Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)





Most Similar Force (MSF) Group: Leicestershire, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, Essex, Thames Valley, Hampshire, Sussex, Avon And Somerset

About this bulletin

This bulletin presents information about complaints defined under the *Police Reform Act 2002 (PRA 2002)*, as amended by the *Police and Crime Act 2017*. The new legislation came into effect on 1 February 2020 (4 January 2021 for the British Transport Police).

It sets out performance against a number of measures and compares force results to their most similar force (MSF) group and with the overall result for all forces (national).

Data relating to complaints made prior to 1 February 2020 will be reported separately and in line with the previous performance framework

Please note: data about complaints handled outside of Schedule 3 to the *PRA 2002* by Bedfordshire Police, Cambridgeshire Constabulary, Hertfordshire Constabularly and Northumbria Police is not included in this bulletin because of technical issues. This will have an effect on the MSF averages, which include these forces, and national figures. The IOPC is working with these forces to ensure reporting of these complaint cases is possible in the future.

Contents

Section A1:1: complaint cases and allegations logged – timeliness and per 1,000 emplyees

Section A1.2: allegations logged – what has been complained about

Section A1.3: allegations logged – what has been complained about – top five allegation categories and their subcategories

Section A1.4: allegations logged – what has been complained about (category) and the situational context of allegations (factors)

Section A2: how complaint cases and allegations have been handled

Section A3.1: complaints cases finalised - timeliness

Section A3.2: allegations finalised – how they have been handed and timeliness

Section A4.1: allegation decisions – by how they were handled

Section A4.2: allegation decisions – by what was complained about (category)

Section B.1: investigations (all investigation types) – timeliness

Section B.2: investigations (by type of investigation) - timeliness

Section C: referrals

Section D1: reviews received

Section D2: reviews timeliness

Section D3: decisions on reviews

Section E1.1: allegation actions – on complaint cases handled outside of Schedule 3

Section E1.2: allegation actions – on complaint cases handled under Schedule 3

Section E2: focus on RPRP, UPP, misconduct and criminal outcomes (for complaint cases handled under

Schedule 3)

Notes

Acronyms used in this bulletin

Select	an authority	y
Selec	tall	
Avon	And Somerset	
Bedfo	rdshire	
British	Transport	
Camb	ridgeshire	
Chesh	nire	
City o	f London	
Cleve	land	
Cumb	ria	
Derby	shire	
Devor	n And Cornwall	
Dorse	t	
Durha	m	
Dyfed	-Powys	
Essex		
Glouc	estershire	
Great	er Manchester	
Gwen	t	
Hamp	shire	
Hertfc	rdshire	
Humb	erside	
Kent		
Lanca	shire	
Leices	stershire	
Lincol	nshire	
Merse	eyside	
Metro	politan	
Natior	nal	
Norfo	k	
North	Wales	
North	Yorkshire	
North	amptonshire	
North	umbria	
Nottin	ghamshire	

Select snapshot	date
Q3 FY 2020/21	
Q4 FY 2013/14	
Q4 FY 2014/15	
Q4 FY 2015/16	
Q4 FY 2016/17	
Q4 FY 2017/18	
Q4 FY 2018/19	
Q4 FY 2019/20	
Q4 FY 2020/21	
Select reporting	noriod
select leboltilig	periou
© 2020/21	penou
	pelloa
<a>2020/21	period
2020/212019/20	period
2020/212019/202018/19	period
2020/212019/202018/192017/18	period
 2020/21 2019/20 2018/19 2017/18 2016/17 	period
 2020/21 2019/20 2018/19 2017/18 2016/17 2015/16 	
 2020/21 2019/20 2018/19 2017/18 2016/17 2015/16 2014/15 2013/14 2012/13 	
 2020/21 2019/20 2018/19 2017/18 2016/17 2015/16 2014/15 2013/14 2012/13 2011/12 	
 2020/21 2019/20 2018/19 2017/18 2016/17 2015/16 2014/15 2013/14 2012/13 	

Select	PCA	2017

Blank)

yes

Select publication data

Exclude

Include

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section A1.1: complaint cases and allegations logged – timeliness and per 1,000 employees

	To contact cu	ustomers	To log compla	int cases
Average number of working days	Initial handling performance	Customer perspective	Initial handling performance	Customer perspective
Force	21	22	17	17
MSF Average	7	7	6	6
National	7	7	6	6


Please note: average times presented in the above table are rounded to the nearest whole number. In comparison, the charts below present the exact result.


	Force	MSF Average	National
No. of allegations logged per 1,000 employees	478	521	467
No. of complaint cases logged per 1,000 employees	338	291	290

Notes

This section presents information relating to the force's contact with customers and their initial handling of the complaint cases. It shows how long, on average it takes from the customer's perspective from when they made the complaint, and the force's performance of the initial handling from when it received the complaint.

Complaint cases with 'invalid dates' have been removed from timeliness measures. Please refer to the performance framework counting rules and calculations on the <u>IOPC website</u> for explanations of customer perspective, initial handling and invalid dates.






Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section A1.2: allegations logged - what has been complained about

		Delivery of duties and service	Police powers, policies and procedures		Access and/or disclosure of information	police	Discriminatory behaviour	Abuse of position/corruption	Individual behaviours	Sexual conduct	Discreditable conduct	Other	Total
	Force	2,004	814	223	117	44	187	28	607	3	31	123	4,181
Number	MSF Average	1,350	580	93	73	29	114	52	514	7	19	41	2,871
	National	52,300	23,368	3,553	2,845	1,104	3,764	1,490	18,073	199	648	1,807	109,151
	Force	48%	19%	5%	3%	1%	4%	1%	15%	0%	1%	3%	
Percentage	MSF Average	44%	22%	3%	3%	1%	4%	2%	19%	0%	1%	1%	
	National	48%	21%	3%	3%	1%	3%	1%	17%	0%	1%	2%	



Notes

This section presents information that shows what people complain about. Allegation categories capture the root of the dissatisfaction expressed in a complaint. A complaint case will contain one or more allegations and one category is selected for each allegation logged.

Please refer to our Guidance on capturing data about police complaints for guidance on logging allegations and complaint category definitions.

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section A1.3: allegations logged – what has been complained about – top five allegation categories and their subcategories

			ce	MSF A	F Average National Nation		onal
Category	Subcategory	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Delivery of duties and service	Total	2,004	48 %	1,350	44 %	52,300	48 %
	Police action following contact	485	24 %	669	48 %	23,155	44 %
	Decisions	201	10 %	144	12 %	7,524	14 %
	General level of service	1,086	54 %	394	29 %	16,612	32 %
	Information	232	12 %	143	11 %	5,006	10 %
						3	0 %
□ Police powers, policies and procedures	Total	814	19 %	580	22 %	23,368	21 %
	Stops, and stop and search	46	6 %	38	6 %	2,275	10 %
	Searches of premises and seizure of property	99	12 %	72	13 %	3,168	14 %
	Power to arrest and detain	105	13 %	87	15 %	3,407	15 %
	Detention in police custody	100	12 %	84	14 %	3,176	14 %
	Bail, identification and interview procedures	33	4 %	21	4 %	702	3 %
	Use of force	253	31 %	167	29 %	6,752	29 %
	Evidential procedures	29	4 %	34	6 %	1,212	5 %
	Out of court disposals	2	0 %	10	2 %	311	1 %
	Other policies and procedures	147	18 %	72	13 %	2,362	10 %
						3	0 %
□ Handling of or damage to property/	Total	223	5 %	93	3 %	3,553	3 %
premises	Handling of or damage to property/ premises	223	100 %	93	100 %	3,541	100 %
						11	0 %
	Delivery of duties and service					1	0 %
 Discriminatory behaviour 	Total	187	4 %	114	4 %	3,764	3 %
	Age			2	2 %	58	2 %
	Disability	23	12 %	14	11 %	487	13 %
	Gender reassignment			3	2 %	35	1 %
	Marriage and civil partnership					4	0 %
	Pregnancy and maternity			1	1 %	5	0 %
	Race	125	67 %	75	66 %	2,375	63 %
	Religion or belief	4	2 %	3	2 %	91	2 %
	Sex	16	9 %	12	10 %	340	9 %
	Sexual orientation	2	1 %	2	1 %	92	2 %
	Other	17	9 %	8	8 %	277	7 %
Individual behaviours	Total	607	15 %	514	19 %	18,073	17 %
	Unprofessional attitude and disrespect	183	30 %	128	25 %	4,687	26 %
	Lack of fairness and impartiality	123	20 %	88	18 %	2,954	16 %
	Overbearing or harassing behaviours	172	28 %	123	26 %	3,419	19 %
	Impolite language / tone	79	13 %	120	20 %	4,645	26 %
	Impolite and intolerant actions	50	8 %	55	11 %	2,367	13 %
	Other neglect or failure in duty			1	0 %	1	0 %

Notes

This section presents the five most commonly recorded categories for allegations that have been logged.

A complaint case will contain one or more allegations and one category (and sub-category, where available) is selected for each allegation logged.

Total % is of the total number of allegations logged.

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section A1.4: allegations logged – what has been complained about (category) and the situational context of complaints (factors)

	Allegation category											
Factors	Delivery of duties and service		or damage	Access and/or disclosure of information	Use of police vehicles	behaviour		behaviours			Other	Total
Arrest	52	160	11	3	1	15	1	49			1	293
Call Handling	110	3	1	2		2		18				136
Child protection / CSA / CSE	26	7		3		1	1	7			1	46
Coronavirus – other	46	30		1		1	1	45			11	135
Coronavirus – police powers on infectiou	1	3										4
Coronavirus – police powers on restricti	35	16		1				13				65
Custody	18	73	9	3		6		9			4	122
Death	8											8
Domestic / gender abuse	120	10	2	8		9	1	23			1	174
Drugs / alcohol	12	2	1					2		1		18
Firearms	2		3									5
Fraud	25	2	1	1			1				1	31
Hate Crime	19	1		1		7		5			1	34
Investigation	539	32	52	11		15	9	70	1	6	2	737
Mental health	16	11	3	2		2		11			1	46
Missing persons	9	3				1		1				14
Neighbourhood policing	160	17	1	2		13	3	43		1	4	244
None	680	268	112	72	14	87	6	245	2	20	68	1,574
Police dogs or horses		3									1	4
Premises search	10	33	13			2		4			1	63
Public order incident	5	1				1		2				9
Restraint equipment		14				1						15
Roads/traffic	62	39	3	1	27	5	1	28		2	8	176
Serious injury	3	1						1				5
Social media	9			2			2	3			3	19
Stop and/or search	9	41	1			10		17				78
Taser	1	6						2				9

Notes

This section presents information that shows what people are complaining about using a combination of allegation categories and factors.

Categories capture the root of the dissatisfaction expressed in a complaint. Factors capture the situational context of the dissatisfaction expressed in a complaint. The combination of categories and factors provides a richer picture of what people are complaining about compared to the categories alone.

Each allegation should have a single category selected. However, multiple factors can be selected on a single allegation. Therefore, the sum of factors will not equal the total allegations logged in each category.

Please refer to our <u>Guidance on capturing data about police complaints</u> for definitions of categories and factors.

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)


Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section A2: how complaint cases and allegations have been handled

	Force		MSF Av	erage	National	
Reason complaint case handled under Schedule 3	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Nature of the allegation(s) in the complaint	21	1%	137	13%	5,811	16%
Dissatisfaction after initial handling	56	3%	60	6%	2,889	8%
Complainant wishes the complaint be recorded	421	21%	200	19%	12,440	34%
AA/body responsible for initial handling decides	1,532	75%	661	62%	15,225	42%

	Fore	ce	MSF A	verage	onal	
How allegations were handled	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Outside of Schedule 3	889	29%	789	28%	32,012	38%
Under Schedule 3 - not investigated	2,171	70%	1,449	69%	45,205	54%
Under Schedule 3 investigated (subject to special procedures)	11	0%	14	1%	688	1%
Under Schedule 3 investigated (not subject to special procedures)	39	1%	147	11%	5,845	7%



Notes

This section presents the number of complaint cases handled under Schedule 3 of the PRA 2002 and the reasons why. A breakdown of how allegations were handled, including whether they were investigated under Schedule 3 or otherwise than by investigation (not investigated) is also given.

Please note that figures presented in the second table may be under-representing the number of allegations finalised under Schedule 3 and investigated (not suject to special procedures), instead grouping some of these allegations as finalised under Schedule 3 and not investigated. This is because police forces were not able to consistently and accurately collect this data on their systems until the implementation of an upgrade from November 2020.

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley




Section A3.1: complaint cases finalised - timeliness


Average number of working days to finalise complaint cases	Force	MSF Average	National
Outside of Schedule 3	14	14	25
Under Schedule 3 (inc suspension)	73	72	73
Under Schedule 3 (not inc suspension)	72	71	72

Notes

This section shows the time it takes the force to finalise complaint cases from the customer's perspective. It gives a breakdown of the time taken to finalise complaint cases handled outside of Schedule 3 and those that are being handled under Schedule 3 from the date the complaint was made.

Complaint cases with 'invalid dates' have been removed from the data shown. Please refer to the performance framework counting rules and calculations on the <u>IOPC website</u> for an explanation of invalid dates.





Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section A3.2: allegations finalised - how they have been handled and timeliness

	Foi	'CE	MSF Av	rerage	National		
How allegations were handled	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Outside of Schedule 3	889	29%	789	28%	32,012	38%	
Under Schedule 3 - not subject to investigation	2,171	70%	1,449	69%	45,205	54%	
Under Schedule 3 - by local investigation	50	2%	160	11%	6,496	8%	
Under Schedule 3 - by independent investigation			2	0%	37	0%	


Average number of working days to finalise allegations	Force	MSF Average	National
Outside of Schedule 3	13	14	20
Under Schedule 3 - not subject to investigation	69	53	57
Under Schedule 3 - by local investigation	69	104	106
Under Schedule 3 - by independent investigation		184	130


Notes

This section shows the time it takes the force to finalise allegations by how they were handled. It gives a breakdown of allegations handled outside Schedule 3 and those that were handled under Schedule 3, which were either investigated or handled other than by investigation. Timeliness is calculated from the date the allegation was received by the force.

At present, allegations finalised by directed investigations are being included under 'local investigation'. The IOPC is working with force IT suppliers to ensue that reporting on this is possible in the future.

Allegations with 'invalid dates' have been removed from the data shown. Please refer to the performance framework counting rules and calculations on the <u>IOPC website</u> for an explanation of invalid dates.





Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section A4.1: allegation decisions - by how they were handled

How allegations were handled ▲	Force %	Force No.	National %	National No.
Outside of Schedule 3	29 %	889	38 %	32,011
Under Schedule 3 - not investigated	70 %	2,171	54 %	45,201
Under Schedule 3 investigated (subject to special procedures)	0 %	11	1 %	688
Under Schedule 3 investigated (not subject to special procedures)	1 %	39	7 %	5,845
Total	100 %	3,110	100 %	83,745

How allegations were handled	Out	side of S	Schedu	ile 3	Under Schedule 3 - not investigated (subject to special procedures)											
Allegation decision				Nat. No.				Nat. No.		Force		Nat. No.				Nat. No.
	%	No.	%		%	No.	%		%	No.	%		%	No.	%	
No further action					26 %	557	14 %	6,252	9 %	1	1 %	10	67 %	26	10 %	572
Regulation 41 applies							0 %	55			0 %	2			0 %	27
Service provided - unable to determine					4 %	91	4 %	1,906			1 %	4			3 %	147
Service provided - not acceptable					10 %	219	11 %	5,153			1 %	10	15 %	6	10 %	561
Service provided - acceptable			0 %	8	57 %	1,246	66 %	29,644			14 %	99	18 %	7	73 %	4,279
Not Resolved	1 %	11	6 %	1,955												
Resolved	99 %	878	94 %	30,048												
No Case to Answer									91 %	10	59 %	403				
Case to Answer											20 %	136				
Withdrawal					3 %	58	5 %	2,191			3 %	24			4 %	259
Total	29 %	889	38 %	32,011	70 %	2,171	54 %	45,201	0 %	11	1 %	688	1 %	39	7 %	5,845

Notes

This section presents information about the decisions being given on allegations. An allegation decision is logged for each allegation finalised.

The allegation decision reflects how the complaint case has been handled, with different decisions available for the different means of handling. Both the allegation decisions and the subsequent actions available will depend on two things: firstly, whether the complaint case has been handled outside or under Schedule 3; and secondly, the means of handling where it has been dealt with under Schedule 3.

Please note that figures presented may be under-representing the number of allegations finalised under Schedule 3 and investigated (not suject to special procedures), instead grouping some of these allegations as finalised under Schedule 3 and not investigated. This is because police forces were not able to consistantly and accurately collect this data on their systems until the implementation of an upgrade from November 2020.

Please refer to our <u>Guidance on capturing data about police complaints</u> for details of allegation decisions.

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section A4.2: allegation decisions – by what was complained about (category)

		Allegation category										
Allegation decisions	Delivery of duties and service		or damage	Access and/or disclosure of information	Use of police vehicles	behaviour		behaviours			Other	Total
No further action	249	127	13	21	4	29	5	107		8	21	584
Service provided - unable to determine	32	14	6	2	2	3		29		1	2	91
Service provided - not acceptable	125	35	10	9	3	7		33			3	225
Service provided - acceptable	582	263	34	35	9	81	10	219	1	11	8	1,253
Not Resolved	7	1	1			1					1	11
Resolved	548	91	121	6	16	1	2	58		1	34	878
No Case to Answer	2	4		1		1		1	1			10
Withdrawal	25	9	1	5		2	1	11		1	3	58

Notes

This section presents information about allegations finalised grouped by the allegation decision and the category selected on each allegation. Each allegation has a single category selected.


Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley




Section B1: investigations (all investigation types) - timeliness

Investigations active for	Force	MSF Average	National
0-3 months	50%	57%	53%
3-6 months	39%	25%	23%
6-9 months	10%	16%	17%
9-12 months	1%	37%	8%
12-18 months			
More than 18 months			




Investigations completed in	Force	MSF Average	National
0-3 months	42%	36%	43%
3-6 months	50%	42%	37%
6-9 months	8%	20%	17%
9-12 months		4%	3%
12-18 months			
More than 18 months			



Allegations finalised by investigation (all types) - timeliness

	Year allegation	on finalised
Average number of working days	2019/20	2020/21
Force	12	69
MSF Average	17	60
National	16	63

Average number of working days to finalise allegations by investigation



Notes

This section presents information about complaints handled under Schedule 3 that are investigated. It covers complaint cases investigated by both the force and the IOPC.

The data shows how long investigations have been open (active) at the end of the period being reported. Also, the time it takes for allegations that have been investigated to be finalised.

Allegations with 'invalid dates' have been removed from finalised timeliness. Please refer to the performance framework counting rules and calculations on the <u>IOPC website</u> for an explanation of invalid dates.


Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley




Section B2: investigations (by type of investigation) - timeliness

Investigations active for	Loc	Ind	AII
0-3 months	50 %	100 %	50 %
3-6 months	40 %		39 %
6-9 months	10 %		10 %
9-12 months	1 %		1 %
12-18 months			
More than 18 months			




Investigations completed in	Loc	AII
0-3 months	42 %	42 %
3-6 months	50 %	50 %
6-9 months	8 %	8 %
9-12 months		
12-18 months		
More than 18 months		



Allegations finalised by investigation - timeliness

	Year allegation finalised					
Average number of working days	2019/20	2020/21				
Local	12	69				
Independent						
AII	12	69				



Notes

This section presents information about complaint cases handled under Schedule 3 that are investigated, by the type of investigation. It covers complaint cases investigated by both the force and the IOPC.

The data shows how long investigations have been open (active) at the end of the period being reported. Also, the time it takes for allegations that have been investigated to be finalised by the type of investigation. At present, allegations finalised by directed invetigations are being included under 'local investigation'. The IOPC is working with force IT suppliers to ensure that reporting on this is possible in the future.

Allegations with 'invalid dates' have been removed from finalised timeliness. Please refer to the performance framework counting rules and calculations on the <u>IOPC website</u> for an explanation of invalid dates.


Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section C: referrals

	Force	Force %	MSF Average	MSF Average %	National	National %
Number referrals received	116		101		4,542	
Number referrals completed	114		100		4,546	
Decision: Independent Investigation	10	9%	13	13%	577	13%
Decision: Directed Investigation	3	3%	1	1%	47	1%
Decision: Local Investigation	57	50%	62	63%	2,712	60%
Decision: Return to Force	42	37%	24	22%	1,153	25%
Decision: Invalid	0	0%	0	0%	28	1%



Notes

The figures presented in this section include all referrals that the force makes to the IOPC (received), not just those arising from complaints.

When the IOPC receives a referral from the force, it reviews the information they have provided. The IOPC decides whether the matter requires an investigation, and the type of investigation.

Referrals may have been completed in a different period to when they were received.

Where a referral is made by the force on a mandatory basis but does not meet the mandatory referral criteria, the matter may not fall within the IOPC's remit to assess and will be determined invalid.

The sum of decisions may not match the number of referrals completed. This is because some matters referred may have come to the attention of the appropriate authority before 1 February 2020 and have investigation type decisions of either managed or supervised.

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley




Section D1: reviews received

	Complaint cases finalised under Schedule 3	Reviews received	Reviews received as proportion of complaint cases finalised under Schedule 3		Number LPB reviews received - non-investigation		Number IOPC reviews received - non-investigation
Force	1,327	313	24%	142	169	2	0
MSF Average	708	158	22%	30	110	11	7
National	23,243	5,371	23%	1,156	3,246	478	491

Section D2: reviews timeliness

	Force	MSF Average	National
Average number of working days to complete Local Policing Body reviews	56	41	36
Average number of working days to complete IOPC reviews	81	47	47



Notes

explanation of invalid dates.

Where a complaint has been recorded under Schedule 3 to the *Police Reform Act 2002*, the complainant has a right to apply for a review. A person can apply for review if they are unhappy with the way their complaint was handled, or with the outcome. This applies whether the complaint has been investigated by the appropriate authority or handled otherwise than by investigation (non-investigation). The application for a review will be considered either by the local policing body or the IOPC; the relevant review body depends on the circumstances of the complaint.

This section presents information about applications for review handled by both local policing bodies and the IOPC.

Information about the right of review and who is the relevant review body is available in <u>chapter 18 of the IOPC's Statutory Guidance on the police complaints system (February 2020).</u>
Reviews with 'invalid dates' have been removed from reviews timeliness. Please refer to the performance framework counting rules and calculations on the IOPC website for an

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley




Section D3: decisions on reviews


% LPB reviews found complaint case outcome not reasonable and proportionate

	Force	MSF Average	National
Investigation	4	16	18
Non-investigation	6	9	14



	Force	MSF Average	National
Investigation	100	27	32
Non-investigation	0	33	32





% LPB reviews resulting in...

	Force	MSF Average	National
Recommendation made			

% IOPC reviews resulting in...

	Force	MSF Average	National
Recommendation made	0	0	0
Direction	100	28	23
Extra work commissioned	0	4	1

Notes

This section presents information about the decisions made on reviews by local policing bodies and the IOPC. It includes the proportion of reviews where the relevant review body found the outcome of the complaint was not reasonable and proportionate and those that resulted in a recommendation and, if necessary, a direction to the appropriate authority in respect of any person serving with the police.

The percentage of reviews the relevant review body determines to be not reasonable and proportionate excludes any reviews that were deemed invalid. Invalid reviews may, for example, include applications that were made outside of the 28 day period to submit an application.

Where the IOPC does not have enough information to decide on a review of a police force investigation, they are able to request that the force undertakes further work to gather additional evidential material. This is known as commissioning further work. The proportion of reviews completed where additional work was commissioned are shown in this section.

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section E1.1: allegation actions - on complaint cases handled outside of Schedule 3

	Force		Force MSF Average		erage National	
Actions following outside of Schedule 3 complaint cases	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Learning from Reflection			3	1%	205	1%
No further action	69	8%	177	26%	8793	31%
Explanation	435	50%	222	35%	11617	41%
Debrief	29	3%	13	2%	470	2%
Apology	237	27%	56	8%	2000	7%
Goodwill gesture	2	0%	2	0%	144	1%
Policy review			4	0%	54	0%
Individual learning	1	0%	8	3%	722	3%
Organisational learning	1	0%	2	0%	235	1%

Notes

This section presents information about what happened as a result of the allegation (action). Actions are captured at allegation level and multiple actions can be selected, where appropriate, on single allegation. The figures shown in this section are based on allegations on finalised complaint cases that resulted in the corresponding action. As more than one action can be selected for a single allegation, the sum of all percentages will not equal 100%.

The actions available once an allegation is finalised depend on how the complaint case has been handled. Please refer to our <u>Guidance on capturing data about police complaints</u> for details of actions available.

Please note: not all of the available actions arising from the complaint handling are shown. The actions presented in this section are those that focus on putting an issue right and preventing it from happening again by encouraging those involved to reflect on their actions and learn.

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Section E1.2: allegation actions - on complaint cases handled under Schedule 3

	Force		Force MSF Average			verage	National	
Actions following Schedule 3 complaint cases	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Organisational learning	14	1%	14	2%	456	2%		
Individual learning	37	3%	44	8%	1218	5%		
Policy review	2	0%	2	0%	48	0%		
Goodwill gesture	1	0%	1	0%	21	0%		
Apology	28	2%	22	3%	890	4%		
Debrief	3	0%	3	0%	183	1%		
Explanation	43	3%	32	4%	5602	24%		
Misconduct proceedings			2	0%	18	0%		
Unsatisfactory Performance Procedure (UPP)	3	0%	3	0%	6	0%		
No further action	786	59%	482	72%	13279	57%		
Other action	8	1%	11	2%	341	1%		
Other actions following a case to answer decision					7	0%		
Referral to RPRP	65	5%	21	3%	815	4%		

Notes

This section presents information about what happened as a result of the allegation (action). Actions are captured at allegation level and multiple actions can be selected, where appropriate, on single allegation. The figures shown in this section are based on allegations on finalised complaint cases that resulted in the corresponding action. As more than one action can be selected for a single allegation, the sum of all percentages will not equal 100%.

The actions available once an allegation is finalised depend on how the complaint case has been handled. Please refer to our Guidance on capturing data about police complaints for details of actions available.

Please note: not all of the available actions arising from the complaint handling are shown. The actions presented in this section are those that focus on putting an issue right and preventing it from happening again by encouraging those involved to reflect on their actions and learn.

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley




Section E2: focus on RPRP, UPP, misconduct and criminal outcomes (for complaint cases handled under Schedule 3)

RPRP and learning

Number of complaint cases resulting in below actions	2019/20	2020/21
Learning		
Force		51
National	10	1661
□ RPRP		
Force		65
National	6	815

Percentage of complaint cases resulting in below actions	2019/20	2020/21
Learning		
Force		4%
National	3%	7%
□ RPRP		
Force		5%
National	2%	4%



RPRP, UPP, misconduct and criminal

	For	ce	MSF A	verage	National	
Percentage of complaint cases	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
resulting in below actions						
UPP	3	0%	3	0%	6	0%
Misconduct hearing			1	0%	3	0%
Misconduct meeting			1	0%	15	0%
RPRP	65	5%	21	3%	815	4%

Notes

This section focusses on what happened as a result of the complaint case (action) in relation to RPRP, UPP, and a case to answer for misconduct.

Actions are captured at allegation level and multiple actions can be selected, where appropriate, on a single allegation. The figures shown in this section are based on allegations on finalised complaint cases that resulted in the corresponding action. As more than one action can be selected for a single allegation, the sum of all percentages will not equal 100%. More than one UPP, RPRP, misconduct meeting and misconduct hearing can result from a single allegation, therefore the numbers shown do not represent the number of these processes which occurred in the period.

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley



Notes

Data sources

- Complaint cases data is taken from XML data submissions made by forces to the IOPC every quarter.
- IOPC performance data is taken from the IOPC case management system.
- Police force employee numbers are taken from the latest police workforce England and Wales statistics published by the Home Office.
- The most similar force (MSF) groups used for the calculation of the MSF averages in this bulletin are those determined by the Home Office. Please note that the British Transport Police and City of London Police do not have an MSF group. A list of the MSF groups is available on the IOPC website.

Performance Framework counting rules and calculation

- The counting rules and calculations used to produce the data shown in this bulletin can be found on the IOPC website.
- Average times are presented in working days and do not include weekends or bank holidays.
- Some percentages may add up to more or less than 100% due to rounding.
- Complaint cases and allegations with invalid start/end dates have been removed from average time calculations. Therefore, the numbers of complaint cases and allegations used in the average time calculations may be lower than the total number of complaint cases and allegations logged or finalised.

Data constraints

- The data is sourced from live case management systems and provides a snapshot of information as it was at that time. Therefore, there may be variances between the information in this bulletin and information reported at a later date.

Further Information

- A glossary providing a full list of definitions used in this bulletin, can be found on the IOPC website.
- Additional information about the recording of police complaints, including the definitions of the complaint categories, can be found in appendix A of the IOPC's Guidance on capturing data about police complaints.
- Information about how the police complaints system operates, who can complain and how reviews are dealt with can be found in the IOPC's Statutory Guidance on the police complaints system (February 2020).

Reporting Period: 01 April 2020 - 31 March 2021 (Q4 2020/21)

Indep Office Police

Appropriate Authority: Thames Valley

Acronyms used in this bulletin

Force – year to date force numbers

IOPC – Independent Office for Police Conduct

Inc. – including

Ind – independent investigation

Loc – local investigation

LPB – local policing body

MSF – most similar force

Nat. – National

No. – number

PRA – the Police Reform Act 2002

RPRP – reflective practice review process

UPP – unsatisfactory performance procedure