



CONSULTATION PAPER

APACS Performance and Diagnostic Indicators for 2008/09: *Technical Consultation*

Deadline for responses: Friday 18 January 2008

Police and Crime Standards Directorate
December 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This document sets out proposals and seeks views on performance indicators to be used in APACS (Assessments of Policing and Community Safety): the new framework to cover key services delivered by the police, working alone or in partnership, which will come into operation in April 2008.

This technical consultation (over six weeks) on framework structure, data definitions and data management issues is complemented by a similar consultation exercise by (the Department for) Communities and Local Government (CLG) on indicators in the national set for local government and local government partners. It is also complemented by a longer (twelve week) consultation with respect to wider performance management arrangements that will be based around APACS.

DOCUMENT STRUCTURE

Section 1: Overview of development

This section summarises the background to this document, progress to date and the wider strategic consultation.

Section 2: Framework structure, domain definitions and scope

This section sets out proposals for the structure of APACS, recognising that a high-level structure that groups similar indicators together is helpful for both practitioners and the public, when considering performance across a complex public service.

Section 3: Proposed headline performance indicators

This section sets out the proposed headline performance indicators for inclusion in APACS for 2008/09.

Section 4: Proposed diagnostic indicators

This section sets out the indicators that will be used alongside headline performance indicators in coming to a view on performance.

Section 5: Conclusion and next steps

This section summarises key points and sets out plans and timescales for finalising the framework structure and indicators to be used from 2008/09.

RESPONSES

We are consulting organisations representing key stakeholders and would welcome feedback on proposals by **Friday 18 January 2008**.

Respondents may wish to comment on all or some of the proposals. However, this exercise is not intended to re-consider issues which were subject to decisions in last year's Local Government White Paper or which were addressed in the recent publication of CSR2007, Public Service Agreements 2008/09 – 2010/11, the Crime Strategy or the National Indicator Set.

Respondents may wish to comment on proposals in light of other related consultation exercises:

- Consultation by the Home Office on wider APACS performance management arrangements (the *Strategic Consultation*). This is available from <http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/apacs>.
- *Consultation on National Indicators for Local Authorities and Local Authority Partnerships* – The consultation by Communities and Local Government (CLG) on the technical definitions of performance indicators in the national set to apply to all local authorities (working alone or in partnership). This consultation runs from 8 November to 21 December 2007, and is available from www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/indicatorsdefinitions
- Consultation by the Audit Commission and other inspectorates on 'Comprehensive Area Assessments', launched on 19 November, and the separate Audit Commission consultation on the annual use of resources assessment, including key lines of enquiry for the 2009 assessments. Both consultations are available at www.audit-commission.gov.uk.
- Consultation by CLG on the new Place Survey which will collect information for some of the citizen perspective indicators proposed for inclusion in APACS (to follow later in December).

Electronic response (preferred)

APACSdevelopment@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

Hardcopy response

APACS Consultation, Home Office, 2 Marsham Street, Fry Building (4th Floor, Post Point A), London SW1P 4DF

Queries and further information

Please email: APACSdevelopment@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk
or go to web page: <http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/apacs>

ANNEXES

- A** List of consultees
- B** Framework structure, domain definitions and scope
- C** Overview of proposed performance indicators 2008/09
(highlighting placeholders)
- D** Overview of proposed performance indicators 2008/09
(highlighting links to PSAs)
- E** Overview of proposed performance indicators 2008/09
(highlighting links to national indicator set for local government)
- F** Table of performance and diagnostic indicators proposed for 2008/09
- G** Templates for all performance indicators, placeholders and diagnostic indicators
proposed for inclusion in APACS 2008/09

Disclosure

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data in accordance with the DPA and in the majority of circumstances; this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

1: OVERVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT

This section summarises the background to this document, progress to date and the wider strategic consultation.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 This document sets out proposals and seeks views on the performance indicators to be used in APACS. It is complemented by a longer (twelve week) consultation with respect to wider performance management arrangements under APACS (which is available from <http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/apacs>).

1.2 This consultation is also taking place alongside a similar exercise by (the Department for) Communities and Local Government (CLG) on the national set of indicators for outcomes delivered by local government working alone or in partnership. Indicators which relate to outcomes which require action by both police and local authorities - and other local partners - working together will appear in both the national indicator set and APACS. This common set of indicators will underpin joint working, promote the effectiveness of local partnerships and ensure the performance regimes for the police and local government and other partners work together to promote better outcomes for local people. This includes working to align APACS and the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA).

Background

1.3 Performance indicators for crime, drugs and policing have been in use for some years, across various frameworks. The development of APACS offers an opportunity to revisit and redefine the key indicators that should be used as performance information to underpin service delivery in these areas.

1.4 Through the summer, the Home Office has been working with partners to review existing indicators, identify areas for development and bring forward proposals for performance indicators for APACS. The result of this work was endorsed by the APACS Steering Group in September as a basis for consultation and hence forms the basis for this consultation paper.

1.5 This consultation paper focuses on two different types of performance indicator:

Headline performance indicators are used as the key measures of performance. These headline performance indicators have historically been set on a statutory basis, and hence have been referred to as **Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs)**. Data on headline performance indicators will be assessed and published. See section 3.

Diagnostic indicators provide additional information to supplement the headline information contained within the performance indicators. **Key Diagnostic Indicators (KDIs)** within APACS are defined to allow further

understanding of performance on a comparable basis. Data relating to diagnostic indicators may be published, e.g. as part of other Home Office statistical publications, but it will not be graded as part of any assessment. See section 4.

1.6 This technical consultation paper is connected to the CLG consultation on indicators relating to the National Indicator Set for Local Government. All feedback received on measures that are in both the national indicator set and APACS should be directed to the Home Office, but will be shared between CLG and the Home Office. A consultation paper relating to the wider performance management arrangements within which APACS sits (with a longer deadline of twelve weeks) is available at <http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/apacs> . The CLG consultation paper is available here, but the deadline for that consultation is Friday 21st December: www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/indicatorsdefinitions.

1.7 Where APACS indicators are also contained within the National Indicator Set, details for consultation are contained within this document. Stakeholders whose interest is in APACS need not, therefore, cross refer with the CLG consultation. Responses on such indicators should be sent as part of the APACS consultation.

1.8 In addition, CLG are about to consult on arrangements for the Place Survey, which is proposed as one of the methods of collection for some of the APACS indicators set out in this consultation paper. For a number of the APACS survey measures it is proposed that survey data is derived from the Place Survey in addition to the British Crime Survey, subject to consultation.

1.9 Some of the indicators set out here, including those in the national indicator set, reflect the indicators recently published alongside new Public Service Agreements (PSAs) and Departmental Strategic Objectives (DSOs) for 2008-11.

1.10 As part of arrangements to support the Policing Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF), the Home Office has benefited from the views, knowledge and experience of stakeholders through a Performance Assessment Technical Group. The group recently put together some criteria which it felt reflected best practice for the development of performance indicators, and these have been taken into account in proposing indicators for inclusion. These principles are that headline performance indicators should:

- a) be **strategically relevant**, with a clearly stated purpose relating to the strategic priorities for crime, drugs and policing, and ideally focussing on results (outcomes), rather than activity;
- b) be **well defined**, clearly stated, based on good quality data and with all component parts defined and explained;
- c) provide a **clear basis for comparison** and assessment, for example including peer comparison, national benchmark, historical performance etc;
- d) are **influenced by local action**, i.e. that changes in performance are possible based on the actions of the organisation(s) to which the indicator applies.
- e) have **proportionate cost** of measurement;

- f) **avoid perverse incentives**, with indicators modified or revised to avoid adverse distortions in activity or decision making;
- g) have been considered in terms of **risks to public confidence**, understanding the consequences of making data and/or assessments available to the public (e.g. counter-terrorism capability);
- h) be **verifiable**, with timely, reliable data available on a comparable basis; and
- i) be **exclusive**, not overlapping significantly with other indicators.

1.11 We have recognised from the outset that a key test of the new performance assessment framework is that it is seen as credible and useful. For that reason, we have developed new arrangements in consultation with stakeholders. Therefore whilst this document represents formal consultation on the way forward, it is based on a significant degree of existing stakeholder input. This includes:

- Senior representatives from fourteen partner organisations at a Steering Group (including the Association of Chief Police Officers, the Association of Police Authorities, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, Communities and Local Government, the Local Government Association, the Audit Commission and the National Policing Improvement Agency);
- Workshops with cross cutting representation from policy, practitioners and performance leads for each of the areas covered by the developing framework, and for the key cross cutting themes of partnerships and fairness and equality;
- Ten regional events over the summer of 2007, attended by almost nine hundred people from the police and partner organisations (including representatives of CDRP responsible authorities and criminal justice agencies) at which input on both the high level functions and shape of the framework, and the detailed domains and measures of which it might be comprised, were discussed;
- Regional workshops on the development of new indicators of efficiency;
- An ongoing role for Government Offices, contributing to specific themes within the framework to shape the final product alongside this consultation;
- Seconded personnel from partner organisations who have worked on the project team developing the APACS framework; and
- A technical group comprising performance management practitioners from stakeholder organisations to give practical advice on the technical development of the framework (e.g. appropriateness of measures and methods of assessments).

1.12 Going forward, a user group will also look at issues around presentation and implementation of the framework, for example, training needs and other support for local areas in making APACS a reality.

2: FRAMEWORK STRUCTURE

This section sets out proposals for the structure of APACS, recognising that a high-level structure that groups similar indicators together is helpful for both practitioners and the public, when considering performance across a complex public service.

INTRODUCTION

2.1 The accompanying strategic consultation document sets out the proposals for the wider performance management arrangements within which APACS sits. It is envisaged that APACS will contain a range of information covering a wide range of issues relating to policing and community safety. Often, users of APACS will require information on specific areas covered by the framework, or will need to navigate through the information. In order to assist this, it is proposed to group similar components of APACS together into a small number of key headline areas, in order to aid interpretation and navigation.

Framework title

2.2 The working title of the single framework throughout its development has been *Assessments of Policing and Community Safety* (APACS). We believe that this title reflects most simply and accurately the function of the framework. The use of “policing” in this context is intended to capture the wider, partnership-led outcomes that are so vital to high performance, as well as the single agency contribution of “the police” in its narrower sense. The title has gained currency throughout the extensive consultation to date and changing the title now could create confusion.

Q1. *We believe that the title ‘Assessments of Policing and Community Safety’ best summarises what the framework is intended to assess. Views on any preferred alternative are invited.*

Framework structure and domain titles

2.3 The delivery of policing and community safety is a complex business and a range of performance indicators are needed to give a balanced view of performance. Given that one of the aims of the framework is to facilitate dialogue with the public about performance, we believe some means of bringing together performance information is needed to provide a coherent picture comprehensible to a lay person. Grouping like assessments together is also helpful locally in taking a view on specific areas of performance.

2.4 A number of working models for the framework were tested to achieve this and the structure found to provide best coverage and balance comprised five headline areas as shown overleaf. These headline areas are sometimes referred to as “domains”.



Q2. Following stakeholder events over the summer, we believe that the five domains provide an understandable and helpful structure to underpin a balanced view of performance across policing and community safety. Views on any preferred alternative for the domain titles and/or domain structure are invited.

Domain definition and scope

2.5 The definition and scope of each domain is set out at Annex B. In summary, the three operational domains are focused on ‘high volume / low seriousness’ on the left-hand side, moving to ‘low volume / high seriousness’ on the right-hand side. These domains are underpinned by a domain linked to ‘internal’ effectiveness and efficiency of organisations and there is an overarching domain focused on citizen perceptions and customer experience.

Q3. The definitions and scope at Annex B are advocated following significant consultation with stakeholders. Views on these are invited, with a particular focus on the scope proposed for each domain (especially key omissions or issues which should be omitted or considered as part of another domain).

2.6 In addition to the headline domains set out above, it is also envisaged that other themes of interest could be explored using the information contained within APACS. For example, cross-cutting issues such as drugs or fairness and equality could be considered on the basis of information contained within several domains. The use of such “virtual” domains also means that there is less requirement on the headline domains to serve the purposes of all users simultaneously, which would be impossible.

3: PROPOSED HEADLINE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

This section sets out the proposed headline performance indicators for inclusion in APACS for 2008/09.

INTRODUCTION

3.1 Performance indicators will form a key part of APACS, measuring outcomes, perceptions and activities, which reflect the impact of community safety and policing services in local communities. The indicators set out in this section are an important part of this consultation in terms of coverage, balance and definition. These headline performance indicators are often referred to in this document, and in the annexes, as Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs).

Headline performance indicators

3.2 Data on headline performance indicators in the framework would be published and assessed (graded). An overview of the indicators proposed is shown in Annex C below - shaded areas representing place holders for possible introduction in 2009/10 - and technical details of each measure are set out at **Annex G**, including the links between proposed indicators and specific PSAs. In line with previous practice, we propose to establish such headline performance indicators on a statutory basis for the police. Indicators that have been set as part of the PSAs will automatically be included within the framework, although views are sought on the technical definition of these indicators.

Q4. *The indicators proposed stem from work with stakeholders to develop and identify those for inclusion in the framework. Stakeholders are invited to provide feedback on whether the proposed set of indicators is the right one, but in particular whether there are:*

- *key gaps – i.e. indicators that have not been proposed but which should be*
- *duplications – i.e. where more than one indicator substantively covers the same issue or*
- *revisions needed – where indicators need amending or defining differently*

and also to consider whether the allocation to domains and overall balance of indicators is correct.

Q5. *Recognising that indicators linked to PSAs and the national indicator set have been agreed by Ministers, views are invited on the details of indicators at Annex G.*

3.3 Consultees are advised that technical refinement of indicators will continue during December and January.

Place holders

3.4 In developing APACS, we have been clear that our aspirations should not be constrained by the availability of existing data. Where we believe there is an aspect of policing and community safety that needs to be assessed but where no indicator currently exists, we have looked to see what indicator(s) might be developed. In some cases we have included new proposals (either as headline measures or as diagnostics), but in other cases this work has not yet delivered a proposed performance indicator so we have established place holders for 2009/10. Progress and intentions for place holders are set out at Annex G in lieu of a technical template.

3.5 Place holders are particularly relevant within the Organisational Management domain, in respect of which we have significant ambition to develop a suite of robust indicators that will give a more rounded picture of how the police manage themselves and their resources. In taking this forward, we are looking to draw on the work already underway within a number of forces to improve operational business processes that impact directly on outcomes.

Q6. Stakeholders are invited to submit proposals for areas of delivery for which a headline performance indicator has not yet been developed, which could be considered for future development of APACS (e.g. for inclusion from 2009/10).

3.6 Further to the generic questions outlined in Q4 we know that there are particular issues which consultees may want to address in relation to specific domains. Some of these may reflect gaps or drawbacks identified in the domains as structured in the Policing Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF) or as featured in other performance regimes.

3.7 For the Confidence and Satisfaction domain there are a few issues relating in particular to user satisfaction measures, on which views are sought.

Q7. What do consultees feel about the measure of user satisfaction for victims of anti-social behaviour. Is this the right measure? How could it be improved? We have considered using a proxy measure for criminal damage in its place. Would this be the right solution?

Q8. Should the measure of user satisfaction include victims of road traffic collisions?

Q9. Should the measure of user satisfaction only account for 'completely and very' satisfied responses, rather than 'completely, very and fairly' satisfied responses as at present?

Q10. Do the proposed measures represent the appropriate proxies for public confidence in community safety services?

3.8 Additionally, a number of proposed indicators are considered for collection via the new Place Survey, and a consultation on the Place Survey will be launched shortly by CLG. Responses to the Place Survey consultation will help to inform the development of these indicators going forward, and other options for collecting data

considered where necessary. (For example the British Crime Survey, recognising that this can only be monitored at the Force level, but may be available on a more frequent basis.)

Q11. *Views are invited on whether the Place Survey proposals (as set out in the upcoming CLG consultation paper) provide a suitable source for the relevant performance indicators in APACS?*

3.9 APACS presents the opportunity to give greater consideration to neighbourhood policing and neighbourhood management outcomes, as recommended by Sir Ronnie Flanagan in his 2007 Review of Policing. Neighbourhood management is proposed as a placeholder within the Promoting Safety domain. It is proposed that this might usefully serve as a basket of measures which exist in domains across APACS, and potentially beyond.

Q12. *What indicators would usefully form a suite of indicators for neighbourhood management? Should they be comprised of mainly survey measures from the promoting safety and confidence and satisfaction domains or should they also include non-survey data from other sources, including crime data?*

3.10 The Organisational Management domain is one area of the framework that will need further development and refinement for 2009/10. It is recognised that there is the potential to develop better measures and assessments in this area, and work will continue throughout 2008/09, in order to bring forward ideas for future inclusion.

3.11 Specific views would be welcome on how this area of APACS can be best developed in future, including:

Q13. *How might efficiency and productivity be further captured within the framework?*

Q14. *Do the Organisational Management placeholders identified for 2009/10 reflect the key areas for development? What might be the most appropriate measures in these areas (e.g. leadership, collaboration, business process, etc?)*

Q15. *What other measures could be developed to support the Organisational Management domain? What would the best measures be for:*

- a) Productive use of time / effective deployment (e.g. as captured through Staffordshire's measure of the match between supply and demand).
- b) Key process benchmarks? (e.g. benchmarks of key processes in terms of time, quality, staff / officer ratios, etc.)

Q16. *How should we best assess how forces and authorities are using benchmarking to drive performance and improve productivity? (e.g. through reduced cost and increased quality?)*

4: PROPOSED DIAGNOSTIC INDICATORS

This section sets out the indicators that will be used alongside headline performance indicators in coming to a view on performance.

INTRODUCTION

4.1 Headline indicators covering key outcomes are an important part of any performance framework. However, it is often important to consider other information alongside those indicators as supporting evidence, or consider indicators which it is not desirable to include as headline performance indicators (for example, where there are weaknesses).

Key Diagnostic Indicators (KDIs)

4.2 Discussion around performance indicators has highlighted that, for some, it would be difficult to understand headline data without an ability to drill down into detail. Accordingly, we see a need for the framework to include indicators - *key diagnostic indicators* (KDIs) - that are not assessed nor published routinely but which provide important information to understand performance, for example:

- data providing a better picture of performance in relation to the rates of offence types within the overall basket of offences defined as 'serious acquisitive crime';
- data in relation to efficiency (subject to ongoing consultation, efficiency indicators could be used as KDIs from 2008/09 and in later years be recommended as SPIs, once we were satisfied with the reliability and robustness of data);
- data that would be useful to local service providers for ongoing performance management activity;
- data which cover some significantly new areas of the framework (see 4.4); and
- data which could be useful in determining contextual judgements.

4.3 Even so, it is accepted that there remains a need to reduce the data demand on partners notwithstanding the value of certain data in a diagnostic capacity. Proposals for diagnostic indicators are set out in the relevant Annexes. We would welcome views on the scope and balance of the set of diagnostic indicators proposed.

Q17. *Views are invited on the inclusion – in principle – of a limited number of Key Diagnostic Indicators where inclusion would facilitate the understanding of headline performance data.*

Q18. *Views are invited on the proposals for KDIs at Annex F, focusing on any key omission or revisions (especially with respect to efficiency data).*

4.4 In addition, APACS brings an enhanced focus to the area of Serious Crime, including Counter-Terrorism. These areas were not covered by previous frameworks, and APACS offers the opportunity to introduce proposals for new measures in these areas. In the case of the Counter-Terrorism indicators, some proposals have drawn on the examples of relevant police pilot projects, operations and cross-cutting work with partners like local authorities. However, recognising the sensitivities and complexities within some of the topics covered, as well as that indicators are still in development for this area of work, it is proposed to introduce these indicators as diagnostic indicators for the first year. This will allow time to assess the indicators operationally as well as to consider further the various sensitivities around publication of this information.

5: CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

This section summarises key points and sets out plans and timescales for finalising the framework structure and indicators to be used from 2008/09.

CONCLUSION

5.1 This technical consultation covers the performance indicators that will be introduced within APACS from 1 April 2008. The technical consultation will close early in the new year, **on Friday 18th January 2008**. The related strategic consultation exercise will run for twelve weeks.

NEXT STEPS

5.2 Once the technical consultation has closed, responses will be collated and summarised, and then discussed with the APACS steering group. Following this consideration, final recommendations on the framework for 2008/09 will be submitted to Ministers and consultation responses will feature within this advice. In the New Year, regulations containing the final SPIs will be laid in Parliament and finalised technical guidance will be issued.

5.3 In addition, the Home Office will be working with partners to develop those areas of performance covered by place holders, to bring forward substantive proposals for inclusion in 2009/10.

5.4 An outline timetable follows below.

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| January | Consultation closes |
| January | Consideration by the APACS steering group |
| January/ February | Advice to ministers, followed by finalisation of performance indicators |
| February | Plans finalised for development of place holders for inclusion in 2009/10 |
| February | Statutory instrument published and technical guidance issued |
| February | Handbook of definitions for National Indicators published |
| April 1 | Performance year begins |
| July onwards | Ongoing development of indicative proposals for new indicators for collection in 2009/10 |

ANNEX A: List of Consultees

The development of APACS has benefited greatly from discussion with, and input from, a wide ranging steering group of key stakeholders. The group includes representatives of the Home Office, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO), the Association of Police Authorities (APA), Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), the Local Government Association (LGA), the Audit Commission, the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG), HM Treasury, the Ministry of Justice, the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA), the Prime Minister's Delivery Unit, the Metropolitan Police Service, the Metropolitan Police Authority, the Welsh Assembly Government and regional Government Offices. APACS will continue to be developed in close consultation with these Steering Group members.

Building on the current and continuing input of the Steering Group, the consultation aims to get a wider and more comprehensive view from delivery partners, and thus is primarily targeted at the following:

Police Forces

(via Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO))

Police Authorities

(via Association of Police Authorities (APA))

Local authorities

Other local partners

(including CDRPs, DATs, LCJBs, etc)

The consultation will be publicly available on the Home Office website, and views from other interested groups and members of the public are welcome.

ANNEX B: Domain Definitions and Scope

The business of policing and ensuring safer communities is complex. What matters to the public about the performance of the police - and partners - cannot meaningfully be captured by one or even a dozen performance indicators. Accordingly, the arrangements put in place to help deliver, improve and demonstrate performance need to be robust and, critically, relevant to both practitioners and the public.

All the components in APACS are allocated to one of five 'domains': Promoting Safety; Tackling Crime; Serious Crime and Protection; Confidence and Satisfaction; and Organisational Management. These domains are useful in describing headline aspects of performance in a straightforward way, recognising more detailed data and analysis is always available for practitioners, specialist or other interested groups.



A definition for each domain follows. Taken as a whole, the domains reflect the range of work involved in policing and community safety in a way which is comprehensive and consistent. This is not to imply that everything that the police and partners do is measured or assessed in APACS. Rather, the domains reflect a balanced and proportionate view of all areas of work, from dealing with anti-social behaviour to combating serious and organised crime. By analogy, each performance indicator can be seen as one piece of the jigsaw, with indicators grouped together by domain – each forming a discrete part of the whole picture.

APACS has been designed to align with proposals for the new suite of PSAs and the new Crime Strategy (along with associated strategies including alcohol, drugs, reoffending and criminal justice). The broad objective of the strategy is to continue to reduce crime across the spectrum and give local delivery partners greater flexibility at the lower end of the spectrum to identify and respond to local priorities.

PROMOTING SAFETY

The activities covered by the Promoting safety domain are core to local partnerships where the focus is on anti-social behaviour, low-level disorder as well as other environmental and 'quality of life' issues such as vandalism. The harm caused by one-off incidents may be relatively low but the cumulative effects on communities and

individuals can be serious. Such incidents may also be symptomatic of wider social problems (especially if part of, or the beginning of, more serious offending) where the police and partners have a responsibility to work with communities to address them.

The domain will be used to ensure key services over-and-above those related to crime are reflected and to ensure that, especially for young people and adults leading chaotic lives, action is taken to minimise the risk they pose to themselves and their communities. This may mean interventions for certain types of offender other than judicial sanction where these have been shown to be successful. These approaches will often involve other delivery partners and the scope of this domain is focused on measures for the police, local authorities, health, education and the voluntary and community sector, including:

- anti-social behaviour;
- anti-social use of alcohol;
- street drug use;
- arson / deliberate fires;
- low-level offending; and
- road safety.

TACKLING CRIME

The *tackling crime* domain reflects the second element of the Safer Communities PSA in that it covers volume and acquisitive crime as well as reducing re-offending.

The domain also reflects the new Crime Strategy, with a greater focus on early intervention with young people at risk of offending and designing out crime from new products, places and services. The domain also reflects the focus on tackling the drivers of crime and offending - including alcohol & drug misuse and social exclusion – as well as ensuring an effective response to crimes committed (both in the investigation of crime and in managing offenders, especially Prolific and other Priority Offenders). It is a domain which, like promoting safety, has a strong emphasis on local partnership working.

The Tackling Crime domain focuses on issues more serious than anti-social behaviour and criminal damage. These latter crime types form the bulk of crimes reported to the police (covered as part of *promoting safety*). The most serious violent crimes are covered under *serious crime and protection*. Accordingly, the Tackling Crime domain is focused on:

- serious acquisitive crime;
 - assaults with injury;
 - domestic violence;
 - crime investigation (including hate crime);
 - re-offending by adults and young people;
 - drug related-offending;
 - re-offending by Prolific and other Priority Offenders;
 - bringing offences to justice.
-

SERIOUS CRIME AND PROTECTION

The seriousness of a crime - or criminality - is critical to any response and crimes such as murder and rape need specialised resources and approaches, either to prevent or to investigate. It is also a feature of modern society that criminals have become increasingly sophisticated and, with respect to terrorism and domestic extremism, ever more violent and harmful. Much of the work done by the police and partners is proactive, often covert, and this critical contribution needs to be reflected in APACS.

For these reasons, a domain on *serious crime and protection* is used which also reflects the work of the police and others in preparing for, and dealing with, critical incidents and major events which are infrequent but potentially very harmful and disruptive when they occur. Consequently, the scope of this domain is focused on performance with regard to:

- international terrorism;
- domestic extremism;
- serious violent crime, including domestic homicide;
- gun crime and knife crime;
- bringing violent and sex offenders to justice;
- support to rape victims;
- organised crime (including removing the benefits of crime);
- taking criminals off our roads;
- civil emergencies.

CONFIDENCE AND SATISFACTION

Community Safety is not just about making people safer, it is also about making people feel safer and more reassured - a key part of which is showing clearly that all the community safety partners, and others, understand local concerns and are taking steps to address them.

Success in promoting community safety, tackling crime, disrupting organised crime and preventing terrorism all help to reassure people, especially vulnerable groups, in addition to the benefits gained by reducing crime and bringing offenders to justice. In recognition of this, a '*confidence and satisfaction*' domain is used to bring together important perception based information.

The domain also deals with direct service provision: obtaining feedback from people coming into contact with the police and other public services, which is used to learn lessons and help ensure other people will be satisfied with the service they receive. Not only is this a key element to get right in its own right; people satisfied with how they and their families, friends and colleagues were treated are more likely to engage positively with the police. The scope of this domain is focused around:

- how people feel about their area (both in terms of the police specifically and partnerships more generally) on issues such as community safety, anti-social behaviour plus wider effectiveness and fairness;

- direct experience of victims and witnesses of crime;
- comparative levels of satisfaction with services received.

ORGANISATIONAL MANAGEMENT

APACS supports the police working alone or in partnership to deliver, and improve, key services by monitoring and assessing results. This emphasis on results, rather than inputs or processes, facilitates new ways of doing business and helps to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy.

Of course, the way in which the police and others manage themselves has a direct bearing on their ability to deliver results, and this domain highlights the importance of understanding how the police use their resources. The information collected for this domain is essential and complementary to the other aspects of APACS, as it will enable an understanding of the relationship between where forces and authorities allocate their resources, and the performance they achieve.

Data and assessments in this area must be of particular value to the Police (not least by highlighting where peers have developed better structures, processes and approaches). Work to develop indicators in this area is ongoing, and it is likely that some desirable indicators will not be ready in time for the first year of APACS. However, we welcome views on what it would be useful to include in future, including detailed suggestions around specific measures. The scope of this domain covers:

- leadership;
- delivering efficiency targets;
- productive time (eg sickness);
- financial management;
- collaboration and shared services;
- staffing (eg equality and diversity);
- business processes; and
- how to match supply to demand for resource.

In addition, the Audit Commission's scored judgement on Police Use of Resources could be incorporated into APACS, and is shown here alongside the proposed SPIs for the Organisational Management domain.

ANNEX C: Overview Of Proposed Performance Indicators 2008/09

Shaded cells represent placeholders

| PROMOTING SAFETY | TACKLING CRIME | SERIOUS CRIME & PROTECTION | CONFIDENCE & SATISFACTION | ORGANISATIONAL MANAGEMENT |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Perception of anti-social behaviour | Serious acquisitive crime rate | Counter-terrorism (contest) | Understanding local concerns (agencies) | Leadership |
| Perception of drunk / rowdy behaviour | Assault with injury rate | Domestic extremism | Dealing with local concerns (agencies) | Police efficiency |
| Perception of drug use / drug dealing | Domestic violence enforcement | Serious violent crime rate | Understanding local concerns (police) | Front line policing |
| Neighbourhood management | Domestic violence victimisation | Domestic violence - homicide | Dealing with local concerns (police) | Officer sickness rate |
| Arson and deliberate fire | Detection rate – serious acquisitive crime | Gun crime rate | Satisfaction with service delivery (police) | Police staff sickness rate |
| Road traffic casualties | Detection rate (hate crime) | Serious knife crime rate | Comparative satisfaction with delivery (police) | Police collaboration |
| | Bringing offences to justice – serious acquisitive crime | Serious violent offences brought to justice | Satisfaction with service delivery (racist incidents) | Business processes |
| | Priority offender re-offending rate | Support to victims of serious sexual offences | Satisfaction with service delivery (ASB) | Minority ethnic police officer recruitment |
| | Adult re-offending rate | Serious sex offences brought to justice | Comparative satisfaction with delivery (ASB) | Female officer representation |
| | Youth re-offending rate | Sex offender re-offending rate | Satisfaction with service delivery (CJS) | |
| | Drug-related offending rate | Asset recovery | Confidence in effectiveness of the CJS | <i>Financial management (PURE)**</i> |
| | First-time youth offending | Strategic roads policing (ANPR) | Confidence in fairness of the CJS | |
| | Race equality in criminal justice | Serious and organised crime | | |
| | Effectiveness and efficiency (CJS) | | | |

*Some measures are based on subsets of crime types on the basis of 'relative seriousness' recognising that all crimes are serious from the point of view of the victim.

** The Audit Commission's PURE judgement is shown alongside proposed SPIs, as part of the Organisational Management domain, although further consideration will be given on how to combine qualitative judgments with quantitative information.

ANNEX D: Overview of proposed performance indicators 2008/09
Shaded cells highlight links to PSAs

| PROMOTING SAFETY | TACKLING CRIME | SERIOUS CRIME & PROTECTION | CONFIDENCE & SATISFACTION | ORGANISATIONAL MANAGEMENT |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Perception of anti-social behaviour (PSA 23) | Serious acquisitive crime rate (PSA 23) | Counter-terrorism (contest) | Understanding local concerns (agencies) | Leadership |
| Perception of drunk / rowdy behaviour (PSA 25) | Assault with injury rate | Domestic extremism | Dealing with local concerns (agencies) (PSA 23) | Police efficiency |
| Perception of drug use / drug dealing (PSA 25) | Domestic violence enforcement | Serious violent crime rate (PSA 23) | Understanding local concerns (police) | Front line policing |
| Neighbourhood management | Domestic violence victimisation | Domestic violence - homicide | Dealing with local concerns (police) | Officer sickness rate |
| Arson and deliberate fire | Detection rate – serious acquisitive crime | Gun crime rate | Satisfaction with service delivery (police) (PSA 24) | Police staff sickness rate |
| Road traffic casualties | Detection rate (hate crime) | Serious knife crime rate | Comparative satisfaction with delivery (police) | Police collaboration |
| | Bringing offences to justice – serious acquisitive crime (PSA 24) | Serious violent offences brought to justice (PSA 24) | Satisfaction with service delivery (racist incidents) | Business processes |
| | Priority offender re-offending rate | Support to victims of serious sexual offences | Satisfaction with service delivery (ASB) | Minority ethnic police officer recruitment |
| | Adult re-offending rate (PSA 23) | Serious sex offences brought to justice (PSA 24) | Comparative satisfaction with delivery (ASB) | Female officer representation |
| | Youth re-offending rate (PSA 23) | Sex offender re-offending rate | Satisfaction with service delivery (CJS) (PSA 24) | |
| | Drug-related offending rate (PSA 25) | Asset recovery | Confidence in effectiveness of the CJS (PSA 24) | <i>Financial management (PURE)</i> |
| | First-time youth offending (PSA 14) | Strategic roads policing (ANPR) | Confidence in fairness of the CJS (PSA 24) | |
| | Race equality in criminal justice (PSA 24) | Serious and organised crime | | |
| | Effectiveness and efficiency (CJS) (PSA 24) | | | |

**Shaded cells represent links to specific indicators in PSAs. Please see annex G or PSA Delivery Agreements (available from www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/pbr_csr/psa) for more information. Indicators may not be exactly as defined in the PSA. Additionally, most other indicators have some link with PSAs and in some cases may be strongly linked to priority actions.*

ANNEX E: Overview of proposed performance indicators 2008/09
Shaded cells highlight links to national indicator set for local government

| PROMOTING SAFETY | TACKLING CRIME | SERIOUS CRIME & PROTECTION | CONFIDENCE & SATISFACTION | ORGANISATIONAL MANAGEMENT |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Perception of anti-social behaviour (NI 17) | Serious acquisitive crime rate (NI 16) | Counter-terrorism (contest) (NI 35 and 36) | Understanding local concerns (agencies) (NI 27) | Leadership |
| Perception of drunk / rowdy behaviour (NI 41) | Assault with injury rate (NI 20) | Domestic extremism | Dealing with local concerns (agencies) (NI 21) | Police efficiency |
| Perception of drug use / drug dealing (NI 42) | Domestic violence enforcement | Serious violent crime rate (NI 15) | Understanding local concerns (police) | Front line policing |
| Neighbourhood management | Domestic violence victimisation (NI 32) | Domestic violence – homicide (NI 34) | Dealing with local concerns (police) | Officer sickness rate |
| Arson and deliberate fire (NI 33) | Detection rate – serious acquisitive crime | Gun crime rate (NI 29) | Satisfaction with service delivery (police) | Police staff sickness rate |
| Road traffic casualties (NI 47 and 48) | Detection rate (hate crime) | Serious knife crime rate (NI 28) | Comparative satisfaction with delivery (police) | Police collaboration |
| | Bringing offences to justice– serious acquisitive crime | Serious violent offences brought to justice | Satisfaction with service delivery (racist incidents) | Business processes |
| | Priority offender re-offending rate (NI 30) | Support to victims of serious sexual offences (NI 26) | Satisfaction with service delivery (ASB) (NI 24) | Minority ethnic police officer recruitment |
| | Adult re-offending rate (NI 18) | Serious sex offences brought to justice | Comparative satisfaction with delivery (ASB) (NI 25) | Female officer representation |
| | Youth re-offending rate (NI 19) | Sex offender re-offending rate (NI 31) | Satisfaction with service delivery (CJS) | |
| | Drug-related offending rate (NI 38) | Asset recovery | Confidence in effectiveness of the CJS | Financial management (PURE) |
| | First-time youth offending (NI 111) | Strategic roads policing (ANPR) | Confidence in fairness of the CJS | |
| | Race equality in criminal justice | Serious and organised crime | | |
| | Effectiveness and efficiency (CJS) | | | |

ANNEX F: TABLE OF PERFORMANCE AND DIAGNOSTIC INDICATORS PROPOSED FOR 2008/09

The table sets out the proposed performance and diagnostic indicators for 2008/09. Placeholders, signalling an intent to develop a performance indicator for use in APACS 2009/10, are shaded.

| Indicator type | | Short title | Long title |
|-------------------------|-----|--|--|
| SPI | KDI | | |
| PROMOTING SAFETY | | | |
| ✓ | | Perception of anti-social behaviour (NI 17) | Percentage of people with high level of perceived anti-social behaviour (seven-strand BCS measure) |
| ✓ | | Perception of drunk/ rowdy behaviour (NI 41) | Percentage of people who perceive people being drunk or rowdy in public places to be a problem in their local area |
| ✓ | | Perception of drug use / drug dealing (NI 42) | Percentage of people who perceive drug use or drug dealing to be a problem in their local area |
| | ✓ | | Number of offences brought to justice for Class A drug supply and possession with intent to supply per 10,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Number of sanction detections Class A drug supply and possession with intent to supply per 10,000 population |
| | ✓ | | The level of Class A supply offences as a proportion of acquisitive crime |
| ✓ | | Deliberate fires and arson (NI 33) | Number of deliberate primary fires and secondary deliberate fires per 10,000 population |
| ✓ | | Road traffic casualties (NI 47 and 48) | Number of a) people and b) children killed in under 30 days or seriously injured in road traffic collisions per 100 million kilometres travelled |
| | ✓ | | Number of warnings, fixed penalties or reports for prosecution for failure to wear a seat belt compared with the number of vehicle occupant deaths in road traffic collisions where the person killed had not been wearing a seat belt at the time of the collision. |
| | ✓ | | Number of warnings, referrals to speed awareness courses, fixed penalty notices and reports for prosecution compared with the number of vehicles exceeding the speed limit. |
| | ✓ | | Number of reports for prosecution for drink or drug driving compared with the number of road traffic collisions involving drink or drugs |

| Indicator type | | Short title | Long title |
|-------------------|-----|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| SPI | KDI | | |
| 2009/10 indicator | | Neighbourhood management | Neighbourhood management |

| TACKLING CRIME | | | |
|----------------|---|--|---|
| ✓ | | Serious acquisitive crime rate (NI 16) | Number of serious acquisitive crimes (PSA 23; Priority Action 2) per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Rate of individual offences within PSA 23, Priority Action 2 per 1,000 population: a) Domestic burglary; b) Theft from motor vehicle; c) Theft of motor vehicle; d) Personal robbery; and e) Business robbery. |
| | ✓ | | Rate of vehicle interference per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Rate of non-domestic burglary per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Number of cash-in-transit robberies per 1,000 population |
| ✓ | | Assault with injury rate (NI 20) | 'Assault with injury' crimes per 1,000 population |
| ✓ | | Domestic violence enforcement | Proportion of domestic violence related offences that result in an arrest |
| ✓ | | Domestic violence victimisation (NI 32) | Percentage of victims of domestic violence of victims managed by a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) who are subject to a repeat incident of domestic violence, where violence has occurred within 12 months of a case coming to the MARAC |
| | ✓ | | Proportion of domestic violence related offences reported to the police that are based on so called 'honour' |
| | ✓ | | Proportion of repeat domestic violence related offences committed by offenders on a Criminal Justice System perpetrator programme |
| | ✓ | | Proportion of offenders brought to justice (convicted) as proportion of those arrested for domestic violence related incidents |
| | ✓ | | Incidents of domestic violence reported to the police per 1,000 population |
| ✓ | | Detection rate (PSA 23 Priority Action 2) | Sanction detection rate for serious acquisitive crimes (PSA 23; Priority Action 2) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | ✓ | | Sanction detection rate for PSA 23 Priority Action 1, Priority Action 2, and for different crime types in Priority Action 1 and 2: a) Serious violence; b) Serious sexual offences; c) Domestic burglary; d) Vehicle crime; e) Robbery. |
| | ✓ | | Rate of forensic identification per recorded crime: a) Domestic burglary; b) Non-domestic burglary; c) Theft from motor vehicles; d) Theft of motor vehicle; e) All crime. |
| | ✓ | | Rate of conversion from forensic identification to sanction detections: a) Domestic burglary; b) Non domestic burglary; c) Theft from motor vehicles; d) Theft of motor vehicle e) All crime. |
| ✓ | | Detection rate (hate crime) | Sanction detection rate for crimes flagged as 'hate crimes' |
| | ✓ | | Rate of offences brought to justice for crimes flagged by the police as 'hate crimes' |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of crimes flagged as 'hate crimes' for which an enhanced sentence is sought |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of hate crimes against repeat victims |
| | ✓ | | Victim satisfaction rate for hate crimes |
| ✓ | | Bringing offences to justice (PSA 23; Priority Action 2) | Percentage of serious acquisitive crimes brought to justice rate (PSA 23; Priority Action 2) |
| | ✓ | | Offences brought to justice rate for different crime types within PSA 23; Priority Action 2: a) Domestic burglary; b) Vehicle crime; c) robbery. |
| | ✓ | | Conversion rate from charge to conviction for PSA 23: Priority Action 2 offences |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of offences brought to justice (PSA 23, Priority Action 3) |
| ✓ | | Prolific and other Priority Offender re-offending rate (NI 30) | Number of convictions recorded against identified Prolific and other Priority offenders (PPOs) |
| | ✓ | | The PPO Journey: This is a snapshot of where PPOs are in the Catch and Convict/Rehabilitate and Resettle process |
| | ✓ | | Removal from scheme: Number of PPOs removed from the PPO list for the given quarter subcategorised into groups |
| | ✓ | | 28 days notification: Number of PPOs known to the Prison Service for whom the BCU responsible for managing the offender was notified 28 days or more prior to release; notified less than 28 days prior to release; or not at all |
| | ✓ | | OASys and Sentence Plan: Number of PPOs who have received a community sentence, or were released on licence, whose OASys assessment and sentence plan drawn up within 5 working days, more than 5 days or not at all |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| ✓ | | Breach Enforcement – Court: Number of PPOs who breached their community sentence and the information was laid before a court within 10 working days; more than 10 days; or not at all |
| ✓ | | Breach Enforcement – Arrest: Number of PPOs whose breach of licence was notified to the police and who were arrested within 24 hours of notification; more than 24 hours; or not at all |
| ✓ | | Court Warrants and Recall Notices: Number of Court Warrants or Recall Notices issued against PPOs that were executed in less than 8 days; between 8 and 28 days; more than 28 days; or not at all |
| ✓ | | OASys assessment target: Number of adult PPOs who entered custody in the reporting period who had an OASys assessment completed within the 8 week reception target set out in PSO 2205; outside the 8 week reception target; or not at all |
| ✓ | | Discharge OASys assessment: Number of adult PPOs who have been released from custody who had an OASys assessment completed within the discharge target of more than one month but less than 3 months prior to release set out in PSO 2205; outside the discharge target; or who did not have an OASys assessment completed at all |
| ✓ | | Accommodation Status of PPOs: report on the accommodation status of PPOs who were at the point of discharge from prison or in the community |
| ✓ | | Suitability of Accommodation: Number of PPOs who have accommodation that is judged to be suitable to their needs |
| ✓ | | Drug Treatment: Percentage of PPOs in the community or in custody formally identified as requiring interventions for drug related issues |
| ✓ | | Retention in Treatment: Percentage of PPOs retained in drug treatment for at least 12 weeks prior to leaving treatment/being removed from caseload |
| ✓ | | Alcohol: Number of PPOs in the community or custody assessed as having an alcohol problem |
| ✓ | | Offender Behaviour Programmes: Number of PPOs who started and completed an accredited OBP in custody or the community |
| ✓ | | Basic Skills Awards: Number of PPOs who started or completed a Basic Skills course in custody or the community |
| ✓ | | Community Sentence and Licence completion: Number of community sentences and licences successfully or not successfully completed by PPOs |
| ✓ | | OASys scores: A list of the number of PPOs for whom an end OASys score is available for the above reporting period |
| ✓ | | The overall score from the Government Office PPO Traffic Lights assessment |
| ✓ | | JTrack completion measure: Data on PPOs must be input onto JTrack within 7 working days |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| ✓ | | Adult re-offending rate (NI 18) | Percentage of adult offenders (aged 18 and over) on the Probation caseload who are proven to have re-offended within three months from the month the snapshot was taken compared with the predicted reconviction rate for that Probation Area and Local Authority |
| ✓ | | Youth re-offending rate (NI 19) | Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders |
| | ✓ | | Persistent young offender pledge |
| ✓ | | First-time youth offending (NI 111) | Number of first time entrants to the youth justice system |
| ✓ | | Drug-related offending rate (NI 38) | Rate of offending of those identified as Class A drug misusers in the course of their contact with the Criminal Justice System |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of adults arrested for a trigger offence (A), to be drug tested (B) (Target 95% for DIP intensive schemes). Test on 'charge' in Wales. |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of adults who test positive and have an initial required assessment imposed (A), to attend and remain at the initial required assessment (B) (Target 95% for DIP intensive schemes). Applies to 'English' intensives. Welsh KDI: '90% of adults who test positive, and who are not on caseload (A), to have an initial contact (B). |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of adults with whom initial contact is made and who are not on the caseload (A), to be assessed by the CJIT (B). (Target 60%). Applies to all DIP schemes except English intensives. |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of adults assessed as needing a further intervention (A), to be taken onto the case load (B) (Target 85% for all DIP schemes) |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of adults taken onto caseload (A), to engage in treatment (B). (Target 95% for all DIP schemes) |
| ✓ | | Race equality in criminal justice | Race disproportionality at key stages of the criminal justice process |
| | ✓ | | Disproportionality between BME and white communities in the use of Stop and Search measured by the resident population |
| | ✓ | | Frequency of arrest arising from stop and search for each ethnic group |
| | ✓ | | Level of victim satisfaction with police action between white and BME communities |
| | ✓ | | Percentage and number of charging decisions for each offence type measured by ethnicity |
| | ✓ | | Percentage and number of unsuccessful outcomes in race hate crime cases due to victim and witness issues |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) who have completed data collection |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | ✓ | | Percentage of LCJBs who have comprehensive evidence and analysis |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of LCJBs in process of implementing an action plan to address unfair disproportionality |
| 2009/10 indicator | | Effectiveness and efficiency | Effectiveness and efficiency of the Criminal Justice System in bringing offences to justice |
| SERIOUS CRIME AND PROTECTION | | | |
| ✓ | | Sex offender re-offending rate (NI 31) | Re-offending rate of Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) Category 1 Offenders (Registered Sexual Offenders – RSOs) who are being managed at Levels 1, 2 and 3) |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of wanted/missing MAPPA Category 1 offenders circulated as wanted on PNC |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of MAPPA Category 1 offenders arrested for breaches of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 Part 2 that result in no further action (either at the police station or at court) |
| ✓ | | Asset recovery | Ratio of assets recovered per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Volume of confiscation orders per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Value of confiscation orders per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Volume of cash forfeitures per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Value of cash forfeitures per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Number of restraint orders per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Number of cash seizures per 1,000 population |
| ✓ | | Serious violent crime rate (NI 15) | Number of most serious violent crimes (PSA 23; Priority Action 1) per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Number of murder offences per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Number of attempted murder offences per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Number of manslaughter offences per 1,000 population |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| | ✓ | | Number of GBH offences (both with and without intent) per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Number of 'honour' homicide offences per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Number of 'mental health' homicide offences per 1,000 population |
| ✓ | | Knife crime rate (NI 28) | Number of recorded serious violent knife crime offences per 1,000 population |
| ✓ | | Domestic homicide (NI 34) | Number of domestic violence homicide offences per 1,000 population |
| ✓ | | Bringing serious violent offences to justice | Percentage of serious <u>violent</u> crime offences (PSA 23; Priority Action 1) brought to justice |
| ✓ | | Gun crime rate (NI 29) | Number of recorded life threatening gun crime per 1,000 population |
| ✓ | | Bringing serious sex offences to justice | Percentage of serious <u>sexual</u> crime offences (PSA 23; Priority Action 1) brought to justice |
| | ✓ | | Number of recorded serious sexual offences (PSA 23; Priority Action 1) per 1,000 population |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of serious sexual offences (PSA 23; Priority Action 1) resulting in a sanction detection |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of serious sexual offences (PSA 23; Priority Action 1) which are no crimed |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of serious sexual offences (PSA 23; Priority Action 1) going to court that result in a conviction |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of prosecution for serious sexual offences (PSA 23; Priority Action 1) which are discontinued |
| ✓ | | Support to victims of serious sexual offences (NI 26) | Proportion of victims of a serious sexual offence aged 16 and above (who report the offence to the police) that receive support from a specialist sexual violence and abuse service |
| ✓ | | Strategic roads policing | Percentage of arrests resulting from Automated Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) hits as a proportion of all arrests |
| | ✓ | | Number of ANPR systems compliant with ACPO standards developed jointly with partnerships by type: a) Fixed site; b) Mobile; c) Portable; d) CCTV |
| | ✓ | | Number of RIPA authorities for covert ANPR deployments for investigation/intelligence gathering purposes. |
| | ✓ | | Number of joint ANPR operations with other forces and external agencies such as immigration, HM Revenue and Customs, VOSA, DVLA. |
| 2009/10 indicator | | Serious and Organised Crime | Serious and Organised Crime |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | ✓ | | The number of level 2 organised criminal groups – as identified in the 2007/08 ACPO mapping exercise – operating in a police force area which the force has disrupted |
| 2009/10 indicator | | Domestic extremism | Domestic extremism |
| | ✓ | | For the Police Service nationally, the number of high impact harm incidents linked to domestic extremism: That is home visits, criminal damage, arson and assaults. |
| | ✓ | | For the Police Service nationally, the number of domestic extremism offences brought to justice |
| | ✓ | | Preparedness of police forces for a civil emergency as assessed by the National Capabilities Survey undertaken by the Cabinet Office |
| 2009/10 indicator | | Counter-terrorism (Contest) | Counter-terrorism (Contest) |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of occasions of police support to Security Service Priority investigations where support provided achieves an excellent or good grading |
| | ✓ | | For the police service nationally, the number of disruptions to terrorist networks in the reporting period as approved by the Disruptions Assessment Panel |
| | ✓ | | Preparedness for a terrorist attack as assessed by the National Capabilities Survey undertaken by the Cabinet Office |
| | ✓ | | Number of areas under Rich Picture where Counter Terrorism Units (CTUs), Counter Terrorism Intelligence Units (CTIUs) and Regional Security Service Stations assess local understanding to be good. |
| | ✓ | (NI 35) | Building resilience to violent extremism |
| | ✓ | (NI 36) | Reduce vulnerability of crowded places from terrorist attack |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of dangerous sites (hazardous substances) assessed as green. |
| | ✓ | | Percentage of intelligence reports forwarded to specialist counter terrorism police units which are fit for further development |
| CONFIDENCE AND SATISFACTION | | | |
| ✓ | | Understanding local concerns (agencies) (NI 27) | People who agree that the police and local councils seek their views on anti-social behaviour and crime in their area. |
| ✓ | | Dealing with local concerns (agencies) (NI 21) | People who agree that the police and local councils are dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime that matter in their area |
| ✓ | | Understanding local concerns (police) | Percentage of people who ‘agree that the police in your area understand the issues that affect this community?’ |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| ✓ | | Dealing with local concerns (police) | Percentage of people who 'agree that local police are dealing with anti social behaviour and crime that matter in this area' |
| ✓ | | Satisfaction with service delivery (police) | Percentage of victims that are satisfied with the overall service provided by the police |
| | ✓ | | Victim satisfaction with contact made by the police |
| | ✓ | | Victim satisfaction with action taken by the police |
| | ✓ | | Victim satisfaction with progress updates made by the police |
| | ✓ | | Victim satisfaction with treatment by staff (police) |
| ✓ | | Comparative satisfaction with service delivery (police) | Satisfaction gap between white and BME victims when comparing victim satisfaction with the overall service provided by the police |
| ✓ | | Satisfaction with service delivery (CJS) | Overall satisfaction with the contact had with the Criminal Justice System by victims and witnesses of crime whose cases reach the point of an offender being charged |
| ✓ | | Satisfaction with service delivery (ASB) (NI 24) | Victim satisfaction with the overall service provided by police/local agencies/local councils in dealing with anti-social behaviour |
| ✓ | | Effectiveness of the CJS | Percentage of the public who are confident that the Criminal Justice System as a whole is effective |
| ✓ | | Fairness of the CJS | Percentage of the public who are confident that the Criminal Justice System as a whole is fair |
| ✓ | | Comparative satisfaction with service delivery (ASB) (NI 25) | Satisfaction gap between white and BME victims when comparing victim satisfaction with the overall service provided by local agencies (ASB) |
| ✓ | | Satisfaction with service delivery (racist incidents) | Satisfaction of victims of racist incidents with the overall service provided by the police |
| ORGANISATIONAL MANAGEMENT | | | |
| ✓ | | Police efficiency | Delivery of cashable efficiency targets |
| ✓ | | Officer sickness rate | Percentage of working hours lost due to sickness: Police officers |
| ✓ | | Police staff sickness rate | Percentage of working hours lost due to sickness: Police staff |
| ✓ | | Minority ethnic police officer recruitment | Proportion of police officer recruits from minority ethnic groups compared to the proportion of people from minority ethnic groups in the economically active population |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| ✓ | | Female officer representation | Percentage of female police officers compared to the overall force strength |
| 2009/10 indicator | | Frontline Policing | |
| | ✓ | | Proportion of time spent by beat officers outside the station |
| | ✓ | | Proportion of time spent by beat officers carrying out incident and non-incident related paperwork |
| 2009/10 indicator | | Police collaboration | Force collaboration / shared services |
| 2009/10 indicator | | Leadership | Leadership |
| 2009/10 indicator | | Business processes | TBC |
| | | Police Use of Resources* | Police Use of Resources: PURE* |

* The Audit Commission's PURE judgement is shown alongside proposed SPIs, as part of the Organisational Management domain, although further consideration will be given on how it will be incorporated into APACS.

Annex G: Templates for all performance indicators, placeholders and diagnostic indicators proposed for inclusion in APACS 2008/09

Performance indicators will form a key part of APACS, measuring outcomes, perceptions and activities, which reflect the impact of community safety and policing services in local communities. Performance indicators have historically been set on a statutory basis, and hence have been referred to as Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs). Data on performance indicators will be assessed and published.

Place holders signal intent to develop a Statutory Performance Indicator for introduction in APACS 2009/10.

Diagnostic indicators provide additional information to supplement the headline information contained within the performance indicators. Key diagnostic indicators (KDIs) within APACS are defined to allow further understanding of performance on a comparable basis. Data relating to diagnostic indicators may be published, i.e., as part of other Home Office statistical publications, but it will not be graded as part of any assessment.

In total, there are 45 SPIs, 9 placeholders and around 95 KDIs proposed for inclusion across the five APACS domains in 2008/09, along with the Audit Commission's PURE judgement.

This annex brings together:

- Templates for all proposed SPIs;
- A short description of place holders;
- Templates for KDIs that require new data sources.

The annexes are presented in five sections, with one section for each of the domains.