



The Sheku Bayoh Public Inquiry
Witness Statement
Andrew Coventry
Taken by [REDACTED] by MS Teams
on Wednesday 10 April 2024

Witness details

1. My full name is Andrew Coventry. I was born in 1991. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.
2. I am the Planning Performance Officer in the Analysis and Performance Unit (APU) in Police Scotland. My line manager is [REDACTED], who is Senior Planning Performance Officer. Tina MacLucas is Principal Analyst and she is effectively the head of the APU.
3. The APU is made up of Planning Performance Officers and the Analyst Hub, which is made up of criminal intelligence analysts and business intelligence analysts. There are Planning Performance Officers on one side and the Analysts on the other side. They both report into Tina. A Business Intelligence Co-ordinator is in charge of the Analysts Hub.
4. One of our key responsibilities in Planning Performance is the creation of the quarterly and year end performance reports. Once every quarter it's a legal requirement to report on our performance. We report on all aspects of policing. For example, we report on community wellbeing from deaths, use of force, stop

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED]

and searches, that sort of thing. We'll include that in those performance reports.

5. I also answer any performance queries and analysis on performance and criminal analysis. This depends on what type of task comes in for us. Our main role is producing those key performance documents.
6. I joined Police Scotland on 30 July 2018. I started as a Business Intelligence Analyst in the Analyst Hub. Around two years ago I moved over to a Planning Performance Officer. That was late 2021 that I moved.
7. As Business intelligence Analyst, it's a very similar role to data analysis. It's very much on quantitative data, not just crime but a whole range of topics, using various analytical methods to query the data and send back a report. I would produce different reports and analysis based on data. I was involved in building dashboards, I carried that on to my Planning Performance role so there is an overlap there in my roles.

Position on statistics in 2015

8. I am asked to explain my understanding of what data on race was collected in 2015.
9. For 2015, I am not overly familiar with it but I have a better idea from the national crime systems in place for then. It's more complicated because there were a number of crime recording systems in 2015. It will differ depending on what crime system you were looking at.
10. In 2022 Police Scotland began moving crime recording to one national system. In December 2023 this process was completed. Data has migrated over to what's called National Unifi. Since around 1 January 2024, all Divisions have been using the new national system. That means they are all recording things in the same way now.

Signature of witness..... 

11. In general terms, what we tend to capture is ethnicity, essentially race but it's called ethnicity. In 2015 in our national crime systems we record officers' perceived ethnicity of individuals and also a record ethnicity if the subject chose to enter their own data. So, we have data of self-defined ethnicity and also officers' perceived ethnicity.
12. This is recorded in the legacy crime system. For example, Crimefile was one of those systems. The west of Scotland had a different crime system. It's essentially the same data but collected in a slightly different way.
13. Some of the challenges in 2015 that hindered analysis in areas such as ethnicity is to do with how it was recorded on these different systems. One of the challenges now is if you look at victims, you could have a number of crimes on one report and the accused is linked to each individual crime, but the victim is linked to the overall crime report.
14. Just from looking at the data, with a manual trawl, you couldn't look at the individual crime, only the whole report. You can't see which crimes attach to which victims 100% of the time. Therefore we had to do a manual review of each crime report to find out.
15. This impacts on analysis of ethnicity of victims and accused relating to crimes. In the legacy crime reports from 2015, you have, for example, one black victim and one white victim. There might be 10 crimes on that crime report for one accused, and we won't know which of those crimes relates to which victim.
16. That's one of the key reasons why our hate crime data has been taken from the vulnerable persons database, not from National Unifi. We've now resolved those issues so we use National Unifi again. From 1 April 2024 we take that data from National Unifi instead of taking the data from the vulnerable person database.

Signature of witness..........

17. The methodology they've used for the new national recording system of National Unifi is one crime report per crime. The individual crime report will now not have more than one offence linked to it.
18. Legacy systems also didn't have the same description of ethnicity. For example, "white Scottish" and another is "white" or "Caucasian". Essentially what we had to do was a manual trawl, reading all the crime reports, and carry out analysis from that. We look at a large batch of crime reports and read them to get the accused's details, victim details and any other data that's relevant so we could do analysis of that in the crime system.
19. One thing we would do regularly at a Force level was, because we didn't have access to the legacy crime systems, we would have to send out a template for the local Divisions to collate that data using their legacy systems for a national picture.
20. I can't recall looking specifically at 2015 in my requests to local Divisions.
21. Ethnicity data for 2015 may have been used, collected and looked at as part of our Strategic Assessment. This is a core product used by the Analysts in the Hub. It looks at the most harmful types of crime used in analysis from there. One of those big areas was hate crime, so it may have been used as part of one of those products but I couldn't be sure.
22. There would be a whole range of analysis used within the 13 Divisions of Police Scotland, to create a local picture. That would be done by the local Divisions. We would focus on a national picture.
23. Andrew Simpson is Analyst Co-ordinator for P Division. He may be the person who would carry out local analysis of race data for Fife and Kirkcaldy for 2015.
24. I am asked if System to Co-ordinate Personnel and Establishment (Scope) is a national legacy system. Scope is still used currently. It contains people data,

Signature of witness..........

use of force data, health and safety and absence data. It includes the number of people in Police Scotland and their role. It monitors our own people's data.

- 25. Use of force by officers is covered, and staff. It is recorded on Scope when they complete their use of force form. It's the same for health and safety, for example injuring themselves in a fall. It also includes officers being injured on duty by a subject, while the use of force data contains if the subject was injured.
- 26. I don't know if it was in place in 2015. I believe it was, because there was a big change to the use of force data. That was in late 2018, early 2019. I don't believe subject data was collated at all prior to that. This change added the subject and their ethnicity, I don't believe it was collated before then. It's one of the key reasons we look, in terms of performance, at our data from 2019 for general comparisons relating to use of force.
- 27. Currently the subject's name is not recorded on use of force forms. One of the big issues with use of force data is that we don't know who that person is. We don't know how to add the ethnicity data back in retrospectively, because we don't have the data of the nominal ID.
- 28. Wit the current use of force data, we don't have names. There's nothing to identify the name of the subject. It's currently a difficulty with data analysis, because we can't see the data of who they are using it on. We only have the high-level data of subject, age and ethnicity.
- 29. I don't know why Police Scotland does not capture this data.
- 30. I am asked why this creates a difficulty in analysing data. One of the big things we want to look at is disproportionate use of force among different ethnicities. One of the metrics we look at is census data, population, we have to look at whether we have a similar use of force proportionate to those groups. So, if it's 80 white and 20 ethnic minorities. The difficulty is if we don't have a nominal ID then we don't know if we're counting people twice. We can't tell if Police Scotland is using force against the whole group or are we using force against

Signature of witness..... 

one individual who is increasing numbers. It can be the same the other way. Our data can be skewed by perceptions of using force against a group but it's mainly being used against one individual. We can only see the high level numbers.

- 31. The way the data is structured, it's very blocked out into its own section, for example a subject section for the subject then the tactics used, and everything's linked to the tactics. We can't see which tactics were used against which subjects. It's all linked to the overall use of force report. We can't see the number of tactics against each person. We can't look at why one use of force is effective and why another isn't effective. All that we can say is that here are a number of reports where a tactic was used and the ethnicity of the subjects in that report. It makes analysis more difficult to dive deeper than the high level stuff.
- 32. We can link the use of force to the ethnicity of the subject. The difficulty is when there are multiple subjects on the same report. The link is not to the person, it's to the use of force report. We don't know what tactic was used against which subject. So, we can't see how many people were handcuffed who were Asian, for example.
- 33. It's essentially the same problem I identified above, it's the way the data is grouped. Everything in the report is set up to answer specific questions and provide high level data. But it doesn't look like it was made to delve deep into analysis to answer complex questions.
- 34. For example we know this many use of force reports have this many subjects who are Asian. We will also know this is the number of times handcuffs have been used. However, it doesn't show how many of the total Asian subjects were handcuffed. It's the way the data is structured. We have to manually look at the use of force report and work out what happened if we wanted to delve any deeper.

Signature of witness..... 

- 35. We do this manual look for analysis when we've got a specific task. It's more regularly done in the business intelligence analysts.
- 36. I am asked to provide an example of a specific task I have completed in relation to race. I have not completed this myself, specifically. APU used to prepare an internal and external report to the use of force monitoring group. The internal report has now moved to a powebi dashboard but we still produce the external report. What would happen on the internal report is I would look at ethnicity factors, proportion, and raise any issues using advanced analytics. We'd look at increases and decreases in use of force. The more data we have the closer we get to the truth. The use of dashboards makes it more transparent. Everyone is using the same data, and everyone understands the limitations.
- 37. I am asked if I have raised these issues with the data I have identified above with Police Scotland. Around a year ago I sent on the technical notes. In the Dashboard it documents the calculations, limitations and difficulties. It's all front and centre. When I'm giving the verbal update, I will tell them the limitations. There are also the technical notes that explain the issues. There's a document explaining where the data comes from, the date used for the calculation eg use of force would be date of incident. For crime it would usually be the date it was raised. Beneath that is the limitations in the data, including the problems I've identified above. Anyone who accesses the Dashboard will have access to the technical notes.
- 38. As far as I've been aware there's no talk about changing these issues. However, the use of force group is looking to change the grouping type of ethnicity to reflect what's used in the census.
- 39. There's no talk of using a code per person to track a subject, but if we had that sort of thing then we could follow that code in the data and know if we are counting someone more than once. We can follow that in the vulnerable persons database if we know who they are. We could also then try to follow that person in a number of different policing systems, for example vulnerable persons, crime, incident and custody systems.

Signature of witness..........

- 40. There are various Dashboards. Your Safety Matters is for when an officer is assaulted, and the report contains an assault. OST have their own Dashboard. This is for all use of force, not just when the officer puts that they have been assaulted onto the report.
- 41. Use of spray is collected as a tactic. This is part of the use of force stuff. We tend to look at how effective the officer perceives that to be.

Statistics on race

- 42. I am asked to explain how race is now recorded.
- 43. For crime, we now have ethnicity, ethnic appearance, and now also have hate reasons and perceived race as a separate category as well. If it is a hate crime you would also fill in reasons if there is race or religion and delve deeper into that. This has been in operation since about 10 days before I gave this statement.
- 44. There can now be three different races in the same crime report. So, I could be perceived as white, I say that I'm Asian and under the hate crime data it could be completed as perceived as African. So, there can be discrepancies because of there being three ways of capturing race for victims. It's hard to say how that will shape out because it's just been in place for 10 days.
- 45. I am asked if I am aware of the policy and strategy in relation to race data collection, analysis and monitoring.
- 46. Broadly speaking, I'm not aware of this policy and strategy.
- 47. That is mainly done through the Data Governance Group. Calum Dundas is head of data strategy. Essential the way it should work now is we engage with Data Governance and make decisions as a whole through them. They govern the data and we help monitor it. We help the Police Scotland statistical team.

Signature of witness..........

For example there is the hate crime button yes/no, and 7 hate aggregators, and specific hate crime legislation.

48. The methodology that was agreed is whether it is a hate crime under a piece of legislation or whether there a hate aggregator.
49. One point I've raised is that it's not the officer's fault if they click that it's a hate crime but they don't say the aggravator. We've been told not to count that a hate crime had occurred if they don't say the aggravator. We are now monitoring this to alter and fix these records and add an aggregator or modify our counting method to account for this.
50. It's one of the challenges we have. Especially for victim's ethnicity, where it's not clear which one is the ethnicity. Is it what the victim chooses, noting that we're victim-centred and we don't want to put pressure on the victim to provide this information, or do we go on what the officer perceives them to be? Or if it's a hate crime, do we look at the perceived race on the hate crime report? So, one challenge is knowing what our go-to methodology is going to be for monitoring race. That will go through the governance group.
51. We have the notes from the methodology. Most things in national performance are written down to give transparency about what we're counting to be included in the report.
52. I am asked if I am aware of any conclusions from analysis on race relating to the position in 2015.
53. I have nothing for 2015, no specific examples for this specific time frame.
54. But in general, when being asked to look at analysis, with greater access to the data, you tend to always look at the ethnic group to see if there's anything to note there. So, for example if you're looking at assaults, you look at ethnicity, your conclusion might be that there are more assaults on a specific ethnic group.

Signature of witness..........

- 55. Analysing the data for a particular region is a lot easier now that we have increased latitude and longitude data so we can look at specific area where victims of a specific ethnicity will be. This looks at Divisions or Subdivisions as well. We can look at what's happening in Fife, or Kirkcaldy, for example. We can look through ethnicity per Division as well.
- 56. For use of force, we don't have the latitude and longitude data. But for crime data we can dig all the way down to exact coordinates of the crime, the victim and the accused.
- 57. For stop and search data, I haven't look at that database in too much detail. Stop and search data would usually be done by another Planning Performance Officer in my team. It's not normally done by me.

Quarterly performance reports

- 58. We are responsible for reporting to the SPA. It's discussed at one of their performance board meetings. We create the report, it's published externally, and it's discussed at the SPA quarterly meetings. Tina MacLucas would be better to explain this in more detail.
- 59. There's one report per quarter. There's also the Chief Constable's year-end report. Q4 is basically the year-end report and also the Chief Constable's year-end report so that is a busy quarter.
- 60. The performance reports are publicly available on Police Scotland's website.
- 61. In every report we highlight hate crime. I don't think we ever went into an ethnicity breakdown in the performance report to do with race. I believe this data is published as well. We did produce the data on race. I'm sure you would find some mention of ethnicity in the text.
- 62. There is also benchmarking of the Q3 report which shows benchmarking compared to England and Wales. I think recently this was on transgender data.

Signature of witness..........

We do this to compare our data with England and Wales. I think they release their data twice a year, which makes it a little more difficult.

- 63. Our year-end report is published about the same time as England and Wales, which is June or July. By Q1 we have access to their year-end stuff for our comparisons. We also get a lot of Freedom of Information requests about hate crime asking about race, religion etc.
- 64. The process for creating the report is data collection. We have a performance framework that is published, we're governed by it. It is signed off by the SPA. We report based on that. The performance framework is available online and refreshed annually. Basically, it starts with data collection from around Police Scotland, statistical team, individual Units, and then we gather that and simmer it down to what is relevant for the report.
- 65. Right now, we're trying to move to performance by exception, in other words: is there data that we need to bring up? This makes the report smaller, more accessible and easier to read.
- 66. We also go back and forth with other units and end up with about 7 or 8 drafts of the report.
- 67. I am asked if I know of any examples of reporting of race data to the SPA. I can't think off hand of any examples. I can't think if we go into that level of detail showing numbers of ethnic minority crimes, missing persons per ethnicity, that sort of thing. I think in these performance reports we don't go into that level of granularity.
- 68. I am asked how the analysis and data is reported. It's now done more through Dashboards. It can be a quick report. It depends on the senior officers and staff, what they want and how it's to be displayed. Some officers might want to look. They might want a specific Dashboard for a problem. For example, violence against women and girls is a specific area.

Signature of witness.....

 .

- 69. We also look at a high-level performance Dashboard across the force. This looks at confidence in policing, anti-social behaviour, custody, missing persons – it's a single source of truth for performance data. It's supposed to be a high-level way to make the data accessible and transparent. There will be a long set of technical notes accompanying them.

- 70. I am asked if we proactively analyse the data and provide information to Police Scotland of our own initiative. This is one of our main tasks. We might proactively look at an increase in assaults, we might look into why that increase is occurring and delve into it a bit deeper and feed that in. If we have the time we will look at different areas.

- 71. Each Planning Performance Officer, most of them, have a Division they would look at for performance. I have Glasgow, and I would look proactively at that data. I would contact the division to ask if any analysis had already been completed that would explain this and, if not, proactively ask their data officer to carry out analysis into this point. So, I might see a large decrease in a particular crime and I would then be seeking an explanation. Now the data is accessible and transparent it is easier to analyse.

- 72. We have a threat register that Tina MacLucas might be able to explain better than me. Our request to local analysts might be by a simple email, or writing a full report for what is required. It's open form how we would approach that.

- 73. I am asked if I think this system of proactively identifying issues is sufficient to pick up issues of race in the data. I would say no, because of the proper way we are looking at the data. It depends on the system. For use of force we're more on top of that than general crime. Crime is more complicated because of the data split between race of victim, the perceived race and the hate crime perceived race. There are improvement we can make in terms of how we record the data and there should be some governance on this.

Signature of witness..... 

74. If the race statistics issues were resolved, and speaking for my own areas, I have raised use of force issues with ethnicity and the groups I have given feedback to about the conclusions from the data has been effective.
75. However I don't think analysis and performance is given enough weight for how things would be recorded in our national crime recording system (Unifi). Things are normally brought up and we say things might need to be different. At that table, senior people in Police Scotland are interpreting data that are not familiar with in terms of analysis and statistical reporting. We are not sighted on all the work that goes into our national crime system, for example, hate crime recording. We (APU) weren't consulted on this. That's how we've ended up with three separate ways of recording a victim's ethnicity/race, which then has impacts on analysis as depending on which method we use we will produce different results and conclusions.
76. Also, two years ago a colleague and I made a request to put in a way of identifying any crime against an officer or staff member on duty into your national crime system. That would let us monitor all crime against on duty officers or staff. The user group then brings up a new way of dealing with it, which we already have, and created duplication. I feel that a lot of these decisions were taken by people who don't understand all impacts this has on analysis. For example, I know that officers rarely put themselves as victims on a crime report, which has now made it harder for us to say how they're meant to record that they're a victim of a crime report. Essentially, they need to record it twice, once on the nominal then once attached to the crime, which they don't understand. I think not enough evidence is used for how the database works by the groups who set this.
77. In terms of us raising these issues with the data that shows, for example, use of force against a specific ethnic group, everyone should be aware of this from the Dashboard and I would raise that directly in an email, or wait until the use of force monitoring group convenes and speak then. But I would raise that

Signature of witness..........

immediately in an email and seek resolution. I can only speak to what I've been involved in.

Statistics and training

- 78. I am asked how my collection and processing of statistics feeds into training.

- 79. Training is heavily used with OST based on data conclusions. Our reports have led to quite significant training changes on how OST have approached their new training program. The Your Safety Matters group sent us (APU) a task for how effective OST's new two day training was. We defined effectiveness as how many officers are injured, because we can track that. We noticed that officers who had completed the training were less likely to be injured by an assault compared to officers who had not completed the training. We also found that the effectiveness of the training decreased as time increased. The closer an officer had completed the training the less likely they were to be injured from an assault.

- 80. We can also look at where the training is effective. We saw that training is less likely to be effective in police vehicles and in police premises. So, we looked at data and completed analysis on police vehicles. We then found that they didn't have specific training to deal with subjects and vehicles. I believe following that analysis we have introduced OST training within vehicles for the first time. That then went into practice to increase officer/subject safety. This also led to a trial running the OST more frequently and see if that continues to reduce the risk of injury. That is the next step. Depending on how that goes and what the data looks like.

- 81. I am asked if I have any similar examples where data on race has been used. I'm not aware of anything that has.

- 82. I am asked if there is a similar proactive approach to data that is relevant to training. It's more likely that we will need a task requested, because we

Signature of witness..... 

wouldn't want to duplicate work being done in training already. They might go external for a review and evaluation of the task. So, we wouldn't want to do a training related task proactively.

83. I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that this statement may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website.

April 26, 2024 | 12:00 PM BST

Date.....Signature of witness.....