

NATIONAL STATISTICIAN'S CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA
UK Statistics Authority, Meeting room 3, Drummond Gate, London, SW1V 2QQ
Thursday 11th May 2017, 14:00 – 16:00

Agenda Item No.	Timings	Order of Business		
1.	14:00 – 14:05 (5 min)			<i>Introduction and announcements</i> Adrian Smith (Chair)
2.	14:05 – 14:10 (5 mins)		NSCSAC(17)7	<i>Minutes, correspondence and matters arising from the meeting held on 24th January 2017</i> Adrian Smith (Chair)
3.	14:10 – 14:40 (30 mins)	For Discussion	Presentation	<i>Presentation on recording and investigating of fraud</i> <i>Andrew Fyfe (Detective Chief Inspector, National Fraud Intelligence Bureau)</i>
4.	14:40 – 15:10 (30 mins)		NSCSAC(17)8	<i>Child Abuse Data Task & Finish Group Report</i> Allan Brimicombe (Chair of TFG)
5.	15:10 – 15:25 (15 mins)		NSCSAC(17)9	<i>Crime Severity Score</i> Emma Wright (ONS)
6.	15:25 – 15:35 (10 mins)		NSCSAC(17)10	<i>Proposed change to classification of violent crime</i> Emma Wright (ONS)
7.	15:35 – 15:45 (10 mins)			<i>Round table</i> Pat MacLeod (Office for Statistics Regulation) OSR Crime Emerging View report
8.	15:45 – 15:50 (5 mins)		NSCSAC(17)11	<i>National Crime Registrar's Report</i> Steve Bond (NCR)
9.	15:50 – 15:55 (5 mins)	Issues log update	NSCSAC(17)12	John Flatley (Secretariat)
10.	15:55 – 16:00 (5 mins)	Any other business		All Members

MINUTES OF
THE NATIONAL STATISTICIAN'S CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING ON 11 MAY 2017

Meeting Room 3
ONS, 1 Drummond Gate, London SW1Q 2VV

CHAIR

Adrian Smith UK Statistics Authority Board

MEMBERS PRESENT

David Blunt	Home Office
Steve Bond	Home Office
Allan Brimicombe	University of East London
Roma Chappell	Office for National Statistics
Steve Ellerd-Elliott	Ministry of Justice
Gavin Hales	Police Foundation
Glyn Jones	Welsh Government (by audio)
Mike Levi	Cardiff University
Patricia Mayhew	Independent Criminological Consultant
Chris Lewis	University of Portsmouth
Stephen Shute	University of Sussex
Bill Skelly	National Policing Lead for Crime Statistics

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES

Andy Fyfe	City of London Police (agenda item 3)
Pat MacLeod	Office for Statistics Regulation (observer)
Emma Wright	Office for National Statistics (agenda items 5 and 6)

SECRETARIAT

John Flatley Office for National Statistics

APOLOGIES

Junaid Gharda	Independent expert
Mike Warren	Home Office
Tom Winsor	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
Mark Stainforth	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

1. Chair's Introduction and announcements

- 1.1. Adrian Smith welcomed Chief Constable Bill Skelly to his first meeting having recently taken over from Jeff Farrar as the National Police Chiefs Council lead for crime statistics.

2. Recording and investigating fraud

- 2.1. The Chair welcomed Chief Inspector Andy Fyfe, from the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau at the City of London Police to the meeting and thanked him for agreeing to

present the Committee with an overview of the handling of fraud reports. The Chair invited Andy Fyfe to give his presentation at the start of the meeting so that he didn't have to sit through discussion of the minutes and matters arising from the last meeting.

- 2.2. Andy Fyfe gave the Committee an overview of the journey of a fraud report and how the NFIB make use of the data to develop intelligence packages for onward referral and investigation by police forces. There were a number of questions and discussion ensued.
- 2.3. Adrian Smith thanked Andy Fyfe for his presentation which he thought had been very helpful in deepening the Committee's understanding of this important crime type.

3. Minutes and matters arising from meeting held on 24 January 2017 - NSCSAC(17)7

- 3.1. The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as an accurate record.
- 3.2. The Chair noted that Action Point 1 had been closed and three others (Action Points 2, 4 and 7) were to be discussed as substantive items on the agenda. It was also noted that Action point 3 referred to ONS circulating a revised mock-up of proposed text in the ONS quarterly bulletin for comment by correspondence and this had been sent out with the meeting papers. The Chair asked that members send any comments in by correspondence to the Secretariat if there was insufficient time to discuss at the end of the meeting.
- 3.3. The Secretariat reported that Action points 4 and 5 were ongoing and should be closed before the next meeting.
- 3.4. With regard to matters arising, para 2.7 referred to HMIC anticipating publishing the next set of force level inspection reports. As there were no HMIC representatives able to attend the meeting, an update had been provided to the Secretariat. John Flatley reported that since the last meeting, HMIC had published a batch of reports¹ together with the annual HMIC assessment of the State of Policing² which made reference to the findings from the first set of audits.
- 3.5. The publication of the next batch of reports for Cambridgeshire, Cheshire and Kent police forces were provisionally scheduled for publication in mid-June.

4. NSCSAC(17)8 – Child Abuse Data Task & Finish Group Report

- 4.1. The Chair invited Allan Brimicombe to introduce the final report of the Committee's Task and Finish Group which had been established to examine data on child abuse. Allan Brimicombe reminded the Committee of the background to the Task and Finish Group and summarised the work that it had completed.
- 4.2. There was discussion about the 3 key recommendations made to the Committee by the Task and Finish Group. Some members of the Committee were sceptical about the

¹ <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/our-work/crime-data-integrity/reports-rolling-programme-crime-data-integrity/>

² <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/wp-content/uploads/state-of-policing-2016.pdf>

proposal for a UK-wide prevalence survey thinking it would be difficult to conduct and subject to non-response bias.

- 4.3. The consensus was that the recommendations should be taken forward sequentially with work to explore the value of Multiple System Estimation (MSE) methods using administrative data being taken forward before considering what additional value a UK-wide prevalence study would yield.
- 4.4. The Chair thanked Allan Brimicombe and members of his Task and Finish Group for their work which had been valuable for the Committee. It was agreed that the report should be sent to the National Statistician for him to consider the advice given by the Committee.

Action 1: The Chair to send a copy of the final report to the National Statistician.

5. Crime Severity Score - NSCSAC(17)9

- 5.1. The Chair invited Emma Wright, from ONS, to introduce the paper on the Crime Severity Score. The paper provided an update on developments since the last meeting including feedback received from users and proposed next steps.
- 5.2. Mike Levi said that he continued to have fundamental concerns about the use of sentencing as a valid scientific indicator of the harmfulness of crimes. Some other members of the Committee were also not sure of the value of the index and concerned about the potential for confusion with existing headline measures of crime.
- 5.3. However, the majority felt these concerns could be addressed by clear health warnings and communication about the uses and limitations of the Crime Severity Score. Therefore it was agreed that the Committee should support ONS plans to release a revised version of the Crime Severity Score data in the autumn of 2017 and then include it as part of the suite of its quarterly outputs in future.
- 5.4. There was, however, agreement that it should not be released as an additional headline measure of crime but as a tool principally aimed at police force analysts.

6. Proposal to change the presentation of Violence Against the Person (VAP) offences in the police recorded crime series – NSCSAC(17)10

- 6.1. The Chair asked Emma Wright to introduce the paper that had been prepared following an initial discussion and advice given at the last meeting.
- 6.2. Emma Wright reported that the proposal in the paper had taken on board the comments made by the Committee and proposed to create a new sub-category within the police recorded category of 'Violence against the person' to separate harassment and stalking from the existing 'violence without injury' sub-category.
- 6.3. In reviewing the draft table template a question was raised as to why Homicide was not split into its individual components (of murder, manslaughter, corporate manslaughter and infanticide). Steve Bond confirmed that the data was collected at this level of detail but wasn't aware of why the official statistics were aggregated in this

way. The view of the Committee was that, unless there was good reason not to do so, such detail should be published by ONS.

- 6.4. On the change to the sub-classification of Violence against the person, the Committee was supportive of this change being implemented following further discussions with users and stakeholders.

Action 2: The Chair to advise the National Statistician that the Committee was supportive of the proposed change.

7. Update from Office for Statistics Regulation on Systemic Review of Crime Statistics

- 7.1. The Chair asked Pat MacLeod to give the Committee an update on the OSR's systemic review of crime statistics. Pat MacLeod referred to the recent publication of an update by OSR³ and outlined plans to hold two roundtable meetings in the near future.
- 7.2. One would be in Belfast and aimed at the devolved administrations and the second would be in London and principally focus on how to extend the value of statistics about crime and justice by increasing the extent of sharing and linking data.
- 7.3. Pat MacLeod mentioned that as part of their systemic review, Chris Lewis had been asked to review international best practice. Committee members expressed an interest in seeing this paper and Pat MacLeod and Chris Lewis were content for a draft to be shared with the Committee prior to its publication.

Action 3: Secretariat to send Committee a copy of Chris Lewis' paper.

8. National Crime Registrar's Report - NSCSAC(17)11

- 8.1. Steve Bond introduced the National Crime Registrar's Report. The Committee noted the contents of the report. There were no questions.

9. Issues log

- 9.1. John Flatley reported that the issues log had been updated and invited members to comment on priority issues for discussion at future meetings.
- 9.2. It was agreed that there should be an agenda item on utilising new sources of data, such as Big data, and Allan Brimicombe volunteered to assist the Secretariat in scoping out a paper.

Action 4: Secretariat to liaise with Allan Brimicombe in scoping out a paper for the next Committee meeting in September.

³ <https://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Crime-Emerging-View.pdf>

10. Any other business

10.1. Mike Levi informed the Committee that Cardiff University were hosting the European Society of Criminology conference in September 2017 and that if the Committee or ONS wanted to hold a workshop at the conference then this could be facilitated.

10.2. The Chair reminded members that the date of the next meeting had been arranged for 18th September 2017.

**NSCSAC Secretariat
23 June 2017**

ACTION TABLE

	ACTION	ACTIONEE	PRIORITY/COMPLETION DATE	PROGRESS
Actions carried forward from 24th January meeting				
5	Secretariat to send draft annual report to members for comment before the next meeting.	Secretariat	Medium – April/May 2017	Ongoing - draft report to be circulated for comment.
6	ONS to work with National Crime Registrar and NPCCC lead to draft a statement.	ONS, HO NCR, NPCC	Medium – April/May 2017	Completed
Actions from 11th May meeting				
	ACTION	ACTIONEE	PRIORITY/COMPLETION DATE	PROGRESS
1	Chair to send copy of Committee's Task and Finish Group to National Statistician	Chair	High – June 2017	Completed
2	Chair to provide advice to the National Statistician about the classification of violent crime	Chair	Medium – September 2017	Pending further discussion at the September meeting
3	Copy of Chris Lewis' paper to be circulated to the Committee	Secretariat	Medium – August/September 2017	Completed
4	Secretariat to liaise with Allan Brimicombe in scoping out a paper for the next Committee meeting.	Secretariat	Medium – September 2017	Ongoing – to be discussed at September meeting

NATIONAL STATISTICIAN'S CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Child Abuse Statistics Task and Finish Group: Final Report

NSCSAC(17)8

Purpose

1. This paper is the final report of the work carried out by the Committee's Child Abuse Statistics Task and Finish Group.

Action

2. The Committee are asked to consider the issues covered in this paper and give their views on the three proposals of the group, which are:
 - There should be collaboration across the Government Statistical Service to produce a compendium of data sources to provide the best evidence of child abuse and publish these as a single report with commentary on an annual basis, preferably down to Local Authority or Community Safety Partnership geographies.
 - ONS should explore the use of Multiple System Estimation (MSE) methods using administrative data to estimate the number of victims of child abuse.
 - Informed by an initial MSE study, Government should commission a new UK-wide prevalence study of all forms of abuse and neglect of children to establish a reliable time series of data.

Background

3. The recent government measures to protect children and young people from sexual abuse, exploitation and trafficking reflects the increasing concern about the scale of child abuse, particularly sexual abuse, and the growing awareness of the potential long term health effects into adulthood. There is no single source reporting the scale and nature of child abuse and it has been recognised that the official statistics in England and Wales are limited in respect to their coverage of child abuse.
4. The Committee established a Child Abuse Statistics Task and Finish Group in September 2015, chaired by Allan Brimicombe and in addition to fellow NSCAC member Fiona Glen, external experts included: Daniel Brown (Department for Education); Alison

Green (Home Office); Deborah Lader (Home Office); Pam Miller (NSPCC); Amy Nicholas (Department of Health); Catherine Davies (Department of Health); Oliver Stephenson (Department of Health); Sophie Riley (Home Office), and Joe Traynor (ONS). Hitherto, the group has met on four occasions and this paper provides a final report on the work. The group was tasked with:

- mapping out existing data sources on child abuse which could be used to improve the official crime statistics;
- investigating the quality of such data sources;
- identifying gaps in the evidence base; and
- making recommendations for improvements to the official statistics for consideration by the Committee.

5. An interim report NSCSAC(16)7 was provided to the Committee at the September 2016 meeting. The group identified a number of proposals to improve the coverage and availability of existing official statistics on child abuse:

- The group would give further consideration to defining a clear set of administrative sources which provide the best evidence of child abuse and publish these as a single report, with commentary, on a regular basis.
- ONS should publish Home Office Data Hub data on crimes committed against children that constitute child abuse as part of their regular outputs once such data becomes available.
- The group would investigate further the use of Multiple System Estimation (MSE) techniques in measuring child sexual exploitation and its uses.
- The group would continue to consider the merits of survey data.

6. Since the September 2016 Committee meeting, the Home Office has funded a Centre of Expertise on Child Sexual Abuse, a project to investigate the scale and changing nature of child sexual abuse (CSA) and child sexual exploitation (CSE). A key aim of the Centre is to increase understanding and awareness of the scale and nature of CSA and CSE and to explore the challenges in reaching a best estimate of both. In bringing together data holders, policy makers and academics, the Centre intends to assess what is and is not known on CSA and CSE and to provide an original and feasible proposal to improve the evidence base.

7. Members of the Task and Finish Group have been actively engaged with the Centre. Although the objectives of the Centre are similar to those of the Group, the Group's remit is broader in scope covering all elements of child abuse such as physical abuse, emotional abuse and neglect as well as CSA and CSE.

Definitions

8. There is no single legal definition of child abuse and those used, for example by practitioners, tend to reflect institutions' functional requirements. Definitions can also change over time, resulting in discontinuities within and between data sources.
9. Following the review of definitions the group found that the majority of abusive behaviours fall into four main categories as identified on the College of Policing Website¹. In addition, child trafficking and child sexual exploitation cover abuse under specific sets of circumstances and are listed separately. The main categories are therefore:
- neglect (including witnessing domestic abuse)
 - physical abuse (including FGM)
 - psychological (or emotional) abuse
 - sexual abuse (including contact and non-contact)
 - child sexual exploitation (including child trafficking)
10. The group's review also found variations in the definitions of a child. Safeguarding guidance² for child protection services defines a child as anyone under the age of 18 irrespective of their situation. Whilst the Department of Health identifies a child as under 16 years old (over 16s are entitled to give consent to their own treatment).
11. The group affirmed the view that official statistics should use the more inclusive age range of anyone under 18 years³ and this should be promoted across Government and elsewhere in new and emerging areas of research.

Data Sources

12. Data sources can be divided into two main categories; those relating to administrative data and those relating to other sources such as surveys. **Administrative data** refer to information collected primarily for administrative (not research) purposes. These types of

¹ <http://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/major-investigation-and-public-protection/child-abuse/key-definitions/#child-abuse>

² The paper [HM Government \(2015\) Working together to safeguard children: A guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children](#) provides this statutory guidance to agencies.

³ The definition of a child is anyone under the age of 18 as defined by the UN convention on the rights of a child

data are collected by government departments and other organisations for the purposes of registration, transaction and record keeping, usually during the delivery of a service.

Survey data collect information from a sample of individuals in a systematic way.

13. All child abuse data sources were reviewed by the group and are summarised in Annexes A and B. A further spreadsheet (provided separately) gives details of all the data reviewed and is structured around specific child abuse measures, including: information on the source of the data; where these data are published; whether or not the source is classified as official statistics; the data owner; geographic coverage/unit; description; comparability across the UK; the update cycle; the reference period; and, strengths and weaknesses. The group discussed and evaluated the strengths and limitations of the data sources available for England and Wales. Whilst crime, including child abuse, is not devolved to Wales, social welfare is. Therefore child abuse and data available on this issue includes both devolved and non-devolved areas.

Administrative data

14. A wide range of administrative data sources were investigated more fully by the group, including: child protection charity data; mortality data and justice data (see Annex A for a summary list). The review concluded that three primary administrative data sources appeared particularly useful for information on child abuse:

- Police Recorded Crime – In particular, the Home Office Data Hub promises to provide much greater evidence from police forces than previously available
- Children In Need and Looked After Children – Dept for Education (DfE)/Welsh Government
- Health Data – Dept of Health/University of Cardiff

15. The **Home Office Data Hub (HODH)** is intended to provide a central database of record level crime reports replacing existing aggregate returns to the Home Office. Current statistical returns are supplied to the Home Office on a monthly basis in an aggregated form for each crime within the notifiable offence list. They are then quality assured by the Home Office Statistics Unit before they send the final data to ONS at the end of each quarter for final preparation and publication as Official Statistics. The data the police supply to the HODH have the advantage of being record level data and providing more detailed information alongside the offence such as the age of the victim, the perpetrator relationship and a number of additional flags including whether the offence incorporated elements of child sexual abuse or whether the offence incorporated elements of

domestic abuse. Such information will lead to a major improvement in the range of child abuse data provided by the police when it becomes available.

16. The DfE, which has overall responsibility for child protection in England, provides substantial data on child abuse and neglect, publishing National Statistics on the [Characteristics of Children in Need](#) and [Children looked after in England including adoption](#).
17. The **Characteristics of Children In Need** are provided through the Children In Need (CIN) Census on the number of children referred to children's social care services and the number of children on child protection plans. These data are a rich source of information and are derived from information gathered during assessments following referrals. During each child's assessment many factors associated with their abuse are identified (e.g. trafficking, gangs, self harm, domestic violence, going missing, etc.) providing valuable detail on the circumstances and the nature of the abuse.
18. The **Children looked after in England including adoption** data include children who started to be looked after by the state during the year by category of need and local authority. The data provide information on the characteristics of the child and a range of other information including whether the child was an asylum seeker and whether they were accompanied by an adult. The data do not record all the categories of need for the child, but only the reason why the child was required to be looked after and is therefore limited in scope.
19. Following the review of potential data supplied by the DfE, a group of summary tables indicating the range of data available were mocked up by the group to show how these tables may look in a future publication. These tables have been made available separately alongside this paper.
20. **Characteristics of Children In Need** and **Children looked after in England including adoption** data in effect record the number of children passing through the social services system, so higher or lower numbers don't equate to children being more or less safe, or at more or less risk of child abuse. Some children at risk of harm may not have been identified and increases could mean more abuse is coming to the attention of social services, not that overall abuse has increased. In addition, a referral to social services doesn't necessarily mean that child abuse has occurred. Similarly, changes in the number of referrals can be affected by changing legislation and changing public concerns about the safety of children.

21. For Wales, the Welsh Government publishes characteristics of children in need through StatsWales and although the information is similar to that collected in England, there are some differences. These differences mean the potential for harmonised outputs for England and Wales for children in need will be limited to a few tables. Furthermore, the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act, section 17 of the Children Act 1989 which defines a “child in need”, was recently repealed and has resulted in the 2016-2017 CIN Census being renamed as the ‘Children Receiving Care and Support Census’ (CRCS) and will now comprise of a census of children with a care and support plan at 31 March each year. Although the children in need data available for Wales will remain largely the same, there are some differences which will impact further on the comparability of data with England in future years e.g. unborn children will not be applicable and information on referrals will no longer be collected.
22. Cases referred to the police and social services will never be able to provide a complete picture of child abuse. As with any crime, perpetrators have a significant interest in avoiding detection and continually employ new techniques in both committing the offence and avoiding discovery. For child abuse, the problem of detection is made worse as child victims can be subject to manipulation and coercion and are often unable to adequately comprehend, assess, or report the situation to the relevant authorities.
23. Current research suggests that as few as 1 in 8 victims of child sexual abuse come to the attention of professionals, as highlighted in the Children’s Commissioner report [‘Protecting Children from Harm: A critical assessment of child sexual abuse in the family network in England and priorities for action, 2015’](#)
24. Health data collections are an alternative source of information. The sources identified as potentially useful are: Accident and emergency department violence-related attendances from the National Violence Surveillance Network (NVSN), and; the NHS CP-IS (Child Protection Information Sharing System).
25. Accident and emergency department violence-related attendances is one of the most relevant sources provided by the University-based National Violence Surveillance Network (NVSN) that collates health data from Emergency Departments (EDs), Minor Injury Units (MIUs) and Walk-in Centres in regions of England and Wales. The data contain records of visits from males and females needing treatment following violence. Currently they provide the only national measure of children under 10 who have been victims of violent crime. However, only serious cases of physical injury where children

are presented at hospital for treatment will be included in this dataset. Other cases of physical abuse (life threatening or otherwise) will not be present, giving an incomplete picture of physical abuse.

26. NHS Digital – Social Services data shared with NHS: CP-IS (Child Protection Information Sharing system) is an ongoing project which the group have investigated for the purpose of obtaining data to enable the estimation of child abuse. Specifically the CP-IS project is delivering a solution to share specific information, which involves integrating different parts of the health and social care system (e.g. emergency departments and social service data) into one child record to help improve decisions around children who are being abused and/or neglected. It also intends to be a national solution in England that will deal with the issues of migration of children across local boundaries where they are not known in other areas. The dataset shared between social care and health aims for better outcomes for vulnerable children in society. It is intended to be operational at a national level across England by 2018.

27. NHS Digital: CP-IS will provide a rich source of information on child abuse from health and social services. However, one of the main limitations is that it will not provide a complete picture of child abuse; the records will only reflect those that come to the attention of the authorities or health professionals. The group continues to engage with DH to gain access to all relevant data sources for statistical purposes.

28. Administrative Data summary

Advantages

- The HODH when fully operational will be able to provide new evidence of recorded crimes committed against children including violent and sexual offences as well as trafficking and grooming, and cruelty and neglect offences. Breakdowns should also be available by the relationship to the perpetrator, sex and specific age bands.
- Can provide sub-national estimates in many instances.
- Does provide some time series information although this may often reflect changes in recording.

Limitations

- All administrative datasets only include information which has come to the attention and has been recorded by the body or institution and does not include other offences. The scale of this under-coverage is unknown.

- Definitions of child abuse and the recording of abuse may vary across and within organisations, making comparison of figures across different datasets and over time difficult.
- Current recorded crime data provide little evidence of abuse other than specific crime categories where the age of the victim is specified in relation to sexual assaults or the crime relates directly to children, such as cruelty.
- DH available data are currently limited.

Survey data on child abuse

29. Over the last two decades there have been few attempts at estimating child abuse using large scale social surveys. Two of the most significant attempts have been made by the NSPCC. In 2000 the NSPCC published the first [UK-wide study of child maltreatment](#).

This was followed ten years later with a much larger study: The National Survey of Child Safety and Victimization, interviewing over 6,000 young adults, teenagers, children and parents of younger children. The publication [Child Abuse and Neglect in the UK today](#) reported on the experiences of abuse and neglect in 2011. It examined the impact of abuse and highlighted that many children experiencing abuse by their parents or carers also experience other forms of abuse from other people. This survey still provides the only current UK-wide research-based indication of current prevalence rates and the impact of child abuse and neglect. The survey was asked of parents (of under 11s), young people (11-17) and young adults (18-24).

30. More recently the ONS took a different approach providing survey evidence of child abuse. Using the 2015/16 Crime Survey for England and Wales, the ONS asked adults aged between 16 and 59 about their experiences of abuse during childhood, providing evidence on the occurrence of child abuse over the last three decades. The figures published in [Abuse during childhood: Findings from the Crime Survey for England and Wales, year ending March 2016](#) in August 2016 provide information on childhood abuse by category of abuse, number of types of abuse, survivor/perpetrator relationships and personal and household characteristics of survivors. The survey also provided more detailed analysis on sexual assault. The survey did not attempt to measure the current prevalence of child abuse.

31. The group found other surveys in which questions relating to child abuse were asked including the Adult Psychiatric Morbidity Survey (APMS) and the Children's Mental Health Survey.

32. The national study of health and wellbeing is also known as [APMS](#). The 2014 study provides data on the prevalence of psychiatric disorders in the English adult population (aged 16 and over). A review of the 2014 APMS [questionnaire](#) shows interpersonal violence and childhood abuse and neglect questions. The results from questions relating to child abuse are not currently published in the main report and tables, although the data are available in the UK Data Catalogue.
33. The [Children's Mental Health survey](#) was launched in January 2017 and is currently out in the field until August 2017. Commissioned by NHS Digital, the survey has been delivered by the ONS Social Survey Division (SSD) and NatCen Social Research, alongside academics based in King's College London and Exeter University. The survey will interview 9,500 parents that have 2 to 19 year olds, as well as carers, teachers and the children themselves and young people aged 11-19 in order to provide updated estimates of how many children in the population are living with a mental disorder. The survey repeats similar surveys in 1999 and 2004.
34. Overall, the children's mental health survey is fairly limited in scope for child abuse statistics. Specifically in the 'under stress after a very frightening event' module there is a question that asks the parent and the child whether the child has experienced rape/sexual abuse.
35. A potentially useful health survey is related to adverse childhood experiences (ACEs). These are stressful experiences occurring in childhood that affect a child either directly (e.g. child abuse and neglect) or indirectly through the environment in which they live (e.g. exposure to domestic abuse). Research has shown the impact of ACEs include increasing stress on the body and individuals' vulnerability to health-harming behaviours, leading to increased risk of poor health outcomes in adulthood.
36. The Department of Health is currently piloting an ACEs questionnaire administered by health professionals in children's mental health services. This involves 1,000 patients aged 14 and over who are asked questions relating to child sexual abuse in routine enquiry forms. The results of the ACEs questionnaire will be evaluated in the summer with potential roll out of the questionnaire nationally later in the year. NHS Digital are intending to produce a prevalence rate of child sexual abuse from 2018, although collecting information for under 14 year olds will follow later.
37. The group discussed the merits or otherwise of a victimisation survey of children or young adults. Annex B includes a summary table of the main survey data. Whilst it was

recognised that a general population survey of children may provide one approach to filling the gap between the true prevalence rate and rates derived from administrative data, the group also recognised a number of complex issues. The main challenge surrounds requiring “informed” consent from parents or guardians for a survey of children. It is unlikely in cases of serious abuse by a parent or guardian that such consent for a child to take part in a survey (either in their own home or at school or other educational setting) would be given. Clearly, this would result in an undercount of abuse which may well be significant.

38. Survey Data summary

Advantages

- Prevalence rates for child abuse from survey data are generally higher than administrative estimates and provide a better estimate of the true prevalence in the general population than administrative data.
- Provide a wide range of data which explore the circumstance, details and consequences of the abuse.
- Are useful in identifying at risk groups in the general population.

Limitations

- There are currently no regular and independent general population prevalence studies dedicated to child abuse. In part, this may be a result of the high cost associated with such studies.
- Methodologies vary widely between studies with prevalence rates varying between definition and approach.
- CSEW Abuse as a child module provides only evidence of prior abuse levels.
- Studies are not repeated, leading to a lack of any consistent time series.
- Where studies do take place, they usually form a module of questions within a wider field of investigation rather than being the purpose of the study. This often limits the scope of the study and the usefulness of the data.
- Generally, surveys cannot provide sub-national estimates.
- Even where data are collected, estimates are not always widely published or easily accessible.

Other

39. The group also considered the work of the English Children’s Commissioner, working with Home Office analysts who employed **Multiple System Estimation (MSE)** methods to estimate the prevalence of child sexual abuse in England⁴.
40. This approach had previously been used to estimate the prevalence of modern slavery⁵. Much like child sexual abuse, victims of modern slavery may not report to authorities. The MSE technique was applied to data gathered on victims of child sexual abuse from the police and social services from local authorities. By identifying those individuals who featured on only one list and no other, and the size of all possible overlaps between lists, an estimate was calculated by fitting an appropriate mathematical model.
41. The MSE method used in the Children’s Commissioner Report was evaluated by an ONS methodologist who is at present giving further consideration to aspects of the data in relation to correlation bias and matching error and considering options available in taking the work forward.
42. Taking the MSE work forward would help inform the need for any further prevalence studies, such as a victimisation study of child abuse.
43. As with other crime types, the increase in new technologies has led to new opportunities for criminal activities and there has been growing awareness of online risks associated with children’s online activity and **cybercrimes** to which children are vulnerable. Whilst the group considered a range of data available, the information is often limited in scope. ONS have recently initiated a programme of work to include questions on elements of child cybercrime into the child survey of 10 to 15 year olds to provide further evidence in this area. This would include crimes such as “sexting”, online bullying and online grooming. If successful, the aim is to introduce new questions into the CSEW child questionnaire from October 2017.

Allan Brimicombe

Chair of the Child Abuse Statistics Task and Finish Group

⁴<http://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Protecting%20children%20from%20harm%20-%20full%20report.pdf>

⁵ Silverman, B (2014) Modern slavery: an application of Multiple Systems Estimation

ANNEX A – Table 1: Summary of the main sources of information on child abuse

Dataset Group	Dataset	Measures/Description of Measures	Owner
Police recorded crime (PRC)	Police recorded crime quarterly data returns	- Number of recorded sexual offences against children, cruelty and neglect offences, and obscene publications offences	Home Office
	Home Office Data Hub (HODH)	- Central database of record-level crime data provided to HO by police force - Flags for all sexual offences related to children, child sexual exploitation, and a flag for offences related to domestic abuse - Age and sex of victims of police recorded crimes	Home Office
	Homicide Index	- Child homicides recorded by the police	Home Office
Mortality Statistics	Death Registrations	- Child mortality statistics include deaths registered by age, sex and selected underlying cause of death. Includes mortality rates and numbers of deaths over time	ONS
	Child death reviews	- Child death reviews completed during the year, including information on circumstances of the death, whether abuse or neglect was a factor, child characteristics and whether the death was deemed to have any modifiable factors.	Department for Education
	Suicide data	- Deaths of 15 to 19 year olds recorded as intentional self harm or event of undetermined intent and deaths of 10-14 year olds recorded as intentional self harm.	ONS
Social services data	Children in need census data	- Referrals accepted by social services, assessments and primary needs/factors - Numbers of children on a child protection plan or on the child protection register, composition and length of plans/registers and re-registrations	Department for Education / Welsh Government
	Looked after children dataset	- Number of looked after children, due to abuse or neglect - Proportion of looked-after children who have three or more placements during the year - Number of children who started to be looked after during the year, due to abuse or neglect	Department for Education/Welsh Government
	NHS Digital - Social Services data shared with NHS: CP-IS (Child Protection Information Sharing system)	- Social services data shared with NHS on: Child protection plans, looked after children (State) and prebirth child protection plans	NHS Digital
Child protection charity datasets	Child Line contact data	- Contacts with ChildLine from counselling sessions with children and young people via phone call, email or online chat.	NSPCC
	NSPCC helpline data	- Calls emails, exits and online reporting to NSPCC's UK 24/7 helpline for those concerned about a child.	NSPCC
	Internet Watch Foundation data	- Measure of child abuse images on the internet	Internet Watch Foundation
Criminal Justice System datasets	Criminal Justice System (MOJ) subsets	- Proceedings for sexual offences against under 16s - Conviction tables (e.g. sexual offences against under 16s)	Ministry of Justice
	Crown Prosecution Service dataset	- Underlying CPS data relating to child abuse - includes pre-charge decisions, total prosecutions, homicide prosecutions, offences against the person prosecutions and sexual offences prosecutions	Crown Prosecution Service
Other admin data sources	National Referral Mechanism (NRM) child trafficking data	- Child trafficking data, using NRM data and referral data	UK Human Trafficking Centre / National Crime Agency
	Hospital data	- Number of children under the age of 10 who have been victims of violent crime	Violence Research Group

Annex B – Table 2: Summary of the main survey data on child abuse

Dataset	Measures/Description of Measures	Owner
Crime Survey for England and Wales	- Abuse during childhood (non-recent), measured for the first time in 2015/2016 in a new self-completion module covering psychological, physical and sexual abuse - Violent incidents experienced by 10 to 15 year olds	ONS
National Survey of Child Safety and Victimization	- Abuse or neglect reported by children when asked in a UK-wide survey - Three parallel versions of the questionnaire were developed based on the age of the child or young person: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. parents with children between 1 month and 10 years (“under 11s”), 2. children and young people aged 11–17 (“11–17s”), for which a parent or guardian completed a subset of questions, and 3. young adults aged 18–24 (“18–24s”). 	NSPCC
Adult Psychiatric Morbidity Survey: Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing, England, 2014	- Provides data on the prevalence of both treated and untreated psychiatric disorder in the English adult population (aged 16 and over). - Questionnaire sections relating to child abuse: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 21 Interpersonal violence and abuse, (p97 for questions on abuse before aged 16 years) 2. Section 22 Childhood Abuse and Neglect p100 3. Section 29 Stressful Life Events (p120 for questions on sexual abuse at any time in your life and whether went into Local Authority Care) - The results from questions relating to child abuse are not currently published ⁶ but data are available in the UK Data Catalogue, see About APMS 2014	NHS Digital
Child Mental Health Survey Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing, England, 2017	-The Children's Mental Health survey was launched in January 2017 and is currently being carried out in the field until August 2017. -Currently interviewing 9,500 parents that have a 2 to 19 year old, as well as carers, teachers, and the children themselves and young people aged 11-19 in order to provide updated estimates of how many children in the population are living with a mental disorder. -'Under stress after a very frightening event' there is a question that asks the parent and the child whether the child has experienced rape/sexual abuse https://dawbacentral.org/py/Forms/demo.py?scenario=1451	NHS Digital
Survey by the Office of the Children's Commissioner for England	- Large survey administered by the Children's Commissioner for England on adult survivors of child sexual abuse (part of compendium of child sexual abuse)	Office of the Children's Commissioner for England
Ofcom survey data	- Survey data on online harm (part of NSPCC compendium of online harm data)	Ofcom

⁶ NHS Digital is planning to publish the tables but no date has been supplied.

Crime Severity Score: Update paper

NSCSAC(17)9

Purpose

1. This paper provides an update on the development of a weighted crime measure; it outlines the feedback received from users on the measure ONS has developed and sets out the proposed next steps.

Action

2. The Committee is invited to note the content of this paper and give views on the proposed next steps.

Background

3. At the National Statistician's Crime Statistics Advisory Committee meeting in May 2016, Chris Lewis (as Chair of the Task and Finish Group) presented a paper 'Crime Index feasibility work: Update paper' (NSCSAC(16)2), which provided an update on the work on the development of a crime index measure.
4. The Committee agreed that ONS should continue work on the index and publish it as experimental statistics in the autumn, followed by a consultation with users.

Progress

5. A research output '[Developing a Crime Severity Score for England and Wales using data on crime recorded by the police](#)' was released at the end of November 2016. The paper outlined the background to developing a weighted crime measure, provided detail on the methodology and included some initial analysis. A data tool was also published, allowing users to explore and compare data for police force areas and regions. The underlying weights were also provided, making it possible for analysts to reproduce the results at a more granular level. The paper also invited feedback from users.
6. Prior to the release of the paper, in response to feedback received from the Committee at the meeting in May 2016, ONS carried out work to further develop some aspects of the methodology:
 - A concern over the different weights for sexual offences had been raised. So for the purposes of deriving weights, sexual offences which are broken down by the sex and/or age of the victim were aggregated into 'rape', 'indecent assault', 'sexual assault', 'sexual activity involving a child' and 'unlawful sexual intercourse with a girl'.

For transparency, a full list of weights were provided alongside the paper, which included the aggregated and disaggregated sexual offence weights.

- Another issue was the coverage of fraud offences as a complete time series of fraud data at police force area level is currently not available. Fraud was therefore not included in the Crime Severity Score at police force area level, but two national level scores that include and exclude fraud have been provided so that comparisons can be made.
 - A further issue was how to incorporate life sentences into the weights for the measure as the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) sentencing data includes information on the number of offenders who have received life sentences but does not include detail on the length of time these offenders served. To incorporate life sentence data into the weights, additional data supplied by MoJ on average length of sentences served by offenders receiving life sentences has been used. To reflect the severity of murder, which is currently the only offence that carries a mandatory life sentence, a fixed sentence of 30 years has been used; this is the longest non “whole life” sentence outlined in the sentencing guidelines for murder.
 - The final issue discussed by the Committee was how best to take into account fines in the severity weight of each offence. The fine equivalency was calculated as the time it would take to earn the fine amount using guidance in the sentencing guidelines that says if no information can be determined about an offender’s income (a fine is based upon weekly income) it should be assumed to be £440¹, equivalent to £88 a day. The fine equivalency for each offence is therefore calculated as the average fine divided by £88.
7. Using the agreed methodology weights were calculated, for the most detailed breakdown of offence types available in the police recorded crime series. Crime Severity Scores were calculated for the year ending March 2003 to the year ending March 2016 for all police recorded crime at the national level and at police force area level.
 8. Following the release of the paper a workshop was held at Leicestershire Police HQ in February 2017. The workshop aimed to provide attendees, who were principally police crime analysts or performance managers, with information on the methodology for the Crime Severity Score as well as encourage ideas and discussion concerning how the new measure might be practically applied by the police and gather feedback.

¹ This is derived from national median pre-tax earnings using projected estimates from the Survey of Personal Incomes for financial year ending 2013

Feedback

9. Overall, feedback was received from 31 users, with most responses coming from police forces following the workshop. Most were very positive, with the majority (25 of the 31 responses) indicating that the Crime Severity Score would be a useful addition to the official crime statistics. Comments received indicated that it would be a useful measure to help police forces with decision making and planning through giving additional context and understanding of the crime harm profile. Some concerns were raised, including that it would need to be well explained to the public and it could be open to misunderstanding and misuse.
10. The majority of feedback responses, particularly from police forces, also suggested that the Crime Severity Score would have important practical applications. A number of uses for the measure were put forward including; building a better understanding of the profile of offences in an area compared with simple crime volumes, and also providing a more sophisticated method of prioritising offenders and victims according to harm and risk.
11. The data tool that was released alongside the methodological paper also received a positive response with two-thirds of responses indicating that it was useful in its presentation of the data. Some improvements were suggested, such as expanding the number of police forces that can be compared in charts (it is currently restricted to selecting 4 police forces) and including data at the lower geographic level of Community Safety Partnership. There was also feedback requesting a Crime Severity Score to be available at specific offence groupings, for example a Crime Severity Score for violence. ONS are in the process of considering this feedback and will incorporate the suggestions, where appropriate.

Refinements to the methodology

12. Feedback from some users suggested refinements to the methodology which ONS has reviewed:
 - Several comments referred to the calculation of equivalencies for community orders and fines within the weights. These had been calculated based on the length of time it would take to pay off a fine, or complete the community order, and assumes a day is equivalent to 7.5 hours (average hours worked per day). Feedback suggested that this might be seen to 'over weight' these sentences; ONS has reviewed this and we have decided that these calculations should assume a full 24 hour day.
 - It had previously been agreed that weights would be updated every 5 years. Feedback from some users indicated that weights should be updated more frequently to reflect changes in sentencing. Given this feedback, it is proposed that the weights will initially be updated after 3 years and at this point ONS will review how frequently the weights should be updated in the future.

13. We have also decided that for offence classifications where only a very small number of people have been sentenced, 10 years of sentencing data (rather than 5 years) will be used. This will help to reduce the variability in offence weights over time.

Proposed next steps

14. It is intended that once refinements to the methodology have been completed, the Crime Severity Score data will be released for the first time in the autumn of 2017 and then included as part of each quarterly crime statistics release from then on.

15. In response to feedback from users, rather than releasing the Crime Severity Score as an additional headline crime measure we are minded to make the dataset available principally as a tool for analysts and researchers undertaking analysis of crime harm. We welcome the Committee's views on these proposed next steps.

Zoe Sargent and Mark Bangs

ONS Crime Statistics and Analysis Team

Proposal to change the presentation of Violence against the person offences sourced from police recorded crime in the official statistics

NSCSAC(17)10

Purpose

1. This paper presents a proposed re-categorisation of offences in the police recorded crime series that currently fall within the category of 'Violence against the person'. This follows the Committee's consideration of options for changing the presentation of these offences at its meeting in January 2017.

Action

2. The Committee are asked to review and give their views on the proposed re-categorisation and next steps.

Background

3. At the January 2017 meeting of NSCSAC the Committee considered options for changes to the presentation of Violence against the person offences in police recorded crime statistics. These changes (set out in paper NSCASC(17)3) were proposed following the expansion of the Harassment offence classification to include offences involving Malicious communication. This led to a large increase in the number of Harassment offences recorded by the police. Given that these offences involve no physical violence ONS sought advice on whether the existing categorisation of violent crime risked causing confusion.
4. A number of options were presented to the Committee for changing the categorisation of Stalking and harassment offences, including splitting these offences out of Violence against the person entirely. On considering these options, the Committee's view was that ONS should explore an alternative approach whereby Stalking and harassment offences are separated from Violence without injury sub-category but remain within the broader Violence against the person grouping. ONS agreed to explore this approach and provide a mock-up table for the Committee to consider further. Annex A sets out what this proposed categorisation and this can be compared against the existing categorisation in Annex B.

Proposed next steps

5. We propose that, subject to final discussions with stakeholders including the Home Office, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), and the Ministry of Justice, the new classification of Violence against the person offences is introduced into the ONS quarterly crime statistics published in October 2017. This would tie in with the first quarters data on the new malicious communication offences. In advance of introducing the change we would notify users of our intention in the July quarterly publication.

Annex A: Proposed re-categorisation of Violence against the person offences recorded by the police

Police recorded Violence against the person by offence, year ending March 2015 to year ending December 2016 and percentage change between year ending December 2015 and year ending December 2016

England and Wales

Offence	Apr '14 to Mar '15	Apr '15 to Mar '16	Jan '15 to Dec '15	Jan '16 to Dec '16	% change between years
1 Murder					
4.1 Manslaughter					
4.1 Corporate manslaughter					
4.2 Infanticide					
	539	574	576	697	21
Homicide^{4, 5, 6}	539	574	576	697	21
2 Attempted murder ⁵	565	684	694	740	7
4.3 Intentional destruction of viable unborn child	9	7	10	10	-
4.4 Causing death or serious injury by dangerous driving ⁷	411	449	440	539	23
4.6 Causing death by careless driving when under the influence of drink or drugs	11	28	23	20	-
4.8 Causing death by careless or inconsiderate driving	158	133	137	125	-9
4.4/6/8 Causing death by dangerous or careless driving
5 More serious wounding or other act endangering life ⁸
5A Wounding ^{8,9}	2	..
5B Use of substance or object to endanger life ^{8,9}
5C Possession of items to endanger life ^{8,9}
5D Assault with intent to cause serious harm ⁹	20,556	23,028	22,284	24,839	11
5E Endangering life ⁹	992	1,346	1,214	1,581	30
6 Endangering railway passengers ⁹
7 Endangering life at sea ⁹
8F Inflicting grievous bodily harm (GBH) without intent ^{10,11}	..	1	..	1	..
8H Racially or religiously aggravated inflicting GBH without intent ^{10,11}
37.1 Causing death by aggravated vehicle taking	8	6	11	9	-
4.7 Causing or allowing death or serious physical harm of child or vulnerable person ¹²	16	23	26	29	-
4.9 Causing death by driving: unlicensed or disqualified or uninsured drivers	1	11	6	15	-
8A Other wounding ¹⁰
8G Actual bodily harm (ABH) and other injury ^{10,11}
8D Racially or religiously aggravated other wounding ¹⁰
8J Racially or religiously aggravated ABH or other injury ^{10,11}	1	..
8K Poisoning or female genital mutilation ^{10,11}
8N Assault with injury ¹¹	348,388	402,343	389,497	425,869	9
8P Racially or religiously aggravated assault with injury ¹¹	2,821	2,981	2,993	3,211	7
Violence with injury	373,936	431,040	417,335	456,991	10
3 Threat or conspiracy to murder ¹³
3A Conspiracy to murder ¹³	40	48	45	54	-
3B Threats to kill ¹³	12,878	17,276	16,398	20,749	27
11 Cruelty to and neglect of children ¹⁷
11A Cruelty to children/young persons ¹⁷	9,167	12,805	11,442	14,112	23
12 Abandoning a child under the age of two years ¹⁷
13 Child abduction	816	1,038	1,020	1,088	7
14 Procuring illegal abortion	7	7	12	7	-
36 Kidnapping	2,187	2,999	2,737	3,582	31
104 Assault without injury on a constable	14,364	15,451	15,060	16,125	7
105A Assault without injury	272,882	343,168	327,761	387,829	18
105B Racially or religiously aggravated assault without injury	4,917	5,583	5,509	5,873	7
106 Modern Slavery ¹⁸	..	882	565	1,721	205
Violence without injury	317,258	399,257	380,549	451,140	19
8L Harassment ^{14, 15, 16}	81,584	155,425	132,155	202,755	53
8M Racially or religiously aggravated harassment ^{14, 15}	1,873	1,788	1,901	1,773	-7
8Q Stalking ¹⁴	2,879	4,154	3,765	4,613	23
8R Malicious communications ¹⁹ (Separate offence classification from April 2017 - previously in Harassment)
Stalking and harassment	86,336	161,367	137,821	209,141	52
TOTAL VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	778,069	992,238	936,281	1,117,969	19

Annex B: Existing categorisation of Violence against the person offences recorded by the police

Police recorded Violence against the person by offence, year ending March 2015 to year ending December 2016 and percentage change between year ending December 2015 and year ending December 2016

England and Wales

Offence	Apr '14 to Mar '15	Apr '15 to Mar '16	Jan '15 to Dec '15	Jan '16 to Dec '16	% change between years
VICTIM BASED CRIME	3,170,270	3,446,897	3,372,261	3,665,961	9
1 Murder					
4.1 Manslaughter					
4.1 Corporate manslaughter					
4.2 Infanticide					
Homicide^{4, 5, 6}	539	574	576	697	21
2 Attempted murder ⁵	565	684	694	740	7
4.3 Intentional destruction of viable unborn child	9	7	10	10	-
4.4 Causing death or serious injury by dangerous driving ⁷	411	449	440	539	23
4.6 Causing death by careless driving when under the influence of drink or drugs	11	28	23	20	-
4.8 Causing death by careless or inconsiderate driving	158	133	137	125	-9
4.4/6/8 Causing death by dangerous or careless driving
5 More serious wounding or other act endangering life ⁸
5A Wounding ^{8,9}	2	..
5B Use of substance or object to endanger life ^{8,9}
5C Possession of items to endanger life ^{8,9}
5D Assault with intent to cause serious harm ⁹	20,556	23,028	22,284	24,839	11
5E Endangering life ⁹	992	1,346	1,214	1,581	30
6 Endangering railway passengers ⁹
7 Endangering life at sea ⁹
8F Inflicting grievous bodily harm (GBH) without intent ^{10,11}	..	1	..	1	..
8H Racially or religiously aggravated inflicting GBH without intent ^{10,11}
37.1 Causing death by aggravated vehicle taking	8	6	11	9	-
4.7 Causing or allowing death or serious physical harm of child or vulnerable person ¹²	16	23	26	29	-
4.9 Causing death by driving: unlicensed or disqualified or uninsured drivers	1	11	6	15	-
8A Other wounding ¹⁰
8G Actual bodily harm (ABH) and other injury ^{10,11}
8D Racially or religiously aggravated other wounding ¹⁰
8J Racially or religiously aggravated ABH or other injury ^{10,11}	1	..
8K Poisoning or female genital mutilation ^{10,11}
8N Assault with injury ¹¹	348,388	402,343	389,497	425,869	9
8P Racially or religiously aggravated assault with injury ¹¹	2,821	2,981	2,993	3,211	7
Violence with injury	373,936	431,040	417,335	456,991	10
3 Threat or conspiracy to murder ¹³
3A Conspiracy to murder ¹³	40	48	45	54	-
3B Threats to kill ¹³	12,878	17,276	16,398	20,749	27
8L Harassment ^{14, 15, 16}	81,584	155,425	132,155	202,755	53
8M Racially or religiously aggravated harassment ^{14, 15}	1,873	1,788	1,901	1,773	-7
8Q Stalking ¹⁴	2,879	4,154	3,765	4,613	23
11 Cruelty to and neglect of children ¹⁷
11A Cruelty to children/young persons ¹⁷	9,167	12,805	11,442	14,112	23
12 Abandoning a child under the age of two years ¹⁷
13 Child abduction	816	1,038	1,020	1,088	7
14 Procuring illegal abortion	7	7	12	7	-
36 Kidnapping	2,187	2,999	2,737	3,582	31
104 Assault without injury on a constable	14,364	15,451	15,060	16,125	7
105A Assault without injury	272,882	343,168	327,761	387,829	18
105B Racially or religiously aggravated assault without injury	4,917	5,583	5,509	5,873	7
106 Modern Slavery ¹⁸	..	882	565	1,721	205
Violence without injury	403,594	560,624	518,370	660,281	27
TOTAL VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	778,069	992,238	936,281	1,117,969	19

Notes to tables in Annex A and B

- 1 The National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) was introduced in April 2002, although some forces adopted NCRS practices before the standard was formally introduced. Figures before and after that date are not directly comparable. The introduction of NCRS led to a rise in recording in year ending March 2003 and, particularly for violent crime, in the following years as forces continued to improve compliance with the new standard.
- 2 Includes the British Transport Police from year ending March 2003 onwards.
- 3 This is a total of all Homicide offences; Murder, Manslaughter, Corporate manslaughter and Infanticide
- 4 The homicide figure for year ending March 2003 includes 172 homicides attributed to Harold Shipman in previous years but coming to light in the official inquiry in 2002.
- 5 The homicide figure in year ending March 2006 of 764 includes 52 homicide victims of the 7 July London bombings, which also accounted for approximately one-quarter of the total of 920 attempted murders.
- 6 The homicide figure for year ending December 2016 includes 96 homicide victims of Hillsborough.
- 7 New offence of 'causing serious injury by dangerous driving' was added to this category in April 2013
- 8 Offence classifications 5A, 5B and 5C were introduced from 1 April 2008 and replaced classification 5. Classification 5A was influenced by a clarification in recording rules that had the effect of significantly increasing levels of recording in some forces. Classification 5A also included some other offences of endangering life as well as GBH with intent, though GBH with intent was the major part of this category.
- 9 Offence classifications 5D and 5E were introduced from 1 April 2012 and replaced classification 5A offences. Offence classification 5E was also introduced and replaced the remaining classification 5A offences, 5B, 5C, 6 and 7.
- 10 Offence classifications 8F, 8G, 8H, 8J and 8K were introduced from 1 April 2008 and had previously been recorded as part of classifications 8A or 8D.
- 11 Offence classification 8N was introduced from 1 April 2012 and replaced classifications 8F, 8G and 8K. Offence classification 8P was also introduced and replaced classifications 8H and 8J.
- 12 New offence of 'cause or allow a child or vulnerable adult to suffer serious physical harm' was added to this category in April 2013
- 13 Offence classifications 3A and 3B were introduced from 1 April 2008 and had previously been recorded as classification 3.
- 14 Prior to year ending March 2009, the police sent combined figures for harassment (8L, 8M) and public fear, alarm and distress (9A, 9B) offences. For the years ending March 2003 to March 2008, figures for these offence groups are estimated based upon the proportionate split between the offences in year ending March 2009. Stalking (8Q) was introduced as a separate crime classification in April 2014, following the introduction of the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 section 111. Before this, stalking offences were included within harassment offences (8L).
- 15 Prior to year ending March 2009, the police sent combined figures for harassment (8L, 8M) and public fear, alarm and distress (9A, 9B) offences. For the years ending March 2003 to March 2008, figures for these offence groups are estimated based upon the proportionate split between the offences in year ending March 2009.
- 16 Changes in the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR), implemented in April 2015, have resulted in the recording of two additional harassment offences ('Disclosure of private sexual photographs and films with the intent to cause distress or anxiety' and 'Sending letters with intent to cause distress or anxiety'; the latter includes any form of electronic communication), not previously counted as notifiable offences under the headline category of violence without injury. There is no available back-series for these additional notifiable offences.
- 17 Offence classification 11A was introduced from 1 April 2012 and replaced classifications 11 and 12.
- 18 Modern Slavery (106) was introduced as a separate crime classification in April 2015. During April-July 2015 this classification included all of the offences that were previously recorded under category 72 (Trafficking for sexual exploitation) and some offences that were previously recorded under category 99 (Other indictable or triable-either-way offences). From 31 July 2015, a new set of Modern Slavery Act offences commenced, replacing all the offence codes previously listed under this classification.
- 19 Malicious communication (8R) was introduced as a separate crime classification from April 2017. Since becoming a notifiable offence on 13 April 2015 these offences were previously recorded under category 8L Harassment.
- Indicates that data are not reported because the base number of offences is less than 50.

NATIONAL STATISTICIAN'S CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Report of National Crime Registrar

NSCSAC(17)11

Purpose/Issue

1. This paper is the regular report to the Committee from the National Crime Registrar. These reports are intended to either outline any proposed changes to the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) in detail where the committee's advice is sought or to inform the committee of non-significant changes for information. These reports have also been used to inform members of other developments that may impact on the quality of crime recording.

Action

2. The Committee is invited to note the contents of this paper.

Background

3. In establishing the Crime Statistics Advisory Committee to give independent advice on proposed changes to the Home Office Counting Rules for police recorded crime it was agreed that the National Crime Registrar (NCR) had delegated authority to determine, in agreement with the Chair, whether changes proposed to the HOCR were significant enough that they required referral to the committee for consideration prior to implementation. It was agreed that more minor changes would be reported for information only.

National Crime Recording Strategic Steering Group

4. The National Crime Recording Strategic Steering group (NCRSSG) has met once (in March 2017) since the last meeting of this Committee. Whilst the NCRSSG continues a focus on their oversight of Home Office actions in relation to the ONS re-designation project (some of which may continue after re-assessment) the group is now looking to concentrate more directly on themes and issues which may be emerging from the on-going HMIC Crime Data Integrity inspections. At the March meeting the National Police Chiefs' Council portfolio lead for crime statistics and crime recording was handed over from CC Jeff Farrar to CC Bill Skelly of Lincolnshire.
5. The NCRSSG agreed one further amendment to the HOCR for 2017/18. This relates to crimes of dishonest use of electricity (abstracting electricity). From April 2017 all reports of this crime received by police will be recorded. Previous practice allowed that, in cases where the report is made by an electricity supply company and that company had taken civil action but also advised police, no crime need be recorded. This offence is included within the large volume category of "other theft" and thus even a significant rise in the recording of dishonest use of electricity is unlikely to impact on the overall category.

Home Office Counting Rules for 2017/18

6. Ministers agreed the publication of the HOCR for 2017/18 and the document was issued to forces and made available publically on April 1st 2017. All of the revisions previously advised were included.

Training for Force Crime Registrars

7. The Committee has previously taken a close interest in the plans for formal training and accreditation for Force Crime Registrars. Since the last meeting of the committee the College has delivered a further successful crime registrars training course with another scheduled for September 2017. Other than instances where normal staff churn has occurred, all forces now have an FCR who has completed the course.
8. The College is now reviewing some forces' own internal training packages, intended for front line officers and call handlers, with a view to developing them into a national on-line package.

Force Crime Registrar Conference on Fraud

9. The City of London Police (as national lead force for fraud and provider of the National Fraud intelligence Bureau) will be holding a special one day conference for crime registrars on 16 May 2017. This session is planned to be in addition to the usual two day national registrars' conference later in the year. This conference will provide an insight into the emerging strategic landscape in relation to policing fraud and cyber crime nationally. The day will also afford FCR practitioners the opportunity to help shape improvements in NCRS/HOCR compliance at force level and identify solutions to a number of other related issues that will help to further improve the national response to fraud & cyber crime. I will provide some feedback on this session in my next report.

Steve Bond
National Crime Registrar
27 April 2017

Issue	Key Points	Timeframe	Latest Developments	Next Steps
Accuracy of police recorded crime data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accumulation of evidence that police recorded crime led the UK Statistics Authority to withdraw National Statistics designation in January 2014. • HMIC inspection of Crime Data Integrity (published November 2014) found unacceptable level of under-recording of crime, particularly violent and sexual offences. • Widely accepted that police recorded crime will never be a good measure of “total crime” but accurate data critical in enabling police efficiency and effectiveness; ensuring victims received the service they require; and enable democratic accountability. • HMIC started new programme of rolling inspections with first force visited in April 2016. This on-going programme will see all 43 forces inspected over 4 years. 	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signs of significant improvement in crime recording processes. • ONS PRC re-designation board (Stephen Shute is NSCSAC representative) met in October to review and recommended draft evidence pack prepared by ONS. • HMIC released the results of the first 3 force inspections in August 2016 showing that, while improvements since 2014 evident, there appears to be continued inconsistency across the forces inspected to date. • The UK Statistics Authority’s Office for Statistics Regulation (OSR) has restored National Statistics designation to the Home Office Homicide Index.¹ • HMIC commented on findings emerging from first 10 audits in their annual State of Policing Report which was recently published.² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ONS to document improvements in police recorded crime and update the Office for Statistics Regulation on their view of the reliability of police recorded crime data.
Crime recording training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of awareness of the Home Office Counting Rules 	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College of Policing have accepted the need for wider training on the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSCSAC to maintain a watching brief.

¹ <https://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Letter-of-Confirmation-as-National-Statistics-Assessment-Report-268.pdf>

² See pages 66-70 in <http://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmic/wp-content/uploads/state-of-policing-2016.pdf>

Issue	Key Points	Timeframe	Latest Developments	Next Steps
	<p>(HOCR) for recorded crime has been found to be one of the key reasons why reports of crime are not recorded correctly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMIC's 2014 Crime Data Integrity inspection report recommended the need for training for all those involved in crime recording – echoing the view of NSCSAC • The College of Policing have developed and delivered a successful training programme for Force Crime Registrars • Training for others involved in crime recording is planned but not yet developed 		<p>NRCS/HOCR for other parts of the policing family (beyond Force Crime Registrars) involved in crime recording.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on College Plans provided in NCR's update to May meeting. 	
<p>Coverage of fraud and cyber-crime in the official statistics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that CSEW and PRC have failed to keep up to date with changing nature of crime and not up to the job of informing society's response to it. • Predecessor committee supported proposals to extend scope of police recorded fraud to cover reports to the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau from industry bodies to provide a fuller picture and extend the CSEW to both fraud and some elements of cyber-crime. 	<p>Ongoing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to administrative and survey data on fraud have been made and new questions on fraud and cyber-crime were added to the CSEW on 1st October 2015. • ONS released first annual estimates from new questions added to the survey in January 2017. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ONS will continue to release updates of the experimental statistics in future quarterly bulletins with first annual comparisons available in January 2018.

Issue	Key Points	Timeframe	Latest Developments	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remains issue that significant volume of fraud and cyber-crime experienced by private and public sector bodies will not be captured by existing sources. 			
Measurement of repeat victimisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criticism that the current approach on the CSEW to dealing with repeat victimisation masks high level repeat victimisation experienced by some victims and risked giving a misleading view of the differential experience of male and female victims. ONS established a project to review the current methodology for dealing with high frequency repeat victimisation and carried out user consultation during 2016. 	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following user consultation and discussion at September 2016 NSCSAC meeting, ONS announced its intention to change the methodology for estimating repeat victimisation in November 2016. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ONS to publish implementation timetable including production of time series on new basis with next quarterly release (July 2017).
Child abuse data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence base on the scale and trends in child abuse weak and not well covered by existing official statistics. At UKSA Better Statistics, Better Decisions event on crime statistics in June 2015, there was a call for a specific victim survey on child abuse to become part of the suite of official statistics on crime. TFG has been established to map child abuse data to 	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ONS published first results in August 2016 from new questions added to 2015/16 CSEW self-completion module on non-recent child abuse. Interim report from TFG discussed at the September 2016 NSCSAC meeting and work ongoing to move to a final report. Final report to be discussed at NSCAC meeting in May. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be discussed at May meeting.

Issue	Key Points	Timeframe	Latest Developments	Next Steps
	<p>identify existing sources which have potential to be included within the official statistics on crime. The TFG will also identify obvious gaps and make suggestions for how they can be filled.</p>			
Crime Index	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summing individual offences into a police recorded crime total takes no account of the crime mix. Case has been made that a weighted index which takes account of seriousness of crime would provide a more helpful measure for the police and decision makers. NSCSAC Task & Finish Group was established to review work being taken forward by ONS to explore the feasibility of incorporating a crime severity index as part of the official statistics. 	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following discussion at May 2016 NSCSAC meeting, ONS published a research report on the development of a Crime Severity Score³ in November 2016 to seek user feedback. ONS held a successful workshop with around 70 police force analysts in attendance in February 2017. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paper on the agenda for May NSCSAC meeting.
Extending the official statistics on police recorded crime to cover more detail of the nature/circumstances of the offences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> User demand for more detailed breakdowns of police recorded crime. This was highlighted as weaknesses in relation to both domestic violence and child abuse. Published official statistics are 	Short term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 37 forces now live on the Home Office Data Hub (HODH) and work being undertaken to resolve known issues with the others. This has already provided valuable breakdowns, such as age/sex of victim and victim/offender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work continuing to resolve problems with the last non-live forces and to improve data quality. ONS and HO statisticians continue to explore opportunities to make use of available data to

³<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/articles/researchoutputsdevelopingacrimeseverityscoreforenglandandwalesusingdataoncrimerecordedbythepolice/2016-11-29>

Issue	Key Points	Timeframe	Latest Developments	Next Steps
	<p>currently restricted to aggregate counts of offences. More detailed data available to users via FOI to either the Home Office or individual forces.</p>		<p>relationships (included in Focus on Violence and Sexual Offences) and more frequent crime data to allow bespoke analysis (e.g. Hate Crime in England & Wales included weekly hate crime data from HODH around the EU referendum).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More crime and victim data being collected via the HODH, as mandatory data under the Annual Data Requirements, e.g. Child Sexual Exploitation, Child Sexual Abuse and Online Crime. 	<p>improve the official statistics.</p>
<p>Improve communication and presentation of crime statistics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ONS are working to improve the presentation and communication of their quarterly crime statistics. 	<p>Ongoing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a first step the statistical bulletin has been shortened from 100 to 40 pages to make the main findings more accessible. • ONS made proposals to move away from simple focus on volumes of crimes to include more reference to rates and describing the distribution of crime victimisation to better inform the public and decision makers. • ONS reflecting on advice given by last NSCAC meeting and working on a revised mock-up. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mock-up to be shared with Committee for comments.
<p>Improved measures of police performance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recorded crime an inadequate measure of broader demand on the police. • The National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR) 	<p>Medium term</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions being held within the Police Service/College of Policing about developing better metrics. • Letter sent from Chair of NSCSAC to National Statistician (March 2016) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSCSAC to maintain a watching brief.

Issue	Key Points	Timeframe	Latest Developments	Next Steps
	<p>could be incorporated within a common framework alongside the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS).</p>		<p>supporting proposal in Curtis review that HO should take back ownership of NSIR, review it and incorporate alongside NCRS. In turn, National Statistician advised the Home Secretary on the benefits of this recommendation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Secretary responded to National Statistician and work ongoing to address this issue. 	
<p>Perceived tension between crime recording standards relating to sexual offences (e.g. sexting) and “criminalising” of children</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been recent revived media interest in the perceived tension between the crime recording rules and the possible “criminalising” of children engaged in sexting (i.e. the sending and receiving sexually explicit messages, primarily between mobile phones). Some of the media reporting could serve to undermine public trust in crime statistics. • In part, this is due to a misunderstanding of the difference between the requirement within the Home Office Counting Rules to record an offence (committed under Protection of Children Act 1978) and guidance 	<p>Medium term</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Police Chiefs Council was reported, in the media, to be developing new guidelines on how to handle this issue. The existing NPCC position was set out by the lead, CC Olivia Pinkney, in September 2015.⁴ • Issue discussed at January NSCAC and agreed ONS should work with NCR and NPCC lead to draft an explanatory note to respond to questions about the policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft to be shared with Committee for comment.

⁴ <http://news.npcc.police.uk/releases/sexting-and-social-media-police-will-always-try-to-avoid-criminalising-young-people>

Issue	Key Points	Timeframe	Latest Developments	Next Steps
	<p>around possible future disclosure of the offence (e.g. during a criminal record check). There is also misunderstanding as to what “criminalising” means. There is an absence of hard evidence as to the reality of this in practice, for example there is no data that shows how many, if any, children, have been subject of formal criminal action (charge/caution) as a consequence.</p>			
<p>Joining up crime and criminal justice statistics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was also criticism that a lack of a common definitional framework across the crime and the criminal justice system makes it difficult for users. 	<p>Longer term</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HO, MoJ and ONS have collaborated successfully in the past in production of compendium publications which join up their statistics, e.g. Sexual Offending, Race and the CJS. Work ongoing to develop a systems diagram helping guide users through the labyrinth of crime and justice statistics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer term ambition could be to use linked up data sets to enhance or replace existing official statistics outputs.
<p>Utilizing new sources of data (e.g. from other crime agencies, private sector & Big Data)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The official statistics on crime published by ONS do not include crimes dealt with by agencies other than the territorial police forces (e.g. National Crime Agency and the UK Border Force) Private sector could provide much more data on crime (e.g. private security firms may help with cyber-time). 	<p>Longer term</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work not actively being progressed at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSCSAC to establish a Task & Finish Group in 2017 to scope out possible work.

Issue	Key Points	Timeframe	Latest Developments	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="456 204 819 293">• Big Data may have the potential to improve crime statistics.			