

GWENT POLICE AUTHORITY

Full Authority Meeting

Date: 04 December 2009 **Item No:** 6c
Heading: Performance Report against Local Policing Plan 2009/10
Report Author: Chief Constable

SUMMARY

This report highlights the current level of performance against the various indicators associated with APACS & the Policing Pledge. (The latest data available at time of submission is for the period 1st April 2009 up to and including 30th October 2009).

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the report is noted and particular attention is focussed on the performance measures found in the appendices.

BACKGROUND

- 1 The Local Policing Plan 2009/10 contains the single top-down Public Confidence Target. This is supported by a number of performance areas which are monitored by the Police Authority, including:
 - Analysis of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs).
 - Quantitative measures around the Policing Pledge.

This report provides information as required by the Police Authority for the purpose of monitoring force performance during the period Apr to Oct 2009. Police Authority members have also been given access to the full range of performance information on a real-time basis via Qlikview, to enable effective and detailed scrutiny.

PROPOSAL FOR CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE/CURRENT POSITION

- 2 This report highlights performance for the financial year to date up to the end of October 2009.

2.1 **APACS Performance Indicators**

APACS is the tool used by the Home Office to compare the performance of police forces. The APACS performance indicator set has been agreed between the Police Authority and the Force to monitor performance on an exception related basis as stipulated in the Local Policing Plan 2009/2010.

Details of performance against the APACS SPIs are shown in Appendix 1 of this report. This also provides Gwent's performance in comparison to its Most Similar Forces (MSF) from iQuanta. (The Most Similar Forces groups consist of Forces assessed as similar on the basis of an evaluation of the cultural and socio-economic environments evident in each Force. The groups are assembled, by the Home Office, on a demographic basis regardless of their geographical size.)

2.2 **Policing Pledge Monitoring**

A suite of performance indicators has been developed to provide a quantitative 'reality check' against the implementation of the Policing Pledge. This is shown in Appendix 2 of this report.

Several of the indicators are still to be fully developed but where both baseline and current Year-To-Date figures are available a colour coded "% change" value is shown to highlight improving or deteriorating performance.

Of note is performance at Pledge PI Ref 9a, which shows victim satisfaction with provided useful information. This area is being targeted by activity within Administration of Justice.

It should be noted that where cumulative figures for survey and dip sample are shown, the results will be more prone to fluctuation towards the beginning of the year than in the latter part of the year. This is due to the numbers being collected and the confidence interval.

Current Performance Overview

2.3

Confidence and Satisfaction

Performance towards the Single Confidence Measure (which is the only national top-down target in the LPP) has been very encouraging. The findings of the 2008/09 British Crime Survey, which have been previously reported to the Authority, represent a step change in improvement from the baseline of 39.3% to 47%. Focused activity is under way in order to build on this success, with local surveys to be undertaken in Force. These will allow analysis to take place at a more local level, before the publication of the next BCS. It is planned that 600 surveys will be made per LPU, totalling 3000 surveys in all. The results of each LPU survey to be reported to the Police Authority.

Performance against the Victims of Crime surveys and LISTEN Quality Checks are monitored throughout the year, and remedial action taken to improve performance. Performance is generally strong.

It should also be noted that results in this area, particularly under APACS 1.2 and 1.3 (covering satisfaction by ethnicity or for racist incidents) are based on low numbers because of the small percentage of the Gwent population classified as being of Ethnic Background, and that this can result in distorted percentage swings. Performance in this area will be monitored closely.

Anti-Social Behaviour

Gwent Police is shown as having a high level of antisocial behaviour incidents when compared with Most Similar Forces, but these have reduced significantly (6.7% above this time last year, down from 13.1% in July).

Targeted activity is taking place to reduce antisocial behaviour across the Force, this includes the identification of ASB Hot Spots and being prioritised into the Level 1 Tasking meeting.

Local examination in Force suggests that recording procedures are leading to an artificially high level of incidents. Contact has been made with other forces to establish their recording practices; Kent, South Wales (being 2nd in our MSF) and Wiltshire (being best nationally) to compare their recording and closing procedures with ours in order to ensure that best practice is under taken, whilst keeping within the applicable recording guidelines. However, this work is still in progress and is expected to be available to the Authority for the next report.

999 Call Data

There has been a significant improvement in taking 999 calls in under 10 seconds throughout September and October. The current data for October is 93%, which is above the year to date average of 85%. This performance has improved due to various issues being addressed within the department, including evaluation of shifts and rotas, and the re-allocation of resources and workloads within the department.

Local Crime & Policing

Recorded crime has shown an increase during this financial year. This position is comparable with most other forces, and there is some evidence that it is linked with the national economic situation.

The Force is working to reduce this trend through ongoing effective tasking and co-ordinating, revising performance management structures and a Chief Officer led action plan to address the performance gap by 31/3/2010.

The seven priority crimes, including volume crime, are highlighted in Qlikview via the Force Overview tab. These crimes types are a point of focus at the Force Monthly Performance Meeting, the resulting actions streamed into both Level 1 Tasking and Daily Management Meeting (DMM).

Crime Types that have been identified as requiring attention through the Performance Meeting and tasking processes are as follows:

Criminal Damage

Criminal Damage has decreased by 2.4% compared with last year. However this area still remains the highest volume crime for the Force and is the subject of continuous monitoring.

Vehicle Crime

The level of vehicle crime has shown a higher level this year compared to last year. When compared with Most Similar Forces, Gwent Police has shown a higher than average level of vehicle crime for a number of years.

Domestic Burglary

Burglaries of people's homes have increased by over 33% compared with last year.

The areas worst affected have been identified and effective procedures such as increased Pro-Active policing have been put in place with positive results.

Non Domestic Burglary

Other burglaries have increased by over 24% compared with last year.

Other Theft and Handling

Shoplifting shows a higher level of offending this year, however the increasing trend seen earlier in the year has levelled off.

This again shows indications of being linked to the national economic situation.

Protection From Serious Harm

Serious Violent Crime

Serious Violent Crime is showing a 38.5% increase, with most of the increase in the category of Grievous Bodily Harm without Intent (64.8% of total increase).

Domestic Abuse accounted for 11.4% of the total Serious Violent Crime last year and this has increased slightly to 12.4% this year.

There have been 168 offences of Robbery so far this year (up 42.4%) over half occurred in Maindee & Central sections

As stated above , Serious Violent Crime is one of the seven priority Crime Types and is subjected to the same level of scrutiny

STAFFING/PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 3 There are no specific staffing or personnel implications associated with this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4 There are no specific financial implications associated with this report.

CONSULTATION

- 5 This report has been considered by members of the Chief Officer team.

PROJECT ASSESSMENT FOR EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY MATTERS

- 6 This project/proposal has been considered against the general duty to promote equality, as stipulated under the Force's Equality Schemes, and has been assessed not to discriminate against any particular group.

RISK ASSESSMENT

- 7 No additional risks have been identified which have not previously been reported upon.

STAYING AHEAD (2011 REVIEW)

- 8 The matters raised in this report have been considered in the context of the Staying Ahead Project and are not considered to have any direct consequences for the outcomes.

CONCLUSION

- 9 The level of confidence in the Police is shown to be high and efforts are being made to improve our position further still.
Many of the crime types listed in this report display levels of crime being higher than the levels found over the same period last year. The reason for this is likely to be the effects of the current economic climate. Both Domestic and Non Domestic Burglaries have seen significant increases throughout the course of the current financial year and these crime types have been the subject of focused police attention intended to prevent those responsible for committing the crimes from re-offending. It should also be noted that the Force has seen a decrease in Criminal Damage, which is the largest volume crime.
This report has shown that the overall force performance has stabilised since the last Full Authority report and it is hoped that the stabilisation will herald a period of improved police performance into the New Year.

CONTACT OFFICER

- 10 Chief Supt Simon Prince – Service Development.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

11 There are no background papers associated with this report.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1:

(APACS SPI Performance)

Appendix 2:

(Policing Pledge Performance)

**Appendix 1
Summary of Performance against APACS SPIs**

Latest Data for October 2009

Promoting Safety

Note: MSF Position of 1 = best, 6 =worst

SPI No.	B Description	2008/09 YTD	2009/10 YTD	% Change	MSF Position
APACS 4.1	Perceptions of Anti-Social Behaviour (data from annual British Crime Survey)	21.8%	21.0%	-0.8%	5 / 6
APACS 4.2	Perceptions of Drunk or Rowdy Behaviour (data from annual British Crime Survey)	30.1%	29.0%	-1.1%	4 / 6
APACS 4.3	Perceptions of local drug use (from annual British Crime Survey)	34.3%	34.0%	-0.3%	4 / 6

NB: The British Crime Survey is undertaken annually and so the results from these surveys will be for 2007/08 & 2008/09.

APACS 7.1

Deliberate Fires (data supplied by Fire & Rescue Service)	83	64	-22.2%	Data Not Published
---	----	----	--------	--------------------

NB: The Fire Service figures are collected annually and so the results from these surveys will be for 2007/08 & 2008/09.

APACS 9.1

(Serious) Road Traffic Casualties - fatal & serious casualties per 100 million vehicle kilometres travelled	2.5	1.1	-56.0%	3 / 6
---	-----	-----	--------	-------

Tackling Crime

SPI No.	B Description	2008/09 YTD	2009/10 YTD	% Change	MSF Position
APACS 5.2	Rate of Serious Acquisitive crime per 1,000 population	9.2	11.1	20.5%	6 / 6

This change could be attributed to the current economic downturn. There is a correlation between the economic climate and a rise in acquisitive crime.

APACS 5.3	Rate of Assaults with less serious injury per 1,000 population	5.6	5.3	-4.9%	5/6
------------------	--	-----	-----	-------	-----

APACS 6.2	Percentage of Serious Acquisitive Offences resulting in conviction, caution or taken into consideration at court (LCJB)	11.1%	10.1%	-1.0%	Data Not Published
APACS 6.3	Sanction Detection Rate for Racially & Religiously Aggravated Offences	41.9%	36.7%	-5.2%	5 / 6

This data is published annually.

APACS 10.1	The change in convictions for Prolific & other Priority Offenders (PPOs) over a 12 month period **	**	**	Not Applicable	Data Not Published
-------------------	--	----	----	----------------	--------------------

APACS 11.1	Adult re-offending rate (i.e. rate of proven re-offending by adults under Probation supervision) **	11.9%	10.8%	-1.1%	Data Not Published
APACS 11.2	Youth re-offending rate (i.e. rate of proven re-offending by offenders aged 10-17) **	Data Not Published	**	Not Applicable	Data Not Published
APACS 11.3	First Time Youth offending rate (i.e. number of first time entrants, aged 10-17, to the Youth Justice System) (LCJB)	1,525	1,704	11.7%	Data Not Published

This data is published annually.

NB: ** these indicators require data from external organisation, which is not yet available.

NB: The LCJB figures are collected annually and so the results above will be for 2007/08 & 2008/09.

Serious Crime & Protection

SPI No.	B Description	2008/09 YTD	2009/10 YTD	% Change	MSF Position
APACS 5.1	Rate of Serious Violent crime per 1,000 population	0.5	0.7	39.6%	5 / 6
APACS 5.4	Rate of Domestic Homicides per 1,000 population	0.00	0.00	0.0%	Data Not Published
APACS 5.5	Rate of Gun Crime per 1,000 population	0.09	0.06	-33.3%	5 / 6
APACS 5.6	Rate of Knife Crime per 1,000 population	0.21	0.20	-2.6%	3 / 6

A change in recording of Inflicting GBH without Intent has greatly contributed to the change in figures.

This figure includes instances of Glassings as per the Home Office counting requirement

APACS 6.1	Percentage of Serious Violent Offences resulting in conviction, caution or taken into consideration at court **	Data Not Published	20.1%	Not Applicable	Data Not Published
APACS 6.4	Percentage of Serious Sexual Offences resulting in conviction, caution or taken into consideration at court **	27.7%	37.9%	10.0%	Data Not Published
APACS 8.1	Value of cash forfeiture orders per 1000 population	774.0	762.6	-1.5%	Data Not Published

NB: ** these indicators require data from external organisation, which is not yet available.
NB: The LCJB figures are collected annually and so the results above will be for 2007/08 & 2008/09.

This figure is dependant on the completion of Police Operations which may take several months to complete and occur at irregular intervals.

Confidence and Satisfaction

Note: MSF Position of 1 = best, 6 =worst

SPI No.	B Description	2008/09 YTD	2009/10 YTD	% Change	MSF Position
APACS 1.1	Percentage of users that are satisfied with the overall service provided by the Police Completely and Very satisfied All Satisfied grades	66.1%	59.9%	-6.2%	Data Not Published
		82.2%	80.9%	-1.3%	1 / 6
APACS 1.2	Satisfaction of victims of racist incidents with respect to the overall service provided Completely and Very satisfied All Satisfied grades	42.9%	33.3%	-9.5%	Data Not Published
		66.7%	33.3%	-33.3%	4 / 6
APACS 1.3	Comparative satisfaction of minority ethnic groups with respect to the overall service provided by the force (Minority Ethnic Groups) Completely and Very satisfied All Satisfied grades	37.1%	50.8%	13.6%	Data Not Published
		63.2%	67.5%	4.4%	3/6

This figure has a very low sample rate, therefore skewing the figures

This figure has a very low sample rate, therefore skewing the figures

	(White Users)	Completely and Very satisfied	64.8%	54.9%	-10.0%	Data Not Published
		All Satisfied grades	80.3%	72.3%	-8.0%	3/6
APACS 1.4	Satisfaction with CJS service (data comes from annual British Crime Survey)	(data comes from annual British Crime Survey)	78%	79%	1.0%	Data Not Published
N.B. For APACS 1.2 & 1.3, Minority Ethnic responses are at a low rate. Data should be viewed within that context.						
NB: The British Crime Survey is undertaken annually and so the results from these surveys will be for 2007/08 & 2008/09.						

APACS 2.1	(Agencies) Understanding Local Concerns from BCS) (*NB Initial data relates to police only)	(data comes from BCS)	57.0%	38.0%	-19.0%	4/6
APACS 2.2	(Agencies) Dealing With Local Concerns from BCS) (*NB Initial data relates to police only)	(data comes from BCS)	42.0%	48.0%	6.0%	4 / 6
APACS 2.3	Public Confidence in Police i.e. "doing a good job" (data comes from BCS)	(data comes from BCS)	39.0%	47.0%	8.0%	5 / 6
APACS 2.4	Effectiveness of CJS (data comes from BCS)	(data comes from BCS)	35.0%	31.2%	-3.8%	Data Not Published
APACS 2.5	Fairness of CJS (data comes from BCS)	(data comes from BCS)	Data Not Published	52.1%	Not Applicable	Data Not Published
*NB: The 2008/09 data refers to Police only, the 2009/10 data refers to Police and Local Councils						
NB: The British Crime Survey is undertaken annually and so the results from these surveys will be for 2007/08 & 2008/09.						

This data is published annually.

Organisational Management

SPI No.	B Description	2008/09 YTD	2009/10 YTD	% Change	MSF Position
APACS 3.1	Proportion of police recruits from minority ethnic groups compared to the proportion of people from minority ethnic groups in the economically active population	7.7%	-	N/A	* Not Applicable
APACS 3.2	Percentage of female police officers compared to overall force strength	24.7%	25.7%	1.0%	* 4 / 6
*N.B. No recruitment has taken place this financial year.					
APACS 12.1	Delivery of cashable & non-cashable efficiency targets (% of net revenue expenditure)				
	Cashable gains	2.1%	0.0%	-2.1%	6 / 6
	Non-Cashable gains	1.6%	0.0%	-1.6%	3 / 6

APACS 13.1	Percentage of working hours lost through sickness by police officers	4.9%	3.0%	-1.9%	6 / 6
APACS 13.2	Percentage of working hours lost through sickness by police staff	4.5%	4.6%	0.1%	4 / 6

NEW INDICATORS FOR 2009/10

APACS 11.4	The volume of proven offending in a follow-up 12 month period by (Class A) drug misusers identified in the course of their contact with the criminal justice system **	**	**	Not Applicable	Data Not Published
APACS 14.1	Repeat Incidents of domestic violence cases reviewed at MARAC **	**	**	Not Applicable	Data Not Published

Appendix 2
Summary of Performance against Policing Pledge

Latest Data for October 2009

1. We will always treat you fairly

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
1a	Victims of Crime survey - % saying the officer was polite & courteous	98.6%	98.1%	-0.5%
1b	Satisfaction of non-emergency callers	95.0%	93.3%	-1.7%
1c	Victims of Crime survey - % saying they were satisfied with the 5 user satisfaction areas (as below)			
	Ease of Contact	94.7%	95.6%	0.9%
	Action Taken	80.9%	78.5%	-2.4%
	Follow-up	66.1%	63.3%	-2.8%
	Treatment	92.3%	92.1%	-0.2%
	Overall	82.2%	81.4%	-0.8%
1d	the number of complaints for incivility, impoliteness & intolerance	Data being established	Process to be established	
1e	LISTEN data Q1 (Officer listened)	96.5%	98.2%	1.7%
1f	LISTEN data Q5 (Instilled Confidence)	94.2%	95.2%	1.0%

2. We will make sure you know how to contact, and work with NPT's

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
2a	Dip Sample/ Desktop research - % of NPT sites that show up-to-date contact information	Baseline to be established 2009/10	21 checks made, unable to make contact in 7 cases	

3. Those teams will be working for you 80% of their time

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
3a	% time abstracted from NPTs	3.1%	4.0%	0.9%
3b	% staff turnover by NPT	Data being established	Process to be established	

4. NPTs reply within 24 hrs, if necessary provide more detailed response

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
4a	Dip Sample – effective use of message booked by Neighbourhood Policing Teams	Baseline to be established 2009/10	21 checks made, unable to make contact in 7 cases	
4b	Mystery customer sampling	Baseline to be established 2009/10	Not current	
4c	Satisfaction of non-emergency callers	95.0%	93.9%	-1.1%

5. Answer 999 calls within 10 secs. Attend emergencies as soon as we safely can.

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
5a	% 999 calls answered within standard	91.5%	88.3%	-3.2%
5b	% emergency response (attended within 15 minutes)	Baseline to be established 2009/10	76.5%	

6. Attend for neighbourhood priorities within an hour. Otherwise, provide appointment within 48 hours of your call, or give you advice.

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
6a	% non-emergency calls answered within 30 seconds	91.8%	88.0%	-3.8%
6b	% non-emergency calls where an ETA is provided to the caller or an appointment is scheduled	Baseline to be established 2009/10	Process to be established	
6c	Priority calls attended within 60 minutes	Baseline to be established 2009/10	71.2%	
6d	% of calls where attendance is not necessary but advice etc is provided	Baseline to be established 2009/10	Closing category of giving advice – but not attendance not necessary	

7. We want to meet with people in your neighbourhood at least once a month – either in formal PACT meetings or please invite us to your group.

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
7a	Dip sample - % NPT websites checked where relevant details exist on public meetings, street briefings etc	Baseline to be established 2009/10	See Note below.	

Note: 66 Ward websites checked, all have mention of PACT but 21 have TBA for date of next meeting

8. We'll provide updates every month on local issues.

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
8a	Dip sample - % NPT websites checked where relevant details are provided	Baseline to be established 2009/10	See Note below.	

Note: 66 Ward websites checked, all have mention of local priorities and what has been done about them. Some updates do not cover every priority and updates are not time stamped - so can't check frequency.

9. For victims of crime, arrange to visit (if required). Agree how often you want information on how the case is progressing – it could be every month.

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
9a	LISTEN data – Q3 (Provided useful information)	91.4%	82.4%	-9.0%
9b	LISTEN data – Q4 (Explained next steps)	80.7%	93.9%	13.2%
9c	LISTEN data – Q6 (Kept well informed)	66.1%	72.1%	6.0%
9d	% of people who were satisfied with 'how well you were kept informed of progress'	65.6%	63.3%	-2.3%

10. If you are not happy with our service, we'll work with you to resolve things.

Pledge PI Ref.	Performance Indicator	Baseline Results (Year End 2008/09)	2009/10 YTD	% Change
10a	LISTEN data – Q7 (Provided complete service)	80.2%	93.3%	13.1%
10b	LISTEN data – Q8 (Met expectations)	90.1%	95.8%	5.7%
10c	LISTEN data – Q9 (satisfied with the overall experience)	90.7%	93.0%	2.3%
10d	Professional Standards information	Data being established	Process to be established	