

NORFOLK POLICE AUTHORITY
SCRUTINY AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

14 FEBRUARY 2006

AGENDA ITEM

Section 95 Ethnic Monitoring Data 3rd Quarter 2005/06

Report by the Chief Constable

This is an overview of Force interactions with Black Minority Ethnic people for the period October 1st – 31st December 2005. The report particularly focuses on PACE Stop & Search and PACE Stop & Account. The analysis of BME interactions was a recommendation made by the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Norfolk Constabulary is under a statutory obligation to monitor our service provision to ensure that there is no adverse differential impact between individuals of different racial origins.
- 1.2 The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry noted that unexplained stops had an adverse impact on public trust and confidence particularly amongst Black Minority Ethnic (BME) people and through Recommendations 60 – 63 put a duty on the police to ensure greater transparency in the processes used. Nationally, disproportionality in stops is monitored by the Home Office using the 4+1 ethnic monitoring categories of White, Black, Asian, Other and Not Known, against the number of stops per 1000 people using the 2001 Census population data.
- 1.3 Although Norfolk is in line with the average national statistics for disproportionality in interactions with Black people and below average for interactions with Asian people we have made the decision to go one step further with our analysis by using the 16+1 ethnic monitoring categories, condensed into 5+1. Whilst this provides improved understanding of the nature of disproportionality it does lead to the creation of statistics which appear to suggest that there is a higher level of disproportionality in Norfolk when this is not actually the case.
- 1.4 Disproportionality is still calculated from the Norfolk population figures from the 2001 Census. The figures for BME groups per 1000 of the population are compared against the figures for White groups per 1000 of the population. It should be noted that the accuracy of the Census information is questionable as these figures are retrospective and do not take into account recent migrations, or the potential for growth of BME communities.

Norfolk Population 2001 Census Data					
All people	White	Mixed	Asian	Black	Other
796,728	784,689	4,780	2,859	1,575	2,825
%	98.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%

The 16+1 categories used in calculating disproportionality in Norfolk are:

A1 Indian
A2 Pakistani
A3 Bangladeshi
A9 Other Asian

B1 Caribbean
B2 African
B9 Other Black

M1 White and Black Caribbean
M2 White and Black African
M3 White and Asian
M9 Any other Mixed

O1 Chinese
O9 Other

W1 British
W2 Irish
W9 Any other White Background

N1 Not Known
N2 Not Known
N3 Not Known
N4 Not Known

These can then be grouped into the 5+1 categories of:

W = White

A = Asian

B = Black

M = Mixed

O = Other

N = Not Known

- 1.5 It should be noted that the demographics of Norfolk change from Area to Area, for example a higher proportion of the BME communities reside and work in Central Area when compared to Eastern Area, which may affect the numbers of police interactions with minority groups in the different Areas. Currently there is no reliable county wide data available on the demographics differences between Areas. It is also relevant to note that there are indications, from other research, that the size of BME populations has doubled over the last three years.
- 1.6 Although the interrogation of the following data is providing a greater understanding of police interactions with BME people, it is important to recognise that statistical analysis of stops alone will not serve to reduce disproportionality.

2. STATISTICAL OVERVIEW

All BME Interactions

2.1 In Norfolk during the period 01.10.05 – 31.12.05 the total number of stop search and stop account interactions were 3483. The self-defined ethnicity breaks down as follows

White	3213
Mixed	40
Asian	25
Black	89
Other	7
Not Known	109
Total	3483

2.2 There were 109 interactions where no self-defined ethnicity was collected, a percentage of 3%. These interactions have been removed from all the analysis in this paper. This is an area for development as it is not desirable to exclude any interaction and it may be preferable to resort to officer defined ethnicity in such cases and to make comment that we gave included them in the respective categories.

2.3 In order to provide some context against the national picture of disproportionality, the Norfolk figures have been calculated using the 4+1 categories and the results are shown in the table below. The national average for disproportionality is that Black people are 7 times more likely to be stopped than White People and Asian people are 3 times more likely.

Disproportionality if Black	7.66 times more likely to be stopped
Disproportionality if Asian	1.47 times more likely to be stopped

It can be seen that Norfolk is only slightly above the national average for interactions with Black people and less than half the national average for Asian people.

2.4 The Norfolk methodology however, using the more detailed 16+1 (condensed into 5+1) ethnic monitoring categories, shows a more detailed picture of disproportionality in the County. This is because the use of 5+1 introduces a category for people defining themselves of Mixed heritage whereas the 4+1 categories have amalgamated the Mixed category into Asian, Black and Other, which has the effect of showing lower figures of disproportionality. The 5+1 categories allow the Mixed category to stand alone and show a more accurate picture, particularly in relation to Black and Asian people.

2.5 Interactions with White people make up 92% of all stops in Norfolk and equates to 4.43 stops per 1000 of the White population. Stops with other ethnic groups are shown in the table below.

		% of interactions	Per 1000 Population	Disproportionality in relation to White stops
White	3213	92	4.43	Not applicable
Mixed	40	1.1	8.3	1.8 times more likely to be stopped
Asian	25	0.7	8.7	2 times more likely
Black	89	2.5	56.5	12.75 times more likely
Other	7	0.2	3.5	0.7 times more likely

2.6 Below is a complete breakdown of the number of BME interactions in the quarter, including the arrest rates arising from the interactions.

Ethnic Code 16+1	Number Stopped	Number Arrested	% Arrest Rate
A1 Indian	2	0	0.00%
A2 Pakistani	4	0	0.00%
A3 Bangladeshi	12	3	25.00%
A9 Other Asian	7	1	14.29%
B1 Caribbean	42	4	9.52%
B2 African	20	0	0.00%
B9 Other Black	27	1	3.70%
M1 White and Black Caribbean	14	1	7.14%
M2 White and Black African	8	0	0.00%
M3 White and Asian	2	1	50.00%
M9 Any other Mixed	15	0	0.00%
N1 Person Declines to Define Their Ethnicity	74	3	4.05%
N2 Person Does Not Understand What Is Required	13	4	30.77%
N3 Officer's Presence is Urgently Required Elsewhere	10	0	0.00%
N4 Situation Involving Public Order	12	4	33.33%
O1 Chinese	3	0	0.00%
O9 Other	4	0	0.00%
W1 British	3118	164	5.26%
W2 Irish	12	0	0.00%
W9 Any other White Background	84	3	3.57%
Total	3483	212	6.09%

2.7 Arrest rates on BME interactions, using 5 +1, are as follows:

Ethnicity	% Arrest Rates
White	5.1%
Mixed	5%
Asian	16%
Black	5.6%

It can be seen that there appears to be a discrepancy in the arrest rates for Asians when compared to other ethnic groups. It is worthy of note that the number of arrests for Asians is low (four). The higher percentage rate could be interpreted as indicating either that further disproportionality exists in arrests or that the stops themselves were more discerning because they led to an arrest. Without further qualitative it is not possible to draw an accurate conclusion.

3. **BCU ANALYSIS**

3.1 The three BCUs were tasked to produce a detailed qualitative analysis package, looking at BME interactions individually to develop our understanding of disproportionality. Whilst BCU's have previously undertaken analysis of stop/search and stop/account data, this is the first time that they have been asked to produce data and analysis to a standard format and within tight timeframes. The result has been to draw attention to previously unrecorded areas of performance, which may provide opportunities to influence change in these areas.

The BCU performance analysts looked at the following information:

- Officer defined ethnicity in comparison to self defined ethnicity
- Home address of BME people stopped
- Results of interactions
- Low versus high discretion searches
- Data collected by the officer
- Disproportionality at BCU level.

3.2 In order to look into BME interactions in greater detail, the analysts on Area discounted all single BME stops made by officers in the quarter, and focused only on stops made by officers who had stopped more than one BME person in the time period. In some instances the reports have revealed anomalies in data recording and these have been referred to Area Community Safety Inspectors for further scrutiny. A natural consequence of this is that a higher degree of quality assurance has been introduced.

3.3 A number of issues were revealed by the BCU analysis:

Officer defined ethnicity in comparison to self defined ethnicity

There do appear to be discrepancies in the comparison of self and officer defined ethnicity. The results of these discrepancies would not affect the levels of disproportionality significantly because the numbers are so small. We are also aware that individuals who have been stopped on multiple occasions have chosen a different self defined ethnicity category at each interaction.

Home address of BME people stopped

Central and Western Area reported that a high number of BME people stopped came from outside of their area of the County. Using self-defined ethnicity, 13 people in Central Area and 11 people in Western Area were from outside of the BCU area. However in Eastern Area only 1 BME person stopped who was not local to the BCU area. Further analysis may help in discovering whether there are links between home locations of individuals and the results of interactions, as there may be links between particular criminal offences and migration of offenders.

Results of interactions

Of the multiple BME interactions that were analysed at BCU level 16 resulted in arrests. All arrests are being scrutinised by Area Performance Managers.

Low versus high discretion searches

All three BCUs recorded that all stops were scrutinised to determine whether they were high or low discretion. The data suggested that there is a 50/50 split between interactions that officers are instructed to carry out (low discretions) and those where they use their own discretion (high discretion). Again all interactions are being scrutinised by Area Performance Managers.

Data collected by the officer

BCU reports have detailed discrepancies, for example where officers have made use of the not known ethnicity categories on more than one occasion, however these have all been carefully scrutinised and no concerns have been raised.

3.4 Disproportionality at BCU level

The BCU reports on multiple BME stops have provided the following disproportionality figures for Black people:

Eastern

Stop & Search Disproportionality	
Officer Perceived Ethnicity	11.45 times more likely
Self Defined Ethnicity	11.6 times more likely

Stop & Account Disproportionality	
Officer Perceived Ethnicity	0.77 times more likely
Self Defined Ethnicity	5.55 times more likely

Central

Stop & Search Disproportionality	
Officer Perceived Ethnicity	10.64 times more likely
Self Defined Ethnicity	10.64 times more likely
Stop & Account Disproportionality	
Officer Perceived Ethnicity	6.08 times more likely
Self Defined Ethnicity	6.52 times more likely

Western

Stop & Search Disproportionality	
Officer Perceived Ethnicity	7.04 times more likely
Self Defined Ethnicity	6.64 times more likely
Stop & Account Disproportionality	
Officer Perceived Ethnicity	4.63 times more likely
Self Defined Ethnicity	5.33 times more likely

It is apparent that the levels of disproportionality in interactions with Black people vary between Areas and this is an issue that merits further exploration as our analysis process is further developed.

4. ACTION PLAN

- 4.1 This analysis has taken the Constabulary forward in terms of developing our understanding of disproportionality. However, it has also raised a number of issues that need to be considered in further development of our analysis. These include issues relating to data capture and analysis, improving our understanding of the context of the data and how this work can inform improvements in service delivery.
- 4.2 The OCC Community Safety Unit will develop an action plan to further improve analysis and understanding of disproportionality.

5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 To be confirmed.

6. RECOMENDATIONS

- 6.1 It is recommended that members note the contents of this report.

Originator:

Claire Bailey – Diversity Projects Officer
Diversity Unit, Community Safety, OCC
Tel: 01953 (42)4021