

Use of Force Performance Pack
Produced by Strategic Governance

Dates Covered:

01/04/2026 30/06/2026

Caveats

Please note, data in this report is based on each individual form submitted by an officer, not individuals force is used on or the distinct incidents unless stated otherwise.

Use of force data is beset by data quality issues across many of the fields that are recorded. All analysis needs to be viewed with this in mind as a result.

Forms

Counts are based on a distinct count of a unique ID field for each form.

This will have an effect on the counting of number of tactics used. The counts are not the number of times each tactic was used, but how many times that tactic appeared at least once on the form. So, for example, if an officer has recorded that they have used unarmed skills on 6 occasions within one use of force form, the count will treat that as 1 rather than 6. So the counts show the number of times that tactic appeared at least once on the use of force form.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity is based on a combination of self defined and officer defined ethnicity.

Self defined takes priority, but where the self-defined ethnicity is not recorded the officer defined is used as a substitute.

It is possible that the person is recorded as having different ethnicities across forms even within the same incident.

Please note, that self defined and officer defined are not recorded in the same way. It is not possible for an officer to record someone as Mixed ethnicity.

Summing of Percentages

Please note, percentages will often add up to more than 100%. This is because an officer can record more than one impact factor or reason, for example, on the form.

Subject Behaviour

Several categories are contained in this column. Only one of these options can be selected.

Compliant behaviour is based on the number of times someone is being recorded as 'Compliant'.

Resistance focuses on where the subject is recorded as resisting, from passive resistance to serious or aggravated resistance.

Verbal/gestures has not been included in either count.

Duplicates

Due to the complexity of identifying duplicates in this data they have not been removed.

With multiple forms for particular incidents able to be recorded, it's not clear how these could be identified and removed accurately.

High Level Overview

7766
Forms

3.09
Per 1000

1.59
Total Dispro


This pack details information on Use of Force within Thames Valley Police for the following time period: 01/04/2026 - 30/06/2026.

There were 7766 use of force forms submitted in this period, with an overall disproportionality ratio of 1.59. There were 3.09 forms completed per 1000 of the population.

The figure on the bottom left shows the number of times body worn video was used where it was available. BWV was not available to be used 8.61% of the time.

Disproportionality was highest for those of black ethnic origin, with a ratio of 3.87. This means a black person was around 3 times as likely to have force used on them as a white person. Please note this is based on a count of each individual form, so it does not refer to an individual subject.

BWV Used?



33.92%
Compliant Handcuffing Only (%)

4320
Individuals - Distinct

420
Taser

Subject profile

This page outlines the subject profile of those who have had force used on them in the specified time period (see front of pack). The top of the page shows ethnicity and gender breakdowns, whereas the bottom shows age grouping and whether the subject was perceived to have physical or mental health impairments by the officer.

Below is a breakdown of the number of form submitted for each LCU and the per 1000 information for each area.

Figure 1: Force by LCU

LCU	Forms	Population	Per 1000
Milton Keynes	1054	287040	3.67
Berkshire East	1516	436596	3.47
Berkshire West	1706	513320	3.32
Buckinghamshire	1498	553035	2.71
Oxfordshire	1938	725280	2.67
Total	**7712**	**2515271**	**3.07**

Figure 2: Use of Force by Ethnicity

Ethnicity (Combined)	Forms	%
Asian	836	10.76%
Black	984	12.67%
Mixed	365	4.70%
Other	144	1.85%
Unknown	108	1.39%
White	5329	68.62%
Total	**7766**	**100.00%**

Figure 3: Use of Force by Gender





Figure 4: Use of Force by Age Group (Officer Perceived)



283
Self-Defined Physical Health Condition

1817
Self-Defined Mental Health Condition

359
Self-Defined Mental & Physical Cond...

Figure 5: Use of Force by Location





Figure 6: Reasons for using force: prevalence on forms by ethnicity

Reason	Forms	White	Eth Min	Asian	Black	Mixed	Other
Prevent Escape	54.31%	53.65%	56.18%	53.01%	57.14%	58.60%	62.22%
Effect Arrest	52.69%	52.73%	52.79%	53.76%	51.56%	55.69%	48.15%
Prevent Harm	48.03%	49.52%	44.59%	44.24%	47.58%	39.36%	39.26%
Prevent Offence	31.69%	31.59%	31.58%	33.33%	31.58%	28.57%	28.89%
Secure Evidence	16.45%	14.61%	20.57%	20.30%	20.95%	20.41%	20.00%
Effect stop and search	15.65%	13.06%	21.98%	22.68%	22.02%	19.53%	23.70%
Remove Handcuffs	10.91%	10.36%	12.10%	13.03%	11.71%	11.08%	11.85%
Effect search in Custody	6.87%	7.09%	6.39%	5.26%	8.16%	5.83%	2.22%
Effect other search	3.58%	3.45%	3.85%	4.01%	3.22%	4.66%	5.19%
Other	2.02%	2.02%	2.04%	2.63%	1.93%	0.58%	2.96%
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**

Figure 7: Impact Factors by Ethnicity: prevalence on forms by ethnicity

Impact Factors	Forms	White	EthMin	Asian	Black	Mixed	Other
Alcohol	38.19%	42.67%	27.52%	27.37%	28.10%	26.87%	26.06%
Mental Health	32.13%	35.56%	24.62%	21.49%	26.56%	25.48%	27.46%
Drugs	31.81%	32.59%	30.20%	29.65%	31.18%	30.75%	25.35%
Prior Knowledge	29.93%	30.44%	28.69%	27.97%	28.21%	31.58%	28.87%
Size/Gender/Build	19.34%	18.81%	20.73%	15.61%	26.26%	16.90%	22.54%
Possession of a Weapon	16.66%	14.78%	21.07%	20.77%	24.41%	15.51%	14.08%
Other	11.02%	10.38%	12.59%	13.45%	11.69%	12.19%	14.79%
Crowd	9.45%	8.73%	10.30%	10.20%	10.87%	9.97%	7.75%
Acute Behavioural Disorder	1.13%	1.17%	1.00%	0.60%	1.23%	1.66%	
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**

Figure 8: Top 5 forms by Officer Duty



Reasons, Impact Factors, Locations, and Officer Duty

This page shows the reasons, impact factors, locations, and officer duties when using force.

Please note, percentages will add up to more than 100% as officers can record more than one impact factor and reason per form.

Figures 6 and 7 each shows the prevalence of each impact factor and reason on each form, and then break this down by prevalence on the form for each ethnic group.

This allows for a comparison to see which impact factors and reasons may be driving use of force against each ethnic group more or less than others.

For example, alcohol is an impact factor recorded far more consistently where the subject is recorded as white, and recorded far less where they are ethnic minority.

Behaviours

This page shows subject behaviours as recorded on each individual use of force form.

This focuses on splitting out resistance and compliance through most visuals.

Resistance includes active resistance, aggressive resistance, passive resistance, and serious or aggravated resistance.

Figure 12 details where the officer has recorded that they were spat at in the incident by the impact factors that they have recorded on the form.

Finally, figure 13 at the bottom of the page shows where the subject has been recorded as compliant vs disaggregated forms of resistance.

This visual shows prevalence on the forms, and then prevalence broken down by each ethnic group.

Figure 9: Resistance by perceived age




Figure 10: Resistance by Gender




Figure 11: Subject Behaviour by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Forms	Compliant	Resistance
Asian	10.92%	15.55%	8.07%
Black	12.85%	13.93%	12.29%
Mixed	4.77%	5.92%	4.08%
Other	1.88%	2.32%	1.57%
White	69.59%	62.28%	73.98%
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**

Figure 12: Officer spat at by impact factors




Figure 13: Subject ethnicity by behaviour (disaggregated)

Subject Behaviour	Forms	White	EthMin	Asian	Black	Mixed	Other
Compliant	36.93%	33.17%	46.08%	53.17%	40.04%	46.08%	46.51%
Active resistance	30.15%	32.69%	24.20%	19.84%	26.81%	28.01%	21.71%
Passive resistance	15.44%	15.20%	15.93%	16.14%	16.57%	12.65%	18.60%
Aggressive resistance	15.02%	16.17%	12.10%	9.39%	14.24%	12.05%	13.18%
Serious or aggravated resistance	2.46%	2.76%	1.70%	1.46%	2.34%	1.20%	
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**

This page shows details on threats towards officers within an incident.

Figures 14 and 16 show threats made by subject ethnicity and gender. They provide a comparison of the proportion on the form against the proportion of threats made by each grouping.

Please note that the percentages will count that a threat has been made, not each individual threat offered. So it shows that a subject threatened the officer in some way, it doesn't count that they were threatened with a knife and a firearm, for example.

Figure 15 shows threats by the recorded behaviour shown by the subject, and figure 17 shows the top 10 tactics used by officers when the subject had threatened them.

Finally, there are various cards showing whether the officer had intelligence of weapons, reported violence by a third party, and shows how many times an officer had recorded the subject as spitting at them.

Figure 14: Forms and Threats by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Forms	Threats
Asian	10.92%	13.71%
Black	12.85%	11.29%
Mixed	4.77%	2.42%
Other	1.88%	
White	69.59%	72.58%
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**

Figure 15: Threat by Subject Behaviour


Subject Behaviour	Threats
Active resistance	33
Aggressive resistance	29
Serious or aggravated resistance	23
Passive resistance	17
Verbal / Gestures	16
Compliant	11

Figure 16: Forms and Threats by Gender

Gender	Forms	Threats
Female	14.17%	
Male	82.68%	100.00%
Other	3.15%	
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**

1393
Intelligence - Weapons

Figure 17: Top 10 Tactics Used when Threatened



Threats

129
Threats

990
Violence - Reported

177
Officer spat at

Assaults & Injuries

101

Injured from assault

This page shows information where an officer has recorded an injury to themselves.

This splits out where they were injured through being assaulted, where they were injured but not from an assault, and where they were assaulted but not injured.

Instances where the officer was not assaulted have been excluded.

The page also shows the level of violence experienced. This ranges from no violence, actual violence, threatened violence, to violence as reported by a third party (this was only consistently recorded from July 24).

Assaults are also split out by the various impact factors recorded on the forms.

Figure 18: Officer Injured or Assaulted

Officer Injured	Forms	%
I was not injured but was assaulted	333	63.07%
I was injured as a result of an assault	101	19.13%
I was injured but not as a result of an assault	94	17.80%
Total	**528**	**100.00%**

Figure 19: Level of Violence





Figure 20: Injuries and assaults by LCU

LCU	Injured from assault	Assaulted but not injured	Injured but not from assault
Berkshire East	22	56	16
Berkshire West	24	64	24
Buckinghamshire	17	66	20
Milton Keynes	14	57	12
Oxfordshire	23	86	19
Total	**100**	**329**	**91**

Figure 21: Assaults and injuries by Impact Factor



Disproportionality by LCU

Figure 22: Asian

Incident LCU	Forms	Population	per 1000	Dispro
Buckinghamshire	212	68294	3.10	1.35
Oxfordshire	141	46379	3.04	1.32
Berkshire West	155	59729	2.60	0.90
Berkshire East	280	103048	2.72	0.83
Milton Keynes	43	35636	1.21	0.34
Total	**831**	**313086**	**2.65**	**0.99**

Figure 23: Black

Incident LCU	Forms	Population	per 1000	Dispro
Oxfordshire	196	14850	13.20	5.72
Buckinghamshire	171	14233	12.01	5.24
Berkshire West	239	18901	12.64	4.40
Berkshire East	173	17353	9.97	3.03
Milton Keynes	191	27882	6.85	1.95
Total	**970**	**93219**	**10.41**	**3.87**

Figure 24: White

Incident LCU	Forms	Population	per 1000
Milton Keynes	724	206081	3.51
Berkshire East	943	286945	3.29
Berkshire West	1170	407122	2.87
Oxfordshire	1455	630090	2.31
Buckinghamshire	1014	442234	2.29
Total	**5306**	**1972472**	**2.69**

Figure 25: Mixed

Incident LCU	Forms	Population	per 1000	Dispro
Milton Keynes	69	11723	5.89	1.68
Oxfordshire	78	22634	3.45	1.49
Berkshire West	78	18429	4.23	1.47
Buckinghamshire	65	19556	3.32	1.45
Berkshire East	71	15384	4.62	1.40
Total	**361**	**87726**	**4.12**	**1.53**

Figure 26: Other

Incident LCU	Forms	Population	Per 1000	Dispro
Oxfordshire	44	11327	3.88	1.68
Berkshire West	35	9139	3.83	1.33
Buckinghamshire	20	8718	2.29	1.00
Milton Keynes	18	5718	3.15	0.90
Berkshire East	23	13866	1.66	0.50
Total	**140**	**48768**	**2.87**	**1.07**

Figure 27: Tactics used (Distinct)

Tactics	Forms	% Forms
Unarmed skills	3609	46.47%
Compliant Handcuffing	2666	34.33%
Non compliant Handcuffing	1818	23.41%
Compliant handcuffing (ONLY TACTIC USED)	723	9.31%
Ground restraint	700	9.01%
Other / improvised	411	5.29%
Limb/Body restraints	407	5.24%
Taser	404	5.20%
Other restraint	195	2.51%
Spit guard	136	1.75%
Irritant spray - used	125	1.61%
Irritant spray - drawn	89	1.15%
Firearms	49	0.63%
Baton drawn	29	0.37%
Baton used	29	0.37%
Less Lethal weapon	11	0.14%
Dog deployed	9	0.12%
Shield	6	0.08%
Dog biting	5	0.06%
AEP drawn	2	0.03%
AEP used	1	0.01%
Total	**7766**	**100.00%**

Figure 28: Compliant handcuffing only vs not compliant handcuffing by age (%)





Figure 29: Compliant handcuffing only vs not compliant handcuffing by ethnicity (%)



Tactics

This page breaks down tactics used.

It shows splits of compliant handcuffing only against cases where something other than compliant handcuffing was also used and breaks this down as proportions against age and ethnic groups. Below you can see the proportion of forms using certain numbers of tactics. All forms must have at least one tactic. Where a form does not, it is removed from the data.

Please note, the Tactics used (Distinct) table used a distinct count of tactics. In other words if, for example, someone has recorded unarmed skills 6 times on one form, this will only be counted once.

Figure 30: Tactics by Tactic Number

Tactic No.	% Forms
First Tactic Used	100.00%
Second Tactic Used	35.46%
Third Tactic Used	12.57%
Fourth Tactic Used	4.53%
Fifth Tactic Used	1.61%
Sixth Tactic Used	0.70%
Seventh Tactic Used	0.36%
Eighth Tactic Used	0.13%
Total	**100.00%**

Figure 35: Compliant Handcuffing Only by Ethnicity (Combined)

Ethnicity	Forms (%)	Compliant Handcuffing Only (%)	More than Compliant Handcuffing Only (%)
Asian	10.92%	15.24%	8.68%
Black	12.85%	13.44%	12.54%
Mixed	4.77%	5.59%	4.34%
Other	1.88%	2.60%	1.51%
White	69.59%	63.12%	72.93%
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**

Figure 36: Not Compliant Handcuffing Only vs Compliant Handcuffing Only by Incident LCU





Figure 37: Compliant Handcuffing Only vs Not Compliant Handcuffing Only by Impact Factor (%)



48

Injured - compliant handcuffing only

579

Injured - not compliant handcuffing only

Figure 38: Compliant handcuffing only and not compliant handcuffing only by reason

Reason	Compliant Handcuffing	%	Not Compliant Handcuffing Only	(%)
Prevent Escape	1495	60.14%	2448	51.28%
Effect Arrest	1398	56.23%	2427	50.84%
Prevent Harm	870	35.00%	2617	54.82%
Effect stop and search	690	27.76%	446	9.34%
Prevent Offence	669	26.91%	1632	34.19%
Secure Evidence	593	23.85%	601	12.59%
Remove Handcuffs	347	13.96%	445	9.32%
Effect other search	91	3.66%	169	3.54%
Effect search in Custody	38	1.53%	461	9.66%
Other	8	0.32%	139	2.91%
Total	**2486**	**100.00%**	**4774**	**100.00%**

Compliant Handcuffing Only vs Not Compliant Handcuffing only

33.92%

Compliant Handcuffing Only (%)

This page breaks out use of force into a comparison of instances where only compliant handcuffing is recorded against where the officer has said other tactics separate from compliant handcuffing were used.

This is visualised by ethnic group against total number of forms, by Incident LCU, by impact factors and reasons, and then shows the number of times someone has been recorded as injured in some way when the tactics were only compliant handcuffing and not just compliant handcuffing.

Please note, it is possible that the injuries were not caused by the use of force itself. Additionally, it is not possible to tell from the data which type of force caused an injury.

Injuries

413

Individual Subjects Injured

This page breaks down the number of times the subject has been recorded as injured on the use of force form.

Unless otherwise stated, this is not injuries caused to distinct individuals but where an injury has been recorded on the form.

The above visual 'Individual Subjects Injured' and figure 41 both show the number of times an individual subject was injured.

All other visuals base the counts on injuries recorded on each form. This means there may be some double counting.

Injury per 1000 is based on a comparison to the population that force has been used on, not comparison to census population.

Figure 39: Injuries by Gender - Prevalence on form against prevelance of injury by gender

Gender	Forms	Injury
Female	19.83%	17.86%
Indeterminate	0.03%	
Other	0.05%	
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**

Figure 40: Injury by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Forms	Injury Combined	Injury - per 1000
Asian	10.92%	7.12%	52.63
Black	12.85%	8.25%	51.83
Mixed	4.77%	4.37%	73.97
Other	1.88%	1.29%	55.56
White	69.59%	78.96%	91.57
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**80.70**

Figure 41: Individuals - Distinct by Subject Injury Level




Figure 42: Injuries by Age Group




Figure 43: Under 18 by Month Year




Figure 44: Under 18 by LCU

Incident LCU	Under 18	%
Berkshire West	232	24.63%
Oxfordshire	218	23.14%
Berkshire East	179	19.00%
Milton Keynes	165	17.52%
Buckinghamshire	148	15.71%
Total	**942**	**100.00%**

12.19%

Proportion U18s

75

Injury - U18

Figure 45: Under 18 by Ethnicity

Ethnicity Combined	Under 18	%
Asian	80	8.45%
Black	146	15.42%
Mixed	100	10.56%
Other	17	1.80%
Unknown	14	1.48%
White	590	62.30%
Total	**947**	**100.00%**

U18s

296

Compliant Handcuffing Only

This page analyses use of force forms where the subject was recorded as under 18.

Figure 43 shows force used over a 24 month time period, with an average of 282 use of force forms per month.

Figure 44 gives a breakdown of the number of forms completed for under 18s by each LCU with percentage of the total.

Figure 45 gives the figures for under 18s by ethnicity, showing how many forms were filled out for each ethnic group where the subject's age was under 18 in the data.

Notes

Self-Defined Ethnicity

Asian

A1. Indian; A2. Pakistani; A3. Bangladeshi; A4. Chinese; A9. Any other Asian background

Black

B1. Caribbean; B2. African; B9. Any other Black background

Mixed / Multiple

M1. White and Black Caribbean; M2. White and Black African; M3. White and Asian; M9. Any other mixed

Not stated

NS. Not stated

Other

O2. Arab; O9. Any other

White

W1. British; W2. Irish; W3. Gypsy or Irish Traveller; W9. Any other white background

Officer Perceived

Unknown; White - North European; White - South European; Black; Asian; Chinese, Japanese, SE Asian; Middle Eastern

Notes

All population statistics are taken from the 2021 Census published 29th November 2022.

Why use per 1000 population?

Showing the incidence rate per 1000 of population makes comparisons between different areas easier, especially when the population size in those areas differs.

Populations by LCU

LCU	Asian	Black	Mixed	Other	White	Total
Berkshire East	103048	17353	15384	13866	286945	436596
Berkshire West	59729	18901	18429	9139	407122	513320
Buckinghamshire	68294	14233	19556	8718	442234	553035
Milton Keynes	35636	27882	11723	5718	206081	287040
Oxfordshire	46379	14850	22634	11327	630090	725280
Total	**313086**	**93219**	**87726**	**48768**	**1972472**	**2515271**