

**NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL****CORPORATE AND PARTNERSHIPS OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****20 September 2010****Police Performance Report: Fourth Quartile****1.0 Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To receive the North Yorkshire Police Policing Pledge local (Force Wide) performance indicators.

**2.0 Performance Data**

- 2.1 A protocol has been devised to improve communication between the work of the Police Authority, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and the Committee. In this context, the Police Authority has produced the fourth quartile performance report against the undertakings in the Policing Pledge. This information is made available to both District and County level scrutiny.
- 2.2 The Safe and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to receive the information on a regular basis to support its role as the designated Crime and Disorder Committee at county level. A copy of the relevant report is attached.
- 2.3 As you will hear during the course of the meeting the Government has scrapped the Policing Pledge, however elements of reporting will remain in place. Currently both North Yorkshire Police and the North Yorkshire Police Authority are in discussions regarding the content and format of reporting and the information they need to convey to our communities and their elected Members.

**3.0 Recommendation**

- 3.1 The Committee is invited to review the performance monitoring report received from the North Yorkshire Police Authority, but also to take the opportunity to review current content and suggest additional content that you consider lacking or missing.

HUGH WILLIAMSON  
Head of Scrutiny and Corporate Performance

County Hall  
NORTHALLERTON  
8 September 2010  
Background Documents – Nil

## NORTH YORKSHIRE POLICE POLICING PLEDGE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK - FORCE

<p><b>Pledge 1:</b> The satisfaction levels for initial stages of contact and treatment are comparable to the previous year, thus NYP continues to have high victim satisfaction levels at the initial stages of contact. The numbers of complaints of incivility over the three month period show an increase of 5 complaints compared to the previous year. The number of letters of appreciation received are higher than the previous year although it is noted that this may be down to more accurate recording.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 2:</b> Performance for pledge 2 is apparently lower than the previous year, with historic survey data showing that reductions have been experienced with both the % of people who are aware of their Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) and the % of people who are aware of how to contact their SNT compared to last year. However, the historic data from the old Public Attitude Survey adopted different methodologies from the new survey which was introduced towards the end of last year, which could account for differences in the results. Data from the new survey has been available from December, and the results to date show that the % of people who are aware of how to contact their SNT has increased by 4% points, and the % of people who are aware of their SNT has remained stable.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 3:</b> Data from the new Public Attitude Survey shows that since December the % of people across the force area who have spoken to their local PCSO or officer has remained stable at 47-49%. The % of people who never see a police officer or PCSO patrolling their area has remained constant at 43-44%.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 4:</b> The nature of this priority means that it is difficult to accurately performance monitor this through the availability of electronic Management Information. Whilst not regular monitoring, a review into compliance of dealing with SNT communications was recently conducted by the force. A manual review of emails from April 2009 to March 2010 found a 79% compliance for dealing with correspondence within 24 hours. This finding was in line with a separate mystery shopper exercise run internally by the FCR which found an 82% compliance. A similar FCR exercise found an 80% compliance with responding to voicemail messages within 24 hours. Over the last year, NYP has improved the provision of information to the public about SNT's through the internet and newsletters to make it easier for the public to contact them.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 5:</b> The three month period of March-May 2010 saw an improvement of 8% points with the % of 999 calls answered within 10 seconds compared to the previous year. Additionally with 999 calls, there has been a decrease in the average time taken to answer calls for the same period. Call handling and dispatch times are comparable to the previous year, as is attendance within target to immediate urban and rural incidents. Attendance times are monitored weekly via the Daily Management Meeting (DMM) process and the force's internal Performance Steering Group (PSG).</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 6:</b> Attendance to Neighbourhood Priority and Vulnerable Persons grade incidents within target had remained stable for a few months up to April when a decrease was experienced with the % of incidents attended within target. However, attendance in May improved compared to April for both Neighbourhood Priority and Vulnerable Persons incidents. Exact comparisons with the previous year is not possible, as it is only recently that local priority information has been integrated into the command and control environment. Through the Daily Management Meeting process and the Performance Steering Group, pledge attendance is being actively monitored on a regular basis.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 7:</b> Due to data for Pledge 7 only recently being populated, it is not possible to provide an historical analysis of performance. However, data from the new Public Attitude Survey has been collected since December, and the percentages for each indicator have remained constant from December to date.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 8:</b> A comparison between May 2010 and May 2009 using historic data shows that a 19% points increase has been experienced with the % of people who feel well informed about what the police have been doing. Data from the new Public Attitude Survey shows that since December, the performance for the indicator has remained stable. Similarly, since December, the % of people who believe that the police keep people informed about crime and ASB has remained constant.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 9:</b> Compared to May last year, the satisfaction with follow up rate has improved by 2% points. Up to Q4 2009/10, the rate was between 63.4 and 64.5%, however from the start of Q4 to date, the level has increased from 64.3 to 66%. Satisfaction with follow up was made a priority at the Chief Constable's Quarterly Review Day. The force strategic target for 2010/11 is 75%.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 10:</b> Both the total number of complaints received by the force and the number of Direction and Control complaints has increased between March and May compared to the same period last year. However, since March, the total number of complaints received on a monthly basis has been declining.</p>	

**Pledge 1: Always treat you fairly with dignity and respect ensuring you have fair access to our services at a time that is reasonable and suitable for you.**

Indicator	Source	Mar - May 10	Mar - May 09	Change		Comparison to 2008/09 Average		Trend	Outside Historical Variation	
Average number of complaints of incivility received within a month by P.S.D	P.S.D	14	11	3	✘	11.5	✘	Random		
Average number of Letters of Appreciation received within a month by P.S.D	P.S.D	14	12	2	✔	12.7	✔	Decrease		
The % of victims who were satisfied with how easy it was to contact someone who could assist them?	User Satisfaction Survey	92.2%	93.4%	-1.2%	✘	92.0%	✔	Decrease***		
The % of victims who were satisfied with the way they were treated by the police officers and staff that dealt with them	# User Satisfaction Survey	93.3%	93.1%	0.2%	✔	93.1%	✔	Decrease	✔	
The % of people who agree the police treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are	^^ Public Attitude Survey	74.5%	HISTORICAL DATA PRESENTLY UNAVAILABLE					✘		
The % of people who feel that the police in the area would treat them with respect if they had to contact them for any reason.	^^ Public Attitude Survey	86.5%						✘		

Key: Strength of trend: \*\*\* = Strong; \*\* = Moderate; \* = Weak, (no asterisks = trend exists but is Very Weak)  
 Historical Variation: ✔ or ✔✔ indicate positive exceptional performance. ✘ or ✘✘ indicate negative exceptional performance  
 # in 'Source' field: Indicates that NYPA have expressed an interest in a strategic target  
 ^^ Public attitude data superceded in January 2010 - please note change in survey methods has meant substantial changes in figures

**Pledge 2: Provide you with information so you know who your dedicated Safer Neighbourhood Policing Team is, where they are based, how to contact them and how to work with them.**

Indicator	Source	May-10	May-09	Change		Comparison to 2008/09 Average		Trend	Outside Historical Variation
The % of people who are aware of their Safer Neighbourhood Team	# ^^Public Attitude Survey	42.4%	54.7%	-12.3%	✘	53.4%	✘	Decrease***	✔✔
The % of people who know how to contact their Safer Neighbourhood Team	^^ Public Attitude Survey	39.5%	45.9%	-6.4%	✘	42.7%	✘	Decrease***	✔

Key: Strength of trend: \*\*\* = Strong; \*\* = Moderate; \* = Weak, (no asterisks = trend exists but is Very Weak)  
 Historical Variation: ✔ or ✔✔ indicate positive exceptional performance. ✘ or ✘✘ indicate negative exceptional performance  
 # in 'Source' field: Indicates that NYPA have expressed an interest in a strategic target  
 ^^ Public attitude data superceded in January 2010 - please note change in survey methods has meant substantial changes in figures

<b>Pledge 3: Ensure your Safer Neighbourhood Team and other police patrols are visible and on your patch at times when they will be most effective and when you tell us you most need them. We will ensure your team are not taken away from neighbourhood business more than is absolutely necessary. They will spend at least 80% of their time visibly working in your neighbourhood, tackling your priorities. Staff turnover will be minimised.</b>							
Indicator	Source	May-10	May-09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation
% of time SNT officers spend working in their local area	NSPIS HR						
Attrition rate for Safer Neighbourhood Staff (calculated over a rolling 3 month period)	NSPIS HR						
The % of people who have spoken to their local officer or PCSO	New Public Attitude Survey	47.5%					
The % of people who never see a police officer or PCSO patrolling their area	New Public Attitude Survey	44.2%					
<small>Key: Strength of trend: *** = Strong; ** = Moderate; * = Weak, (no asterisks = trend exists but is Very Weak)  Historical Variation: ✓ or ✓✓ indicate positive exceptional performance. ✗ or ✗✗ indicate negative exceptional performance  # in 'Source' field: Indicates that NYPA have expressed an interest in a strategic target  ^^ Public attitude data superceded in January 2010 - please note change in survey methods has meant substantial changes in figures</small>							

<b>Pledge 4: Respond to every message directed to your Safer Neighbourhood Policing Team within 24 hours and, where necessary, provide a more detailed response as soon as we can.</b>							
Indicator	Source	May-10	May-09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation
<b>Measures are to be confirmed. Based on dip-sampling - guidance to be developed and actioned</b>							

**Pledge 5: Aim to answer 999 calls within 10 seconds deploying to emergencies immediately giving an estimated time of arrival, getting to you safely, and as quickly as possible. In urban areas, we will aim to get to you within [15] minutes and in rural areas within [20] minutes.**

Indicator	Source	Mar - May 10	Mar - May 09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation
% of 'Immediate Urban' incidents attended within 15 minutes	Force Control Room	80.7%	79.1%	1.5% ✓	79% ✓	Random	✓
% of 'Immediate Rural' incidents attended within 20 minutes	Force Control Room	75.7%	74.0%	1.6% ✓	73% ✓	Decrease	✓✓
% of 999 calls answered within 10 seconds	# Force Control Room	97.1%	86.6%	10.4% ✓	80% ✓	Increase**	✓✓
Average speed of answer of 999 calls	Force Control Room	4.0	6.2	-2.2 ✓	7.8 ✓	Decrease***	✓✓
Amount of time spent at Call Handling stage taking initial details (minutes)	Force Control Room	1.3	1.4	-0.1 ✓	1.7 ✓	Decrease**	
Amount of time taken at Dispatch stage before a resource is proceeded (minutes)	Force Control Room	4.2	4.1	0.1 ✗	4.6 ✓	Random	
% of people that believe the police can be relied on to respond quickly to emergencies	^^ Public Attitude Survey	56.6%		HISTORIC DATA UNAVAILABLE			

Key: Strength of trend: \*\*\* = Strong; \*\* = Moderate; \* = Weak, (no asterisks = trend exists but is Very Weak)

Historical Variation: ✓ or ✓✓ indicate positive exceptional performance. ✗ or ✗✗ indicate negative exceptional performance

# in 'Source' field: Indicates that NYPAs have expressed an interest in a strategic target

^^ Public attitude data superceded in January 2010 - please note change in survey methods has meant substantial changes in figures

**Pledge 6: Answer all non-emergency calls promptly. If attendance is needed, send a patrol giving you an estimated time of arrival and: If you are vulnerable/upset or calling about an issue that we have agreed with your community will be a neighbourhood priority and attendance is required, we will aim to be with you within 60 mins. Alternatively, if appropriate, we will make an appointment to see you at a time that fits in with your life and within 48 hours. If agreed that attendance is not necessary we will give you advice, answer your questions and / or put you in touch with someone who can help.**

Indicator	Source	Mar - May 10	Mar - May 09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation
% of Incidents attended within 60 minutes (Vulnerable)	Force Control Room	56.3%					
				HISTORIC DATA UNAVAILABLE			
% of Incidents attended within 60 minutes (Priority)	Force Control Room	77.7%					
% of non-emergency calls answered within 30 seconds	# Force Control Room	94.9%	61.9%	33%	74%	Increase**	

Key: Strength of trend: \*\*\* = Strong; \*\* = Moderate; \* = Weak, (no asterisks = trend exists but is Very Weak)  
 Historical Variation: ✓ or ✓✓ indicate positive exceptional performance. × or ×× indicate negative exceptional performance  
 # in 'Source' field: Indicates that NYPA have expressed an interest in a strategic target  
 ^^ Public attitude data superceded in January 2010 - please note change in survey methods has meant substantial changes in figures

Pledge 7: Arrange regular public meetings to agree your priorities, at least once a month, giving you a chance to meet your local Safer Neighbourhood Team with other members of your community. These will include opportunities such as surgeries, street briefings and mobile police station visits which will be arranged to meet local needs and requirements.								
Indicator	Source	May-10	May-09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation	
The % of people who think that they (the police) seek people's views about the Anti-Social Behaviour and crime issues that matter	# ^Public Attitude Survey	42.2%						
The % of people who think that the police are interested in issues that concern people living in the local area	# ^Public Attitude Survey	60.6%						
The % of people who think that the police get involved in activities within the local community	^Public Attitude Survey	41.4%						
The % of people who think that the police are in touch with the local community	^Public Attitude Survey	56.6%						
The % of people who agree that they can influence decisions in their local areas	^Public Attitude Survey	38.3%						
% of SNTs that have had at least one publically advertised meeting	Community Consultation	0.0%						
The % of people who have attended a local meeting where the police were involved	^Public Attitude Survey	18.6%						
Key: Strength of trend: *** = Strong; ** = Moderate; * = Weak, (no asterisks = trend exists but is Very Weak) Historical Variation: ✓ or ✓✓ indicate positive exceptional performance. ✗ or ✗✗ indicate negative exceptional performance # in 'Source' field: Indicates that NYPA have expressed an interest in a strategic target ^^ Public attitude data superceded in January 2010 - please note change in survey methods has meant substantial changes in figures								

Pledge 8: Provide monthly updates on progress, and on local crime and policing issues. This will include the provision of crime maps, information on specific crimes and what happened to those brought to justice, details of what action we and our partners are taking to make your neighbourhood safer and information on how your force is performing.								
Indicator	Source	May-10	May-09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation	
% of people who feel well informed about what the police have been doing over the last 12 months	# ^Public Attitude Survey	62.8%	44.2%	19% ✓	44% ✓	Increase**	✓✓	
% of people who think that the police keep people informed about what they are doing to tackle local crime and ASB	^Public Attitude Survey	48.4%					HISTORICAL DATA PRESENTLY UNAVAILABLE ✓✓	
Key: Strength of trend: *** = Strong; ** = Moderate; * = Weak, (no asterisks = trend exists but is Very Weak) Historical Variation: ✓ or ✓✓ indicate positive exceptional performance. ✗ or ✗✗ indicate negative exceptional performance # in 'Source' field: Indicates that NYPA have expressed an interest in a strategic target ^^ Public attitude data superceded in January 2010 - please note change in survey methods has meant substantial changes in figures								

**Pledge 9: If you have been a victim of crime agree with you how often you would like to be kept informed of progress in your case and for how long. You have the right to be kept informed at least every month if you wish and for as long as is reasonable.**

Indicator	Source	May-10	May-09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation
% victims who were provided with progress updates without asking	User Satisfaction Survey	54.6%	39.1%	15% ✓	47% ✓	Increase**	✓✓
The % of victims who were satisfied with how they were kept informed of progress	## User Satisfaction Survey	66%	64%	2% ✓	65% ✓	Increase**	✓✓

Key: Strength of trend: \*\*\* = Strong; \*\* = Moderate; \* = Weak, (no asterisks = trend exists but is Very Weak)  
 Historical Variation: ✓ or ✓✓ indicate positive exceptional performance. ✗ or ✗✗ indicate negative exceptional performance  
 # in 'Source' field: Indicates that NYPD have expressed an interest in a strategic target  
 ^^ Public attitude data superseded in January 2010 - please note change in survey methods has meant substantial changes in figures

**Pledge 10: Acknowledge any dissatisfaction with the service you have received within 24 hours of reporting it to us. To help us fully resolve the matter, discuss with you how it will be handled, give you an opportunity to talk in person to someone about your concerns and agree with you what will be done about them and how quickly.**

Indicator (It is acknowledged that the below indicators do not reflect the full scope of Pledge 10 - further work is ongoing to identify further measures)	Source	Mar - May 10	Mar - May 09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation
The average number of complaints received in a month	^ P.S.D	67	53	14 ✗	55 ✗	Random	
Average number of days taken to record a complaint	^ P.S.D	3	6	-3.3 ✓	8 ✓	Decrease**	✓
Average number of Direction and Control complaints received in a month	^ P.S.D	6	8	0 ✓	11 ✓	Decrease	✓✓

Key: Strength of trend: \*\*\* = Strong; \*\* = Moderate; \* = Weak, (no asterisks = trend exists but is Very Weak)  
 Historical Variation: ✓ or ✓✓ indicate positive exceptional performance. ✗ or ✗✗ indicate negative exceptional performance  
 ^ Force data includes complaints made against Operational Support/Protective Services functions