports of rape:

- one was misclassified as a sexual assault;
- one was misclassified as causing or inciting a female under 13 to engage in sexual activity;
- one was incorrectly classified as an N100 (see below); and
- six were not recorded at all.

We found the force had safeguarded the victims in all these cases. It didn't investigate one unrecorded report of historic rape, because it didn't follow up the victim's allegation.

Where forces don't record a reported rape as a crime, they must apply a Home Office classification N100.

We checked 20 N100 records. Of these:

- two were reports of rape in another force area that were subsequently correctly recorded as rape crimes and transferred to the relevant forces;
- two should have been recorded as rapes at the outset;
- one was a third party professional report which should have been recorded as a rape at the outset;
- two were later correctly recorded as other crimes, namely sexual assault and robbery, after victim confirmation; and
- the remaining 13 were correctly recorded.

Separately, we also reviewed 34 sample records where the force should have used an N100 classification. But it only did so in six of these.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

We found that other than specialist detectives in the rape unit, call handlers and officers still had very little awareness of the N100 classification. Again, this is disappointing as we highlighted this matter as an area for improvement in our 2017 report. The force must now work urgently to improve its understanding and ensure the correct use of classification N100.

It is essential to record a rape report correctly as a crime as soon as possible. Victims will often need a great deal of support from the start. Any delay, or failure to record the crime correctly, can have a negative impact on both the victim's recovery and any investigation.

How efficiently do the systems and processes in the force support accurate crime recording?

 Inadequate

Crime reports held on other systems

4 of 9 vulnerable victim crimes were recorded

See previous findings

To be confident that vulnerable victims always get the support they need, it is important that crimes reported directly to public protection teams are always recorded. To make sure this is the case, the force has changed its procedures for recording crimes reported directly to its public protection teams. A DDM now examines all such reports to make sure every reported crime has been recorded. And the force has introduced an incident review team to review closed incidents without a crime report, to make sure they are correct. Despite these new arrangements, the force still doesn't record all such crimes.

We examined 50 vulnerable victim records and found that six of these records contained a total of nine reports of crime, of which the force had recorded four. The remaining 44 vulnerable victim records did not contain reports of crime and therefore did not require a crime-recording decision to be taken. The five reports of crime that were not recorded by the force were linked to three vulnerable victim records and comprised:

- one crime of non-injury assault against an adult;
- one crime of harassment towards a child; and
- three crimes from one record, being one crime of sexual activity with a child under 16, one of distributing an indecent image and one of possessing an indecent image with intent to distribute.

All these cases involved professional third-party reports and should have been recorded as soon as they were reported. We found the force had provided sufficient safeguarding to two of these victims but hadn't investigated any of these reports.

The force is aware of and working hard to close gaps in operating procedures that mean reports of crime from other organisations, many of whom do not

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

have knowledge about crime-recording imperatives, can be slow to materialise or lack detail.

Modern slavery

See previous findings

Offences relating to modern slavery are an important and recent addition to the crimes that forces must record and investigate. We examined how well the force records reports of modern slavery offences.

The force has improved its procedures to record reports of modern slavery crimes. It has created a human trafficking and modern slavery investigation team, reallocating a detective sergeant, six constables and a PCSO specifically to investigate reports and significantly enhance the volume and sophistication of prevention and victim support activity. The force crime registrar now also proactively examines modern slavery incidents and referrals.

The force works with partner agencies in the local area and the National Crime Agency to share and develop intelligence collaboratively. The community within the city of Leicester, specifically, has unusually rich representation from different countries and consequently has close commercial ties with eastern Europe and Asia. This presents a complex picture to the force and it is taking positive steps to fully grasp the nature and scale of possible modern slavery and human trafficking in the local context.

We examined 20 modern slavery crimes and found that the force correctly recorded 17. It also correctly recorded nine rapes and three other crimes associated with these reports. But it failed to record:

- one rape crime;
- one theft;
- one threat to commit criminal damage; and
- two N100 classifications.

Four modern slavery crimes were over-recorded, along with one crime of kidnap and one of assault.

We also looked at eight modern slavery reports the force received through the national referral mechanism. We found that it correctly recorded one crime of sexual assault but hadn't recorded one modern slavery crime of facilitating travel with a view to exploitation. We also found that it had failed to record two classification N100s where victims had been forced to have sex as prostitutes abroad.

This is an improvement since our last inspection, but the force still faces challenges to fully understand the types and frequency of crimes involved. We believe that the increase in specialist investigators will support the force to make the improvements necessary.

Timeliness

See previous findings

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

The rules require forces to record crimes within 24 hours of the report. We found that, of the crime reports Leicestershire Police had recorded, it did so within 24 hours for:

- 556 out of 611 violent crimes;
- 220 out of 244 sexual offences; and
- 482 out of 492 other offences.

In general, when Leicestershire Police makes correct crime-recording decisions, its procedures successfully ensure it does so within 24 hours. This timely recording enables it to make early referrals to Victim First for those victims in need of support. This is a substantial improvement since our 2017 inspection and is very welcome.

Cancelled crimes

See previous findings

DDMs make all crime cancellations except rape. The force crime registrar makes rape cancellation decisions. We found that the force correctly cancelled:

- 14 out of 16 rape crimes;
- 15 out of 20 violent crimes;
- 16 out of 20 sexual offence crimes; and
- 6 out of 7 robbery offences.

Of the 49 victims the force should have told about its decision to cancel their crime, it had informed only 34.

We found that in some cases, crimes had been cancelled without DDM approval.

Compared to our 2017 report, the force's standards for cancelling recorded crime have got worse. It remains a concern that the force does not always inform victims about the cancellation of their recorded crime.

Equality

See previous findings

The force has made good progress to improve its collection of information about the effect of criminality on identifiable groups within communities. The force can now record ethnicity, religion, nationality and disability when it records a crime, as well as age and gender details. It completed a burglary crime audit in January 2018 which included how often these markers were used. This will form part of all future crime-recording audits.

Building on that improvement, the force is also investing in new software to capture better information linked to equality data. The force crime registrar is active within a national group responsible for developing the force's 'Niche' crime-recording system, to improve the depth and quality of information recorded about victims and crimes, and to elevate the sophistication of analysis it can conduct. This shows the appetite of the force to improve local

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

systems wherever possible and influence at a national level for the benefit of victims of crime.

How well does the force demonstrate the leadership and culture necessary to meet the national standards for crime recording?

See previous findings



Good

We found good leadership from senior officers in Leicestershire Police toward crime recording. Officers and staff showed an approach that places the victim at the forefront of their crime-recording decisions.

The force has improved its crime-recording standards in many areas. Recording rates have improved and its crime-recording timeliness is excellent.

In response to our 2017 inspection report, the force appointed a senior officer as the strategic business lead. The lead will develop and oversee a comprehensive crime data integrity delivery plan. The plan includes all outstanding recommendations from our 2014 inspection report and national action plan, and the recommendations and areas for improvement in our 2017 report.

The force has made good progress against the delivery of this plan. But it needs to make improvements more quickly, as much remains to be done. The force has governance arrangements to allow it to do this, and progress against the delivery plan is regularly reported to the crime data integrity group and the chief officer team.

Crime recording is on the force risk register, and the force has recently reorganised its organisational risk board. In future, crime-recording audit results will be reported to this board as well as the existing governance boards.

The force has fully implemented four out of seven recommendations from our 2017 report and has made some progress against the areas for improvement. It still needs to fully implement the following recommendations:

- develop and implement procedures for effective supervision of crime-recording decisions across the whole force;
- ensure that at the point of report, greater emphasis is placed on the initial account of victims; and where more than one crime is disclosed within an incident record, or is identified as part of other recorded crime investigations, these are recorded; and
- deliver crime-recording training to those officers and staff that have not yet received it.

Also, the force needs to ensure it makes more progress with the outstanding areas for improvement in our 2017 report.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**Conclusion**

Leicestershire Police has made some progress with improving its crime-recording standards since our 2017 report, and this is welcome. But it now needs to work more quickly to address the outstanding causes of concern and areas for improvement identified in this and our 2017 report. We are confident that the leadership and governance arrangements that it now has will enable it to do so.

What next?

We expect the force to continue to address the causes for concern and to fully implement the recommendations and areas for improvement given in our 2017 inspection. We will continue to monitor this and will re-inspect the force again to assess its progress.

Zoe Billingham (HMI) Media Release**Leicestershire Police's crime-recording progress a 'credit' to leadership, but more to be done.**

While inspectors found limited improvements at how Leicestershire Police records crime, a report published today by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) concluded that the overall recording rate is too low.

The report follows a previous crime data integrity inspection carried out in 2017, which found Leicestershire Police's crime recording practices were among the worst in the country. Despite some improvement, HMICFRS has determined that the force's performance is still 'inadequate'.

However, the inspectorate estimates the force's response to the 2017 report has resulted in Leicestershire Police recording an additional 8,300 crimes. It also noted that the force has vastly improved the amount of crimes it records within 24 hours, meaning that more victims can access vital support services more quickly.

HM Inspector of Constabulary Zoë Billingham said:

"I was pleased to see that Leicestershire Police has made renewed efforts to do better at recording crimes reported to it. The force is committed to learning from its mistakes and has taken steps to address some of the problems we found in our last inspection. I am confident that the force is getting back on track and I am optimistic that further improvements will follow in the coming months.

"Leicestershire Police has recognised its old processes weren't fit for purpose and has set up a new dedicated crime bureau. It's still early days, but we found that the force has made great strides in improving how quickly it records crimes reported to it, with the vast majority recording within 24 hours. This means that victims of crime are getting better service from their local force, and have earlier access to vital victim support charities, like Leicestershire's Victim First.

"However, I still found evidence that call handlers, response officers and supervisors are uncertain about when they need to record certain types of crime. Like other forces, officers at Leicestershire often have problems identifying more complicated crimes like malicious communications and harassment.

"I do recognise that there has been progress since our last inspection. The force has rolled out a crime recording training programme, and I welcome the introduction of better internal auditing processes. Individual officers will get much better feedback to help them understand where they're going wrong and how to do better. But I remain concerned that there is some misunderstanding of the Home Office recording rules.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

“It is a credit to the force’s leadership that Leicestershire Police has carried out four of the seven recommendations we made in our last report. The force is in a good position to pick up the pace and finish the job its started, so we can be sure that every reported offence will be recorded. I look forward to working closely with Leicestershire Police to make this happen.”

HMICFRS will continue to monitor Leicestershire Police and intends to re-inspect the force again to assess its progress against its implementation plan.

Media Release – Police and Crime Commissioner**CRIME DATA INTEGRITY INSPECTION**

—
In May 2017, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) conducted a crime data integrity inspection of Leicestershire Police. The 2017 report made recommendations and areas for improvement aimed at improving crime recording in Leicestershire Police.

A subsequent re-inspection, completed in October 2018, assessed the progress made since that report. The findings of that report can be found [here](#)

Lord Willy Bach said: "I'm aware that a lot of resources have been invested in improving the recording processes and I'm pleased that the reports recognises the significant progress that has been made in a short time frame.

"There is clearly more to be done and I will continue to monitor work in this area as the force aims to make further improvements. However, it's reasonable to expect that, as everyone gets used to new processes that are now in place, they will build upon the encouraging progress that has been made so far."

Chief Constable Simon Cole said: "This inspection shows that our overall data integrity compliance rate stands at 84.1%, just behind the national average of 87.7%.

"This is an improvement on last year's results and an area of business we continue to work on, something which has been rightly acknowledged in the latest report which praises our leadership work and found that victims are placed 'at the forefront of crime-recording decisions'.

"We have a rolling plan on how we want to further improve our crime recording, we have introduced new processes, revamped our training and are closely monitoring the progress.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

“However, crime recording is a complex issue and this inspection looks at our technical compliance with a national crime recording system – something which is focused on numbers, categories, how crimes are manually logged on systems and then audited.

“It is an area of business that comes with hundreds of pages of detailed guidance and outcome of the recent inspection isn’t a reflection of the level of investigation into any given crime, personal integrity or how officers and staff liaise with victims, and nor should it be interpreted as such.

“It is about our administrative processes and computer systems and there are aspects of the inspection that we regularly challenge.

“And while we do aim to make further improvements to our audit processes, crime continues to increase nationally and the balancing act on where resources are deployed continues every day and changes every minute. This is a constant challenge. We now have 12 officers and staff supporting this process, where in the past we had 3. That is a balancing act in a world of finite resources.”

Ends