

1. *What training programme was developed and implemented, in relation to call handling staff at the contact management centre, following the 2017 inspection and report?*

Following the 2017 HMICFRS CDI audit/inspection, the force took the decision to implement a policy of recording crimes at the point of initial call. This was to include all cases where a requirement to record a crime arose during a call for service. The previous approach had been to delay recording pending the attendance of an officer, who was then required to confirm that a crime needed to be recorded.

At the time of the 2017 audit, and due to the previous practice, not all call handling staff within Contact Management had been trained in the requirements of National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS) and Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime (HOCR). To support crime recording at the point of a call, all previously untrained call handlers were given training in NCRS and HOCR. The training enables staff to recognise those circumstances where a crime needs to be recorded, and to task more highly trained colleagues within Contact Management to record the crime.

There is little doubt that this change in policy has supported an increase in compliance with NCRS/HOCR (albeit we still have some way to go), and has certainly led to improvements in the timeliness of recording. Both of these improvements were noted by HMICFRS in their 2019 audit/inspection report.

Implementation of the new Contact Management Platform (CMP) will require all call handling staff to record crimes disclosed during calls for service. CMP will make the recording of crime easier by offering direct data transfer with the crime recording system; thus avoiding 'double keying' of information.

2. *What further / enhanced training programme has been considered and / or being implemented, following this report?*

At the time of the 2019 HMICFRS audit/inspection the force had already commenced briefing/training of operational sergeants and inspectors in certain aspects of NCRS/HOCR. This training was primarily focused on the filing of crimes, and the application of crime outcomes, but through necessity the training included the refreshing of knowledge around the basis requirements for recording crime. The briefing/training is continuing, and is being delivered either 1:1 or to small groups by staff within the Force Crime Registrar Unit. To date (02/09/2019) the briefing/training has been delivered to a total of 492 sergeants (or equivalent police staff supervisors) and 108 officers of inspector rank or above.

As part of the force's response to the 2019 report there is a plan to review current training programmes and identify opportunities to address current knowledge gaps in relation to NCRS/HOCR. The aspiration is that crime recording will form a 'golden thread' which flows through all relevant training programmes. Work continues in relation to this objective but the following have now been achieved in delivering the plan:

- Training on specific requirements of NCRS/HOCR in relation to rape and serious sexual offences has been included in a new Specialist Sexual Assault Investigators Development Programme (SSAIDP).

- A Professionalising Investigation Training (PIT) course has been extended to include training on NCRS/HOCR. The extended course will commence in the autumn and will be delivered to all new sergeants.
 - Training in crime recording and the requirements of NCRS/HOCR are to be included as part of a revised CID course.
-

3. *How many additional applications were made to the victim support service, from the 'additional' 13,800 crimes (i.e. potential victims)?*

'Await data on numbers of referrals.'

We are unlikely to be able to respond to this question with any accuracy - 13,800 more crimes does not mean 13,800 more victims. Some of the increase will be in additional crimes (i.e. the requirement to record more than one crime per victim) or crimes against the state where there is no identifiable victim.

Processes for referral to victim support services has changed during the period between HMICFRS reports, and victim consent is now required to refer. Given these changes it may not be possible to assess the strength of any link between an increase in referrals and an increase in recorded crime.

What is certain - by recording a victim's crime correctly does offer the victim the opportunity to engage with support services. Any improvements in recording will therefore enable access which may previously have been denied.

4. *Why had the standard of N100 reporting, which included 5 rapes, deteriorated and why did contact management staff not understand the classification distinctions?*

The NCRS requirement for recording reports of rape differs from that which applies to all other offences. Police are required to record all reports of rape (either as a full crime or N100) regardless of the origin of the report. The number of reports required also differs, in that one rape record (crime or N100) is required for each penetrating offender.

As part of their audit the HMICFRS reviewed a sample of 20 N100 reports. There is no statistical significance to the size of this sample.

In 2017 the HMICFRS found that 16 out of 20 N100 reports were correctly recorded – in 2019 this was 15 out of 20. In 2019 the HMICFRS also found that a number of multiple reports should have been created where only a single report was. In all cases either a N100 or full crime of rape was recorded.

Following the 2017 audit, additional guidance in relation to the recording of reports of rape was provided to Contact Management staff. This has also been made available to the force as a whole. It is not clear why the accuracy of these reports has reduced, although the complexity of the requirements can cause confusion, as can the difference in the reporting rules.

5. *Why were certain rapes not recorded as a crime?*

In their audit the HMICFRS reviewed 138 records where a crime of rape should have been recorded. Of these the force had recorded 126 rape crimes. Of the 12 rape crimes not recorded by the force all the relevant reports had been recorded as occurrences within the force's crime recording system (Niche). In the majority of cases an investigation was being undertaken.

In five cases the rape crimes had been incorrectly classified as other crimes/sexual crimes. This was due to either incorrect decision making or misunderstanding on the part of the crime recorder, or a change in information arising during the investigation which should have resulted in the classification being amended to a crime of rape.

In five of the remaining seven cases, the investigators clearly identified that they were investigating reports of rape, but the records were not formally classified as such. The errors are most likely to have been caused by confusion/misunderstanding around the correct completion of Niche to reflect that a crime had been recorded.

In the remaining two cases, crimes were not recorded due to a lack of understanding of NCRS. In both cases there was information to suggest that a crime had not occurred but this was insufficient to negate the need to record a crime from the outset.

6. *Why has the decision-making, related to the cancelling of recorded offences and subsequent provision of this information to victims, got worse?*

NCRS allows the cancellation of a recorded crime on 5 grounds:

- Crime occurred in another force area and has been transferred to the other force.
- Additional verifiable information (AVI) determines that no crime occurred.
- Duplicate or part of crime already recorded.
- The crime has been recorded in error.
- Self-defence in an assault - up to ABH only.

As part of their audit the HMICFRS review a small sample of crime cancellations - around 20 each for rape, violence, sexual offences, and robbery. There is no statistical significance in the size of the samples, but the HMICFRS are keen to assess the accuracy of a force's decision making in regard to cancellation, and whether victims are fully engaged within the process.

Within TVP only staff within the Force Crime Registrar Unit are authorised to cancel crimes. This was the case at the time of both audits, and it was the same individuals responsible for decision making in both the 2017 and 2019 samples.

In the 2019 audit the HMICFRS assessed that fewer of the crime cancellation decisions were correct - the relevant data is set out below. It is difficult to explain how/why this might be the case, since it was the same people making the decisions, and applying the same understanding. The majority of challenges to decision making revolved around the extent of any additional verifiable information (AVI). Since the audit, additional guidance has been issued to FCRU staff regarding the level of AVI required to support a decision to cancel a crime.

Crime	Correct decisions - 2017	Correct decisions - 2019
Rape	20/20	19/20
Violence	19/20	17/20
Sexual Offences (excl. rape)	20/20	16/21
Robbery	18/20	17/20

In the 2019 audit the HMICFRS noted that, of the 50 victims who should have been informed of the cancellation of their crime, only 42 were. In the 2017 audit this was 47 out of 49 victims. Once again it is difficult to account for this variation since it is the same people authorising the cancellation. However, there is a clear need to ensure that the fact that a victim has been informed of the decision to cancel a crime is clearly recorded as part of the cancellation request.

7. *What is TVP doing, right now, to accelerate the pace of implementation, particular in relation to domestic violence cases?*

The force CDI Delivery Plan has been updated to reflect the issues highlighted in the 2019 HMICFRS report. A delivery manager has been appointed to oversee delivery of the actions within the plan. Actions will have an identified owner and time scale for delivery. The plan remains under the ownership of the DCC and the CDI Strategic Working Group.

Following publication of the report TVP policy and guidance in relation crime recording has been refreshed/revised and published. Publication has been communicated to the force via the intranet.

Appropriate links have been made between CDI and investigation through Op. Endeavour. This will ensure improvements in CDI compliance can be achieved through improved supervision and management of investigation.

The implementation of the new Contact Management Platform has begun. The system, will make recording if crime easier and more efficient, by supporting data exchange between command and control and crime recording systems, and removing the need for double keying.

Work has begun in identifying training opportunities to address knowledge gaps in relation to the requirements of crime recording. Some training courses have already been amended to include input on crime recording and plans are in place to include this in others.

Achieving and maintaining a good level of compliance with NCRS remains an objective within the Force Strategic Plan. This is monitored through performance meetings and improvement reviews.

Audits of NCRS compliance continue to be undertaken and any learning will be shared to support improvement. The amount of 'front end' checking of crime recording has increased particularly around domestic incidents which account for a high proportion of violent crimes.