

From : [REDACTED]
To : [REDACTED]
CC : [REDACTED]
Date Sent : 11/11/2014 19:12:22
Subject : FW: FW: SCJS and Police Record Crime comparison papers

[REDACTED] – copying to you again after receiving an undeliverable email error message.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 November 2014 19:11
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: FW: SCJS and Police Record Crime comparison papers

[REDACTED],

Apologies for the second email – I should have pointed out that this report contains a few 2013-14 police recorded crime results and has been forwarded to you under the usual and standard pre-release access arrangements and regulations (as set out in the Pre-Release Access to Official Statistics Order 2008). I expect you know what this involves(!), please don't save in a shared file or share with anyone not on the copy list to this email without obtaining prior approval from [REDACTED], however happy to provide more information on this if required – please let me know if you are at all unsure about this.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Safer Communities Analytical Unit
[REDACTED]
www.scotland.gov.uk/justicestatistics

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 November 2014 18:59
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Edge N (Nicola); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FW: SCJS and Police Record Crime comparison papers

[REDACTED]

Here is the final version of the 'SCJS chapter' planned for forthcoming publication (although it still needs formatted, links and cross references added etc).

As outlined in my earlier email, and following further in depth thinking on this with others across the Scottish Government statistics group, we're planning to publish this chapter (with additional information on SCJS elsewhere in the PRC bulletin) and are continuing to work on an analytical paper with additional detail – either to be published alongside or potentially after the PRC publication.

To confirm, we have not completed additional statistical testing on SCJS and PRC, and the focus on the period since 2008-09 remains (we've inserted a little more text to explain why that is). However in this version we have tried to present a more positive tone (although essential caveats do also remain), increase clarity for the user in a number of areas, including additional explanations on the possible range of factors which influence differences between the two series (and I expect we'll expand on this in the revised analytical paper). In addition, when redrafting the analytical paper we will also focus on the longer-term 4-year trends, aim to increase clarity in the section on reporting to the police and will add the analysis by crime group back in.

Thanks again for continued support with this work.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Safer Communities Analytical Unit
[REDACTED]
www.scotland.gov.uk/justicestatistics

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 November 2014 12:34
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: FW: SCJS and Police Record Crime comparison papers

[REDACTED]

Thanks for your helpful and constructive response. We'd be happy to review further drafts in due course, so that we can make a judgment about Code compliance ahead of publication.


All the best

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Monitoring & Assessment
UK Statistics Authority

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED],
Cc: [REDACTED] [k](#)
Date: 07/11/2014 09:57
Subject: FW: SCJS and Police Record Crime comparison papers



Many thanks for your helpful notes on our work to bring the two sources together, i.e. the chapter and analytical paper, to address the two requirements concerning the relationship between police recorded crime (PRC) and the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS).

Purpose and overall approach

Having reviewed your comments, previous UKSA comments which advised an analytical paper would be required, and considered where we are now in relation to likely publication date of PRC, we have assessed that the most appropriate way for us to address all views is to improve the draft chapter but also publish an analytical paper with the additional analytical detail (if time allows, alongside PRC, otherwise potentially following PRC publication).

You helpfully point out that we can improve user focus in our work. In the acquisitive crime example you have highlighted we will work on aiding user interpretation – for example, if you are interested in the likely range of such crime in the underlying population you should use SCJS (but note the small sample sizes and variation) and if you are interested in the amount of such crime the police are faced with you should use PRC. We will also add more on the range of factors which influence trends in both series. For example, changes in survey sampling methodology, frequency of surveying etc, which may have affected SCJS estimates, and with respect to PRC note that potential changes in other societal factors, reporting and recording practice may affect results over time.

Overall tone and structure

We are currently rewriting the chapter and analytical paper to incorporate your advice, aiming to make (at least the analytical paper) more concise, using a more positive tone to present a picture of crime in Scotland informed by both sources (maximising value and minimising risk of misinterpretation – so, as you have noted, some caveats will of course still be required, though we will reduce repetition of them). While the remainder of the PRC publication is also still being finalised, in addition to this chapter, SCJS will be highlighted up front in the PRC publication and likely in other places in too.

Content

While I understand your views on this, in terms of the proposed additional statistical testing, we have concerns over the proposed methodology for assessing differences between PRC and SCRS, for example we're unsure how anyone could robustly estimate uncertainty around PRC. In addition, we have a small number of data points and we have small sample sizes of victims: the SCJS (of course happily) finds small numbers of victims of crime within the sample, so

uncertainty in SCJS is already large, especially the comparable acquisitive and violent crime groups. We do not judge it appropriate to complete further statistical tests based on estimates which can generate such wide confidence intervals around results (for example, for violent crime the 2012/13 result is 236k +/- 40k, and therefore the confidence intervals around changes between survey sweeps will be substantially wider), especially where changes can be affected by small clusters of responses from one survey sweep to the next. We view that the two sources are perfectly valid, complementary sources, allowing broad comparisons between some crime groups.

Having read the section on reporting to the police again I agree that this could be clearer and we will consider adding possible influencing/explanatory factors into the narrative – we are working on this, however we are reluctant to speculate very much here as the underlying point is that these are two quite independent sources and could never be expected to marry up completely or even closely. We'll add the analysis by crime group back in to an annex, as before, with caveats highlighting the low sample sizes involved.

Other points:

- Agreed – we will note that the survey is biennial, not continuous.
- Comparisons to previous year / four-year trend – ok, we have generally tried to focus on the four-year trend, but I have spotted a few places where we comment on the changes from the previous year first. We will reverse this.
- Focus on 2008/09 onwards – the uncertainty around even the most recent data is already quite large in a places so we have judged it appropriate to focus on the most recent data rather than earlier data, which is derived from smaller sample sizes. In addition the more recent data is continuous and then biennial, rather than more intermittent.

Thanks again for the helpful steer your comments have provided.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SCJS Project Manager
Safer Communities Analytical Unit

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thanks for the comments. It would be helpful if you could send through some examples or sources for the type of analysis that you are looking for – so that we can have a look at others methodologies and approaches. I think that it would be helpful to see some practical examples

of comparisons between police recorded crime data and crime survey data, as we get think about next steps.

Thanks,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

The Scottish Government

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 24 October 2014 15:41

To: [Redacted] Edge N (Nicola); Richard Laux; [Redacted]

Subject: SCJS and Police Record Crime comparison papers

Dear [Redacted]

Thank you for the documents you sent covering the comparison of crime statistics based on police recording and from the SCJS. The team has reviewed these, and I'm responding on their behalf to take into account my rather extensive experience as a survey methodologist; it's nice to recycle a small part of that!

I attach a Word document that covers a summary of our review of the material grouped by the following areas: purpose, overall structure and tone, and content. I trust that this gives a steer to aid your further development work on this analysis.

All the best

[Redacted]

Monitoring & Assessment
UK Statistics Authority

[Redacted]

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-ainmichte a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadaichte a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach còraichean, foillseachadh neo sgaoileadh, gun chead. Ma 's e is gun d'fhuair sibh seo le gun fhiosd', bu choir cur às dhan phost-d agus lethbhreac sam bith air an t-siostam agaibh, leig fios chun neach a sgaoil am post-d gun dàil.

Dh'fhaodadh gum bi teachdaireachd sam bith bho Riaghaltas na h-Alba air a chlàradh neo air a sgrùdadh airson dearbhadh gu bheil an siostam ag obair gu h-èifeachdach neo airson adhbhar laghail eile. Dh'fhaodadh nach eil beachdan anns a' phost-d seo co-ionann ri beachdan Riaghaltas na h-Alba.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) This email has been certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

For information on the work of the UK Statistics Authority,
visit: <http://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk>

Please Note: Incoming and outgoing email messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications

Legal Disclaimer: Any views expressed by the sender of this message are not necessarily those of the UK Statistics Authority

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) This email has been certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email has been received from an external party and has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) This email has been certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.



- Crime Survey - 2012-13 - Analysis - Comparable Crimes - UKSA Assessment Requirement 11
Section in RC v 4.docx