

Cumbria Police Authority

Policing Plan and Performance Committee

22 February 2010

Agenda Item No. 6

Part I

Proposals for targets and measures 2010

A report by the Chief Constable

1. Summary

This paper proposes a performance framework of targets and measures to enable the Authority to effectively scrutinise the Constabulary's performance and delivery of the Policing Plan on behalf of the people of Cumbria.

There is no proposal to change the current reporting format recently agreed by Policing Plan and Performance Committee.

The framework will be used by the Constabulary in its performance management processes.

2. Recommendation

That Policing Plan and Performance Committee:

- Consider the proposed targets and measures and agree the reporting framework, subject to any amendments agreed by the Committee,
- note the developments being undertaken in the areas of protective services, sickness and diversity measures, reducing repeat victims and victim satisfaction with antisocial behaviour over the next few months.
- Note the next steps.

3. Details

3.1 The Police Authority has considered strategic drivers in national and local policing, partners priorities and objectives, key strategic options for Cumbria, priorities for the next three years and the headline targets to measure performance against the priority objectives and the budget available (Police Authority 17 February 2010).

3.2 The proposed targets and measures framework is based on an approach which aims to:

- maintain the strategic overview by helping the understanding of performance overall
- reflect the priority of citizen focus against a background of good performance and low levels of crime (i.e. it will focus on

outcomes and service delivery for the public rather than inputs from the Constabulary)

- provide focus on the measures appropriate for Cumbria
- minimise bureaucracy on data collection, management and reporting
- remove measures that are currently collected but which add no value

3.3 This can be achieved by having a targets and measures framework made up of:

- i. A small number of headline targets aligned to priorities and focusing on outcomes for communities – safer and stronger Cumbria.
- ii. A suite of measures that will always be reported on to ensure strategic overview and allow focus on areas of importance. These are called *general measures*. The table in Appendix 1 shows what these are and the rationale for including them. These are not targets and so will not have numeric objectives, but an aspiration to improve on current level of performance.
- iii. Exception measures, which will ensure consistent performance standards across the range of policing activity. Exceptions will be based on comparative performance plus significant trends OR an acceptable performance range (especially where numbers are low).

3.4 The proposals have been developed in consultation with a group of senior officers, staff and the PA Performance Officer, led by the ACCs.

3.5 Appendix 2 identifies where the APACS measures are included in the framework.

3.6 The proposed developments before the year end are as follows:

- Development of a CID performance framework which will include protective services, using a balanced scorecard approach. To provide information about value for money.
- Development of the personnel sickness targets, using year end data and reporting measures about attendance and position in relation to peer group (as reported to Police Authority on 17 February)
- Development of further diversity measures, possibly to be reported to the Personnel Committee
- Development of domestic abuse measures – achievable after implementation of the SLEUTH PVP Module – to provide a rounded picture.

- Development of antisocial behaviour victim satisfaction measures and reducing repeat victims measures for crime and antisocial behaviour. Both these are likely in quarter 1 of 2010 – 2011.

3.7 Next steps – internal consultation with Senior Managers' Forum on Thursday 18 February, to agree proposals and establish baseline figures.

Mr Craig Mackey
Chief Constable

22 February 2010

Human Rights Act Implications:

No direct human rights implications.

Race, Diversity and Gender Implications:

The targets and measures proposed support delivery and monitoring of the Policing Plan. The Policing Plan aims to support and promote equality and diversity

Risk Management Implications

The Policing Plan fully reflects risk management activities in the constabulary.

Background documents: Non Applicable

Contact: Jane Sauntson, Strategic Development, Cumbria Constabulary,
01768 217155

Appendix 1

Table showing overview of proposed targets and measures

Priority	Headline Target	General Measures		Exception measures
		Measure	Rationale for including	
	Numeric objective	Maintain current performance level with aspiration to improve		Exception based on comparative performance plus significant trends OR an acceptable performance range.
	Reported to PPP every quarter	Reported to PPP every quarter		Only reported when in exception
<p>We will protect Protecting people from harm and saving lives.</p> <p>We will prevent Preventing crime and antisocial behaviour, ensuring that roads are safe and preventing terrorism.</p> <p>We will prosecute Making sure that crimes are detected, criminals are caught and people are brought to justice.</p>	<p>Improve public confidence by increasing the percentage of people who agree that the police and local councils are dealing with crime and antisocial behaviour that matters to them in their area.</p> <p>The targets are: 60.8% of people agreeing by end March 2011 64.8% of people agreeing by end March 2012</p> <p>NOTE: All the BCS indicators supporting confidence will be provided to PPP as outlined in Appendix 3(BCS Confidence Product).</p>	All crime	Identifies overall trends and is integral to main target (maintaining low levels of crime is major driver in delivering confidence)	Serious violent crime rate Serious acquisitive crime rate
		All antisocial behaviour	Identifies overall trends and is integral to main target (maintaining low levels of antisocial behaviour are major driver in delivering confidence).	Complaints dealt with within legislative timeframes Domestic homicide rate
		All detections	Identifies overall trends for solving crimes, is an outcome measure that is relevant to people and is integral to main target (via phrase 'dealing with')	Gun crime rate Knife crime rate
		Performance measures for all points in the Policing Pledge	Major driver for delivering confidence. Measures will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Victim satisfaction measures by whole experience, activity type and crime type and comparison between white and BME victims Mystery shopping will provide measures for responding to messages, access & opening times, quality & timeliness of updates, quantity and quality of engagement activity Visibility of neighbourhood officers Complaints about incivility Call answering times Response times 	Serious violent offences brought to justice Serious acquisitive offences brought to justice Sanction detection rate for racially and religiously aggravated crimes Serious sexual offences brought to justice Asset recovery
		Burglary in a dwelling	This crime has a significant impact on victims Identified as priority in public consultation Is on all NIM strategic assessments	Adult re-offending rate Youth re-offending rate

Priority	Headline Target	General Measures		Exception measures
		Measure	Rationale for including	
As previous page	As previous page	Assaults with less serious injury	Performance is good and improving but this is an important proxy measure for alcohol related crime. Perceptions of drunk/rowdy behaviour is partnership priority (LAA)	First time youth offending Drug related Class A offending
		Criminal damage	Vandalism was identified as high priority in public consultation Damage to vehicles is the biggest demand for the Constabulary NIM strategic priority for all BCUs An indicator for antisocial behaviour	
		Vehicle crime	Strongly and inextricably linked to criminal damage and is NIM strategic priority for all BCUs	
		Prolific and Priority Offenders	Significant outcome measure as contributor to reducing reoffending. Is a partnership priority(LAA) and activity Has significant investment	
		Road traffic casualties	National targets for casualty reduction are valid until 2010 Dangerous driving was identified as high priority in public consultation	
		Domestic violence incidents	Identified in the CAA as major issue for Cumbria Seeking to increase confidence in services through increased reporting of incidents Is a partnership priority (LAA)	
	NOTE : In development over the next few months (post PVP implementation)	This measure will include the following:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First time reports • Number incidents that are repeats (but not MARAC) by victim and by perpetrator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APACS MARAC measure for repeats • % of offences reported resulting in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ recorded crime ○ arrest ○ sanction detection ○ conviction ○ caution/tic ○ no further action 		

Priority	Headline Targets	General Measures		Exception measures
		Measure	Rationale for including	
<p>We will deliver a professional service Making sure that we respond to communities' concerns and have an organisation that can deliver quality services, effectively and efficiently.</p> <p>We will have pride in what we do and who we are. Making sure that we support staff to deliver services professionally.</p>	<p>Achieve our three-year target of becoming 10.3% more efficient by March 2011 by delivering budget savings of £1.6 million and increasing efficiency to the value of £1.5 million</p> <p>Identify £6 million budget savings and ways to become more efficient to the value of £ 3 million over three years</p>	Police Use of Resources Score	Value for money ranking which is of public interest and government focus. Note that this will only be reported once a year	<p>Minority ethnic police officer recruitment</p> <p>Female police officer representation</p> <p>Further suite of diversity measures to be developed regarding workforce</p>
	<p>Reduce working hours lost to sickness for police officers to 61 hours per annum</p> <p>NOTE: This is subject to further work depending on year end position</p>	Attendance rates	<p>Reporting format similar to other forces Is a positive measure and therefore may provides better incentive Will include restricted and recuperative information</p>	
	<p>Reduce working hours lost to sickness for police staff to 54 hours per annum</p> <p>NOTE: This is subject to further work depending on year end position</p>	Attendance rates	<p>Reporting format similar to other forces Is a positive measure and therefore may provides better incentive Will include restricted and recuperative information</p>	

Appendix 2

The relationship between the different performance management frameworks

Assessment of Policing & Community Safety (APACS)	National Indicator (NI)	Public Service Agreement (PSA)	In Local Area Agree (LAA)	Measure	Proposed framework			Provided in BCS Confidence Product – Supporting Data
					Headline	General	Exception	
1.1		24		Satisfaction with service delivery (Police)		✓		
1.2				Comparative satisfaction with service delivery (Police)		✓		
1.3				Satisfaction with service delivery (racist incidents)		✓		
1.4		24		Satisfaction with service delivery (CJS)				✓
2.1	27			Understanding local concerns (agencies)				✓
2.2	21	23		Dealing with local concerns (agencies)	✓			
2.3				Residents perception of police performance				✓
2.4		24		Confidence in effectiveness of the CJS				✓
2.5		24		Confidence in fairness of the CJS				✓
3.1				Minority ethnic police officer recruitment			✓	
3.2				Female police officer representation			✓	
4.1	17	23		Perception of anti-social behaviour				✓
4.2	41	25	✓	Perception of drunk or rowdy behaviour				✓
4.3	42	25		Perception of drug use/drug dealing				✓
5.1	15	23		Serious violent crime rate			✓	
5.2	16	23		Serious acquisitive crime rate			✓	
5.3	20		✓	Assaults with less serious injury rate		✓		
5.4	34			Domestic homicide rate			✓	
5.5	29			Gun crime rate			✓	
5.6	28			Knife crime rate			✓	

Assessment of Policing & Community Safety (APACS)	National Indicator (NI)	Public Service Agreement (PSA)	In Local Area Agree (LAA)	Measure	Proposed framework			Provided in BCS Confidence Product – Supporting Data
					Headline	General	Exception	
6.1		24		Serious violent offences brought to justice			✓	
6.2		24		Serious acquisitive offences brought to justice			✓	
6.3				Sanction detection rate for racially and religiously aggravated crimes			✓	
6.4		24		Serious sexual offences brought to justice			✓	
7.1	33			Deliberate fires				
8.1		24		Asset Recovery			✓	
9.1	47			Road traffic casualties		✓		
10.1	30		✓	Prolific and other Priority Offender re-offending rate		✓		
11.1	18	23		Adult re-offending rate			✓	
11.2	19	23		Youth re-offending rate			✓	
11.3	111	14		First time youth offending			✓	
11.4*	38	25		Drug related (class A) offending (NEW 2009/10)			✓	
12.1				Police service efficiency	✓			
13.1				Police officer sickness absence rate	✓			
13.2				Police staff sickness absence rate	✓			
14.1*	32		✓	Repeat incidents of domestic violence (NEW 2009/10)		✓		

Appendix 3 Cumbria Confidence and Satisfaction Data - BCS Survey Data Product

Most Similar Groups	Interviews year ending: 31 Mar 08 - BASELINE			31-Mar-09			30-Jun-09			30-Sep-09			Movement from previous quarter (%)	Movement from baseline (%)
	%	MSG average	Rank	%	MSG average	Rank	%	MSG average	Rank	%	MSG average	Rank		
Confidence														
Local confidence (Police do a good job)	56.0%	54.3%	3rd	57.8%	52.9%	1st	61.0%	53.9%	1st	60.5%	54.1%	1st	▼	▲
Diagnostic 1 - Being there when you need them	51.8%	49.2%	2nd	52.4%	47.1%	1st	55.4%	47.4%	1st	56.9%	48.7%	1st	▲	▲
Diagnostic 2 - Treating you with respect	83.7%	84.7%	3rd	83.2%	83.7%	5th	83.7%	83.9%	4th	85.4%	84.3%	3rd	▲	▲
Diagnostic 3 - Treating everyone fairly	63.9%	66.0%	4th	67.2%	66.4%	3rd	66.3%	66.6%	5th	66.6%	67.0%	5th	▲	▲
Diagnostic 4 - Dealing with minor crimes	54.5%	46.1%	1st	55.6%	48.5%	1st	55.4%	48.6%	1st	55.3%	48.8%	1st	▼	▲
Diagnostic 5 - Understanding community issues	69.1%	66.0%	3rd	73.3%	67.2%	1st	74.9%	67.1%	1st	74.1%	67.5%	1st	▼	▲
Diagnostic 6 - Dealing with things that matter	57.1%	54.0%	1st	58.5%	54.6%	3rd	61.6%	54.8%	1st	62.2%	55.3%	1st	▲	▲
Overall Diagnostic - confidence	71.4%	68.1%	2nd	71.3%	66.8%	1st	73.5%	67.3%	1st	72.7%	68.0%	1st	▼	▲
Satisfaction														
Ease of Contact	94.7%	92.4%	1st	93.7%	94.0%	5th	94.3%	94.4%	5th	94.2%	94.9%	5th	▼	▼
Actions	82.7%	79.6%	2nd	81.5%	82.9%	5th	82.9%	83.2%	5th	83.6%	83.6%	5th	▲	▲
Follow up	67.1%	66.6%	4th	75.4%	72.6%	2nd	77.8%	73.3%	1st	78.8%	74.0%	2nd	▲	▲
Treatment	92.7%	92.0%	3rd	93.6%	93.1%	4th	94.3%	93.4%	3rd	94.6%	93.9%	4th	▲	▲
Whole Experience	84.1%	82.4%	2nd	84.0%	84.5%	5th	84.9%	84.8%	5th	86.1%	85.2%	4th	▲	▲
National League Tables	%	National Ranking	%	National ranking	%	National ranking	%	National ranking	%	National ranking	Movement from previous quarter (%)	Movement from baseline (%)		
SPI 2.1 - Understanding local concerns	N/A	/	47.9%	7th	47.6%	8th	50.1%	4th	▲	▲				
SPI 2.2 - Dealing with local concerns TARGET MEASURE	N/A	/	55%	5th	57%	=1st*	55.5%	=5th	▼	▲				
SPI 2.3 - Public Confidence (local police do a good job)	56.0%	10th	57.8%	9th	61%	4th	60.5%	6th	▼	▲				
Diagnostic 1 - Being there when you need them	51.8%	10th	52.4%	4th	55.4%	3rd	56.9%	2nd	▲	▲				
Diagnostic 2 - Treating you with respect	83.7%	22nd	83.2%	27th	83.7%	23rd	85.4%	17th	▲	▲				

National League Tables	%	National Ranking
Diagnostic 3 - Treating everyone fairly	63.9%	24th
Diagnostic 4 - Dealing with minor crimes	54.5%	3rd
Diagnostic 5 - Understanding community issues	69.1%	6th
Diagnostic 6 - Dealing with things that matter	57.1%	4th
Overall Diagnostic - Confidence	71.4%	3rd
Keeping people informed about local concerns (new)	-	-
SPI 2.4 - Confidence in effectiveness of CJS	N/A	/
SPI 2.5 - Confidence in fairness of CJS	N/A	/
SPI 4.1 - Perceptions of ASB (perceiving high or very high levels)	11.9%	10th
SPI 4.2 - Perceptions of drunk or rowdy behaviour (as very or fairly big problem)	20.4%	8th
SPI 4.3 - Perceptions of local drug use (as very or fairly big problem)	23.1%	18th
Risk of personal crime	4.0%	5th
Risk of household crime	12.3%	7th

%	National ranking
67.2%	17th
55.6%	3rd
73.3%	2nd
58.5%	7th
71.3%	4th
---	-
40.2%	12th
62.4%	5th
10.6%	8th
19.0%	4th
25.0%	18th
4.6%	12th
11.1%	4th

%	National ranking
66.3%	23rd
55.4%	3rd
74.9%	1st
61.6%	2nd
73.5%	3rd
-	-
40.7%	14th
63.7%	=2nd
9.3%	3rd
18.8%	3rd
21.8%	13th
4.3%	7th
12.4%	4th

%	National ranking
66.6%	21st
55.3%	3rd
74.1%	2nd
62.2%	2nd
72.7%	4th
43.8%	12th
42.6%	7th
63.9%	3rd
10.0%	9th
20.1%	8th
21.3%	14th
4.2%	8th
14.8%	12th

Movement from previous quarter (%)	Movement from baseline (%)
▲	▲
▼	▲
▼	▲
▲	▲
▼	▲
-	-
▲	▲
▲	▲
▼	▲
▼	▲
▲	▲
▲	▼
▼	▼

Baselines for new SPIs (data collected post March 2008):	SPI 2.1	42.7%	SPI 2.2	52.8%	SPI 2.4	37.4%	SPI 2.5	57.5%
--	---------	-------	---------	-------	---------	-------	---------	-------

For SPI 4.1; 4.2; and 4.3, and risk of crime figures, the lower the percentage rate the less of a problem people perceive there to be, and therefore higher the percentage the worse we are performing.

KEY:		
▲	Improved performance	
▼	Worsened performance	
↔	Stable performance	
%	Performance is below MSG average	
RANK	Ranked position	has deteriorated since previous quarter