

# Nottinghamshire Police Performance Scorecard – Executive Summary

Performance to June 2013 Themes 1 - 7

#### Theme 1

Satisfaction of victims of crime with the service they have received from the Police is stable when considering the long term trend and the Force is below the 90% target. Satisfaction for incidents in the 12 months to April is 87.1%. The Force is above peers nationally whilst remaining in line with the Most Similar Group (MSG) average. A gap remains between the two divisions (City 85.8%, County 88.1%) with the County evidencing possible improvement in dwelling burglary. Vehicle crime satisfaction has deteriorated and is a performance risk.

Satisfaction with **keeping victims informed of progress** now stands at **80.5%** for the 'All Users' group with evidence of possible improvement on the same period last year, reflecting strong performance around dwelling burglary and violent crime.

The disparity in **comparative satisfaction between minority ethnic (BME) and white users is stable** at 5.5 percentage points when compared with the same time last year when the gap was 4.3 percentage points. Positively there is no significant gap in the comparative satisfaction measure for ease of contact; keeping victims informed of progress and treatment; while the disparity has widened with respect to actions taken.

The percentage of **people who agree that local anti-social and other crime issues are being dealt with** across Nottinghamshire is below target following a further dip in agreement levels since the previous quarterly results. It stands at **53.1%** for 12 months interviews ending December 2012. Public confidence continues to be measured through the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), which undertakes face to face interviews with members of the public in Nottinghamshire. Nottinghamshire Police has lost further ground on peers and there is a statistically significant disparity to the national average.

All witnesses are invited to complete a Victim Support Witness Service Quality of Service form when arriving at Court. In May, **94% of victims** and witnesses were extremely or very satisfied with the services provided in Court and the 90% target has been achieved in each of the last six months.

In the first three months of 2013/14 there has been a **21% reduction** in the number of people that have been repeat victims of domestic violence, hate crime or anti-social behaviour (ASB) within the previous 12 months. The strong performance is driven by a reduction of more than a quarter in the number of repeat ASB victims when compared with the same period last year. By contrast there has been a small rise in the number of repeat victims of domestic violence. This is coupled with a large percentage increase in the number of people that have been a repeat victim of hate crime, although the actual volume increase is seven people.

There are two **key indicators in the handling of complaints**: the average number of days to locally resolve allegations; and the average number of days to investigate allegations.

Encouragingly, data for the 12 months to May 2013 shows that the long term trend is stable for local resolutions, with the average time now 72 days. While older allegations impact achievement of the 2013-14 target the 12-months-to-date performance for allegations received since April 2012 is 46 days which remains close to target and illustrates that the Force is on track to achieve to achieve the longer-term target by 2015.

The average time for the Force to investigate a complaint allegation is 179 days for the year to May 2013, 29 days away from target. As with locally resolved allegations, performance is impaired by older complaints. Where allegations have been finalised in the 12 months to May 2013, those that were received prior to April 2012 have an average finalisation time of 259 days. The figure for allegations received since April 2012 is 110 days which is well within the target and illustrates that the Force is on track to achieve to achieve the longer-term target by 2015.

#### Theme 2-6

All Crime - The Force continues to record a year-to-date increase in All Crime offences, however there are signs of a potential improvement in performance with the increase smaller this month than last month. The offence groups of Theft & Handling, Violent Crime and Burglary Dwelling continue to drive this increase, although Burglary Dwelling offences are showing signs of a decrease this month. The Forces Partnership Plus areas on the County show mixed performance, with the majority following the Force level trend in recording an increase year-to-date, and of the areas that have recorded a reduction, none are achieving their reduction target at this time. While an increase in All Crime in the first quarter of the performance year is of concern, examination of historical trends suggests that seasonality plays a large part in the Forces All Crime picture, and based on this it is expected that overall offence volume will begin to decrease in the coming months.

Overall Detection Rate - The overall detection rate in the first quarter of the year is steadily improving; however it remains below the Police & Crime plan target despite an increased use in the proportion of offences dealt with by Community Resolution. The main volume of crime recorded by the Force in the first quarter of the year are Theft & Handling offences, equating to just over a fifth of all recorded crime this year and a very small reduction compared to last year. However, the Force has maintained a similar detection rate compared to last year at 11.6 percent. In contrast, both Shoplifting and VAP with Injury offences equate to a higher proportion of crime this year-to-date compared to last year, at around 11.5 percent. However the detection rate for both offence types has fallen by five percentage-points. Consequently this is having an impact on the overall detection rate recorded by the Force, and a focus on both these offence types should see the overall detection rate increasing closer to the Police & Crime plan target.

ASB - The Force is continuing to record strong reductions in the number of ASB incidents compared to last year with both the City and County divisions recording similar reductions. All 20 high priority wards across the Force are recording reductions in June, however both Carr Bank and Magnus are recording year-to-date increase due to performance in April and May, and despite Eastwood South recording a year-to-date reduction in the number of incidents by a quarter, the number of incidents in June only fell by 2.8 percent and therefore performance will need monitoring to make sure that strong performance recorded in the first two months is not undone. At district level most areas continue to record reductions, however Rushcliffe has recorded an increase in the volume of incidents in June compared to last year, having reduced the number of incidents in May by almost a third following a recorded increase at the start of the year. Similarly the South of the City is recording a small reduction of just over 2 percent in June after strong performance in the first two months of the year and, as with Eastwood South, performance should be monitored going forward to make sure that strong performance at the start of the year is not undone.

**POCA** - For the months of April to June in 2013 the Force has achieved its target, recording a total of 48 orders compared to the 40 recorded in the same month last year and a target of 44. The Force has recorded an increase in total order value to that recorded last year but an increase in average order value. This positive performance is expected to continue through 2013/14, particularly in light of the new processes and training being rolled across the Force which will further embed the POCA processes with the investigative cycle.

**KSIs** - While the level of reduction achieved in 2012 fell lower than the 17.4% target, overall the Force remains broadly on track to achieve the Nottinghamshire Strategic Safety Partnership target of a 50% reduction in KSI's by 2020. The start of the 2013 year has been a promising one, with significant reductions in KSIs recorded, however it is suspected that extreme weather conditions at the start of this year may have influenced this, and therefore the Force will need to maintain this downward trajectory through planned operations in the summer months in order to remain on target.

FTEs - Performance at the start of 2013/14 is positive, with the number of FTEs continuing to decrease, and the current reduction target easily achieved based on year-to-date figures, however it is important to note that performance is showing a slight deterioration when compared to last months position. Another area which may be of concern is the high proportion of BME First-time Entrants, particularly when compared to the previous year. Despite an overall reduction in FTEs, the number of BME FTEs remains unchanged, and this may be of concern when considering that numbers of White FTEs have decreased over the same period. The Force should endeavour to maintain the current level of performance through an ongoing programme of activity, but should also work to ensure that this programme is successful in reducing First-time Entrants across all groups.

#### Theme 7

**Projected Spend vs. Actual** - The full year net revenue budget for 2013-14 is £196.998m. Actual net expenditure for the three months to June 2013 was £48.806m against a budget of £49.561m. The resulting position against budget was an under spend of £0.755m. This under spend is as a result of rephasing the PCC controlled Community and Safety Fund. £0.875m will now be incurred later in the year, therefore after adjusting for this the actual year to date against budget is an over spend of £0.120m.

**Overtime Budget** - The Force's Officer overtime expenditure during June 2013 was £0.355m, which is an over spend of £0.153m against a budget of £0.202m. Staff overtime expenditure was £0.081m during June 2013, which is an over spend of £0.034m against a budget of £0.047m.

The main drivers for Officer Overtime have been: Increase in regional activities around major crimes by the Major Crime Unit and the Serious & Organised Crime Unit, Covering staff shortages in the custody suites, Op Accelerate – short term projects to speed some key crime fighting initiatives, Op Embolite – policing of Easter event, Op Fabella – planned patrols around burglary hotspots, Op Hobblebush – manslaughter, Op Habitat – homicide, Op Breadbun – kidnapping, Op Sponsor – support for the Police Service of Northern Ireland in policing the G8 summit (chargeable to the PSNI). The main driver for staff overtime has been covering the vacancy gap.

Officer Sickness - The latest 12 month rolling sickness data for the Force has shown that officer sickness reduced to 4.18% in June 2013 from 4.53% in March 2013. This compares to 4.77% in June 2012. Although the trend is above target, it has reduced consistently since the updated Attendance Management policy was introduced in October 2012. HR is continuing to work closely with line managers to reduce Long Term Sickness (LTS) which accounts for 70% of working days lost. As at the end of June there were 57 officers and staff on LTS. This compares with 84 at the end of June 2012. Officer sickness absence in the 12 months to June 2013 amounted to a cost to the Force of £4.254m.

**Staff Sickness** - As at the end of June 2013, the rolling year staff sickness rate was 3.94% (8.7 working days). This has reduced since the implementation of the updated Attendance Management policy, although it has increased on the same time last year. Staff sickness in the year to June 2013 amounted to a yearly cost to the Force of £1.619m.

Rest Days In Lieu (RDIL) – Over the last twelve months, the average number of Rest Days in Lieu (RDIL) per Officer has increased from 12.48 to 13.38, against a target of 5 days. The average number of RDIL per staff, over the previous twelve months, has increased from 8.28 to 8.90, against a target of 5 days. In total 1,074 Police Officers and 247 Staff have more than 5 RDIL. The reason for the increase in both is the continued vacancy gap.

**Strategic Priority Theme 1** 

| Strateg  | ic Priority Them  | e 1: Pro   | tect, su   | pport and res                             | pond to vi          | ctims, witr                     | nesses a | nd vulner                 | able people                               |                     |                                  |
|--|---|------------|------------|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|
|  |   |            |            | 2013                                      | 3-14 Performa       | ance Com                        | parators |                           |   |                     |                                  |
| Performance Indicator  | Target Profile  | Trend      | Target     | Most Similar<br>Group<br>(MSG)<br>Average | National<br>Average | Long<br>Term<br>Health<br>Check | Trend    | Target<br>(This<br>Month) | Most Similar<br>Group<br>(MSG)<br>Average | National<br>Average | Short<br>Term<br>Health<br>Check |
|  |   |            | Long T     | Term - 12 Months                          | to Apr 2013*        |                                 |          | Short Te                  | erm - 3 Months to                         | Apr 2013*           |                                  |
| Strategic Priority Theme 1 - Prote   | ect, support and resp   | ond to vic | tims, witr | nesses and vulne                          | rable people        |                                 |          |                           |   |                     |                                  |
| Percentage of victims of crime satisfied with the service they have received from the Police   | 90% completely,<br>very or fairly<br>satisfied by 2013-<br>2014   | <b>*</b>   | •          | average                                   | above               | Concern                         | <b>*</b> | •                         |   |                     |                                  |
| Percentage of people who agree<br>that the Police and Council are<br>dealing with local anti-social<br>behaviour and other crime issues                    | 60% agree by 2015-2016  | •          | •          | below                                     | below               | Risk                            |          |                           |   |                     |                                  |
| Percentage of victims and witnesses satisfied with the services provided in Court  | 90% satisfied with service received and 85% feel confident to give evidence in court (Improved satisfaction levels compared to 2012-13) |            | •          |   |                     | Good                            | <b>*</b> | •                         |   |                     | Good                             |
| % reduction of people that have<br>been repeat victims within the<br>previous 12 months:<br>• Domestic Violence<br>• Hate Crime<br>• Anti-social Behaviour | Reduce the number of repeat victims of: by 5% year on year compared to 2012-13  |            | •          |   |                     | Excellent                       |          | •                         |   |                     | Excellen                         |
| Policing Plan Objective - Expect   | everyone who works  | for Nottin | ghamshir   | e Police consiste                         | ently to demo       | nstrate our l                   | PROUD va | lues                      |   |                     |                                  |
| Average time to locally resolve allegations about the conduct of employees arising from public complaints will reduce to 35 days by 2015                   | Average of 43<br>days to locally<br>resolve<br>allegations by<br>2013-2014  | <b>•</b>   | •          | below                                     | below               | Risk                            | <b>*</b> | •                         |   |                     | Risk                             |
| Average time to locally investigate allegations about the conduct of employees arising from public complaints will reduce to 120 days by 2015              | Average of 150<br>days to locally<br>investigate<br>allegations by<br>2013-2014   | •          | •          | average                                   | below               | Risk                            | <b>*</b> | •                         |   |                     | Concer                           |

# **Strategic Priority Themes 2 – 6**

| Stra   | tegic Priority Th  | eme 2: Im  | proving th   | ne accessi     | bility and e        | effectiveness of          |                      |                 | process        |                     |                            |
|--|--|--|--|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
|  |  | Trend  | Target   | 1              |                     | Performance               | ·                    | S               | <u> </u>       |                     |                            |
| Performance Indicator  | Target Profile   | (12m to<br>Jun)  | (YTD to<br>Jun)  | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Long Term<br>Health Check | Trend (3m<br>to Jun) | Target<br>(Jun) | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Short Term<br>Health Check |
|  |  | ounj   | _  | erm - 12 Mor   | ths to Jun 2        | 013                       |                      | Short T         | erm - 3 Mon    | ths to Jun 20       | 113                        |
| % of Crown Court files to be<br>submitted by the Police to the CPS on<br>time and without deficiencies | To improve the current timeliness and quality of files. • To be better than the national average. • To be consistently in line with CPS national averages. |  | Current Performance: Magistrate Court Quality – 9.9% Error Rate, Timeliness – 22.4% Late Rate,<br>Crown Court Quality – 52.4% Error Rate, Timeliness – 62.7% Late Rate (YTD April-June 13) |                |                     |                           |                      |                 |                |                     |                            |
| Crown Court and Magistrates<br>Conviction rates  | To be consistently in<br>line with CPS<br>national averages  | Current Performance: Crown Court - 83.5%, Magistrates Court - 82.8% May 2013) Performance Against Target: Magistrates Court rate is below national rate, Crown Court rate is above national rate |  |                |                     |                           |                      |                 |                |                     |                            |
| % of effective trials in the Magistrates'<br>and Crown Courts (HMCTS Measure).                         | Achieve Reduce % ineffective trials compared to 2012-13.  • Achieve an effective trial rate of:  • 50% for Magistrates' Court.  • 50% for Crown Court.     | YTD Average: Magistrate Court 41.5% Crown Court 42.6%<br>Target: 50%   |  |                |                     |                           |                      |                 |                |                     |                            |
| Strategi   | c Priority Theme   | 3: Focus   | on those   | local area     | s that are r        | nost affected by          |                      |                 | al behavio     | ur                  |                            |
|  |  | <u>.</u>   | -  |                |                     | Performance               | Comparator           | S               |                |                     |                            |
| Performance Indicator  | Target Profile   | Trend<br>(12m to<br>Jun)   | Target<br>(YTD to<br>Jun)  | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Long Term<br>Health Check | Trend (3m<br>to Jun) | Target<br>(Jun) | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Short Term<br>Health Check |
|  |  |  | Long To  | erm - 12 Mor   | ths to Jun 2        | 013                       |                      | Short T         | erm - 3 Mon    | ths to Jun 20       | 13                         |
| All Crime  | 10% reduction compared to 2012/13  | •  |  |                |                     |                           |                      |                 |                |                     | -                          |
| Detection Rate incl. Positive<br>Outcomes  | Achieve a rate of 37%  | •  | •  | average        | average             | Concern                   | ▽                    | •               | average        | average             | -                          |
| Anti-Social Behaviour Incidents  | 8% reduction<br>compared to<br>2012/13   | Δ  | •  | average        | average             | Good                      | ▽                    | •               |                |                     | -                          |

| Strategi   | c Priority Theme  | e 4: Reduc                                       | e the imp  | act of drug    | gs and alco         | hol on levels of                          | f crime and          | antisocia       | al behavio     | ur                  |                            |  |
|--|---|--|--|----------------|---------------------|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--|
|  |   |  |  |                |                     | Performance                               | Comparator           | S               |                |                     |                            |  |
| Performance Indicator  | Target Profile  | Trend<br>(12m to<br>Jun)                         | Target<br>(YTD to<br>Jun)  | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Long Term<br>Health Check                 | Trend (3m<br>to Jun) | Target<br>(Jun) | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Short Term<br>Health Check |  |
|  |   |  | Long T   | erm - 12 Mo    | nths to Jun 2       | 013                                       |                      | Short 7         | Term - 3 Mor   | ths to Jun 20       | )13                        |  |
| Number of alcohol-related admissions to hospital.  The number of alcohol-related Crimes (proxy measure). | A reduction in the<br>number<br>of alcohol-related<br>admissions<br>to hospital<br>compared to<br>2012-13.     Monitor the number<br>of<br>crimes which<br>appear alcohol<br>related. |  | Alcohol-related hospital admissions: Nottingham City +6.8%, Nottingham County +1.9%, Bassetlaw -2.7% (2012/13 Q3 com 2011/12 Q3)  Alcohol Related Crime: Force 15.8% of All Crime is Alcohol Related, City - 17.5%, County - 14.5% (Apr-June 2013) |                |                     |   |                      |                 |                |                     | -                          |  |
| % of Successful completions of OCU<br>& Non OCU (Opiate and Cocaine<br>Users).                           | 1% Increase compared to 2012-13.  | Awaiting clarity from Partners/PCC around target |  |                |                     |   |                      |                 |                |                     |                            |  |
|  | S   | trategic Pr                                      | iority The   | me 5: Red      | uce the th          | reat from organi                          | sed crime            |                 |                |                     |                            |  |
|  |   |  |  |                |                     | Performance                               | Comparator           | S               |                |                     |                            |  |
| Performance Indicator  | Target Profile  | Trend<br>(12m to<br>Jun)                         | Target<br>(YTD to<br>Jun)  | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Long Term<br>Health Check                 | Trend (3m<br>to Jun) | Target<br>(Jun) | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Short Term<br>Health Check |  |
|  |   |  | Long T   | erm - 12 Mo    | nths to Jun 2       | 013                                       |                      | Short 7         | Term - 3 Mon   | ths to Jun 20       | )13                        |  |
| The number of Proceeds of<br>Crime Act (POCA) confiscation<br>and forfeiture orders.                     | 10% increase (year<br>on year) in the<br>numbers of<br>confiscation and<br>forfeiture orders<br>compared to 2012-<br>13.  |  | C  | urrent Perfo   |                     | 5,427.92 recorded v<br>ce Against Target: |                      |                 |                | ed to 2012)         |                            |  |
| Force threat, harm and risk<br>(THR) assessment level.   | To reduce THR to<br>below the<br>2012-13 level.   |  | Current  | Performance    | e: THR Level        | year-to-date is at a                      | a similar leve       | l to that red   | corded at the  | end of last         | year                       |  |
| The number of people Killed<br>or Seriously Injured (KSIs) on<br>Nottinghamshire's roads.                | 40% reduction in<br>all Killed and<br>Seriously Injured<br>RTCs by 2020 (from<br>2005-09 average).     Monitor KSIs for 0-<br>15 year olds.   | Curr   | Current Performance: Reduction of 28.9% or 37 less people Killed or Seriously Injured (Jan-Mar 2013 compared to 2012)  Performance Against Target: Target of 9.0% has been surpassed   |                |                     |   |                      |                 |                |                     |                            |  |

|   |  | Performance Comparators  |   |                |                     |  |                      |                 |                |                     |                                      |  |  |
|---|--|--------------------------|---|----------------|---------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Performance Indicator   | Target Profile   | Trend<br>(12m to<br>Jun) | Target<br>(YTD to<br>Jun)   | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Long Term<br>Health Check              | Trend (3m<br>to Jun) | Target<br>(Jun) | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Short Term<br>Health Check           |  |  |
|   |  |                          | Long To   | erm - 12 Moi   | nths to Jun 2       | 013                                    |                      | Short T         | erm - 3 Mon    | ths to Jun 20       | erage Health Chec<br>Jun 2013<br>12) |  |  |
| First Time Entrants (FTEs) into the Youth Justice System.   | 10% reduction (year on year) compared to 2012-13.  |                          | Current Performance: 121 FTEs, a reduction of 23.4% (Apr-June 2013 compared to 2012)  Performance Against Target: 10% reduction target has been surpassed |                |                     |  |                      |                 |                |                     |                                      |  |  |
| National Reduce the offending of offenders managed and supervised by IOM (Integrated Offender Management) that cause significant harm. Local - Acquisitive Crime Cohort High Risk of Harm Offenders Young Adult offenders (18yrs to 21yrs). | Reduce (proven) reoffending to be below the national average, less than 32.4 per cent. • Monitor • Monitor |                          |   |                |                     | n Re-offending Ra<br>Nottinghamshire i | •                    |                 |                |                     |                                      |  |  |

Indicators highlighted in tan in the above table are the 2013-2018 Police and Crime Plan and Policing Plan targets and those highlighted in blue are from the 2013-2018 Policing Plan

# Strategic Priority Theme – 7 Section B: Priority 2

Performance Reporting Against the Priority Indicator Set 2013-14

|   |   | F        | Priority 2:                        | To Spend       | Your Mone           | ey Wisely                 |           |                                    |                |                     |   |  |  |
|---|---|----------|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
|   |   |          |                                    |                |                     | Performance               | Comparato | rs                                 |                |                     |   |  |  |
| Performance Indicator   | Target Profile                                      | Trend    | Target<br>(YTD)                    | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Long Term<br>Health Check | Trend     | Target<br>(This<br>Month)          | MSG<br>Average | National<br>Average | Short Term Health Check 113  Good Risk Risk Good Risk Good Risk Good Good Good Good Good Good |  |  |
| Value For Manay and Improving Pro                                     | duativity   |          | Long Term - 12 Months to June 2013 |                |                     |                           |           | Short Term - 3 Months to June 2013 |                |                     |   |  |  |
| Value For Money and Improving Pro                                     | ductivity   |          |                                    |                | V/////////          |                           | I         |                                    |                |                     |   |  |  |
| Comparison of projected spend against actual by force and departments | Budget of £196.998m                                 | •        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | <b>◆</b>  | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| Overtime budget   | Reduce spend on overtime to<br>be below MSG average | •        | •                                  | Average        |                     | Risk                      | <b>4</b>  | •                                  |                |                     | Risk  |  |  |
| Total no of days lost through sickness<br>(Officer)                   | 3.7% or 8.2 days per Officer                        | $\nabla$ | •                                  | Below          | Below               | Risk                      | ▽         | •                                  |                |                     | Risk  |  |  |
| Total no of days lost through sickness (Staff)                        | 3.7% or 8.2 days per person                         | $\nabla$ | •                                  | Below          | Below               | Risk                      | ▽         | •                                  |                |                     | Risk  |  |  |
| Fleet Costs   | Budget of £4.697m                                   | •        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | <b>•</b>  | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| Vehicle Hire  | Budget of £0.174m                                   | •        | •                                  |                |                     | Risk                      | •         | •                                  |                |                     | Risk  |  |  |
| Ratio of Constable to Sergeants and above                             | Be better than MSG average                          | •        | •                                  | Above          |                     | Good                      | •         | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| RDIL by Force (OFFICERS)  | 5 days  | $\nabla$ | •                                  |                |                     | Risk                      | ▽         | •                                  |                |                     | Risk  |  |  |
| RDIL by Force (STAFF)   | 5 days  | $\nabla$ | •                                  |                |                     | Risk                      | ▽         | •                                  |                |                     | Risk  |  |  |
| TOIL by Force (OFFICERS)  | 40 hours  | Δ        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | Δ         | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| TOIL by Force (STAFF)   | 40 hours  | Δ        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | Δ         | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| Officer Establishment   | Available Resources                                 | •        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | •         | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| Staff Establishment   | Available Resources                                 | •        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | •         | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| Finance Department  | Performance of department                           | •        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | •         | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| IS Department   | Performance of department                           | •        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | •         | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| HR Department   | Performance of department                           | •        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | •         | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |
| Health & Safety   | Performance of Health & Safety                      | •        | •                                  |                |                     | Good                      | •         | •                                  |                |                     | Good  |  |  |

# **Appendix A User Guide to the Performance & Insight Report**

The rationale for a Performance & Insight Report:

This document sets out a summary of the performance of Nottinghamshire Police in relation to key measures to deliver against the priorities in the Police and Crime Plan 2013-18. The Force has agreed a new Integrated Business Planning process which will support performance reporting based on the development of balanced scorecards, which will be built into each of the service delivery area business plans, with key measures being identified for monitoring through this Performance Scorecard Report. This Report will be presented to the Police and Crime Commissioner for approval, and will form part of the Police and Crime Commissioner's scrutiny as set out in the principles below.

# Principles:

- To provide Performance Scorecard reports for the Police and Crime Commissioner
- To ensure performance reporting aligns to Force and Police and Crime Commissioner Governance
- To ensure robust quality and timeliness of performance reporting to the Force and the Police and Crime Commissioner
- To build in best practice for performance reporting for information, decision making and informing the Integrated Business Planning Framework
- To build the Performance Report to demonstrate performance monitoring to deliver the Police and Crime Plan strategic objectives and Policing Plan priorities:
  - o To cut crime and keeping you safe
  - o To spend your money wisely
  - o To earn your trust and confidence
- To implement a Home Office (HO) Assessment method to the system to assess performance against target
- Trends to be assessed using statistical methods used by the Home Office police performance system iQuanta
- To demonstrate how the Force is performing against its Most Similar Forces (MSG)
- To design in the what is happening (patterns and trends) and why from the information
- To highlight performance risks in relation to each of the three strategic priorities
- To outline control measures that will be introduced to improve performance

### Key features

The report contains tables showing how the Force is performing in relation to the following Performance Comparators:

- Performance compared to self (Trend)
- Performance compared to target
- Performance compared to MSG and national Forces (where available).

Both long and short-term performance is assessed using the above comparators. Long-term performance is based on a 12 month picture. Short-term performance is based on a 3 month picture, with the target being based on the current month's performance. This allows the reader to assess the Forces progress against the Police and Crime Plan targets using the long-term performance picture, while also allowing them to view any emerging trends in the short-term picture.

Indicators are given a Health Check Measure Rating, which is based on the combined score of the Performance Comparators.

### Commonly used acronyms

ASB - Anti-social Behaviour

ACPO – Association of Chief Police Officers

BCU - Basic Command Unit

BME – Black or Minority Ethnic

CSEW - Crime Survey for England and Wales

MSG - Most Similar Group of Forces; or Most Similar Group of BCU's

PCC - Police and Crime Commissioner

PSD - Professional Standards Directorate

RTC - Road Traffic Accident

## **Data Sources:**

Satisfaction data has been taken from the Force's internal user satisfaction surveys
Confidence data has been taken from the Crime Survey for England and Wales (formerly the British Crime Survey)
MSG and National comparisons are based on data taken from the external iQuanta systems
Contact Management data has been taken from the internal Vision, SICCS and Symposium systems

PSD data has been extracted from the internal Centurion system
MSG and National comparisons for complaints are based on data provided by the IPCC Police Complaints Information bulletins.
Finance and Business data has been taken from the internal e-financials, transport and HRMS systems

Crime and Detections data has been taken from the internal CRMS system. Please note that detailed analysis of crime and detections data is based on data from CRMS for the period 1st April 2012 – 31st June 2013. As CRMS is a live system this data may be subject to change. MSG and National comparisons are based on data taken from the external iQuanta system – the most similar group for the force consists of Nottinghamshire, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Northumbria, Northamptonshire, Staffordshire, South Wales and South Yorkshire. Further data definitions for the Protection from Serious Harm indicators can be viewed in Appendix B.

#### Data Time Period:

Satisfaction data, excluding MSG and National comparisons, covers incidents reported up to March 2013 (interviews up to May 2013). Data for MSG and National forces is for 12 months of interviews up to December 2012 for Satisfaction data (incidents reported up to October 2012).

Data for MSG and National forces is for 12 months of interviews up to December 2012 for Confidence data.

Data for Public Complaints indicators covers public complaints and allegations up to April 2013.

Data for MSG and National forces is for 12 months to March 2013 for public complaints data.

Unless otherwise stated, data for Crime and Detections Trend and Target position is up to May 2013

MSG and National Comparisons for Crime and Detections is based on the 12 months to December 2012 unless otherwise stated

# Statistical Methodology

Analysis of trend is based on the most recent 12 months performance (long-term trend) or 3 months performance (short-term trend), with tests of statistical significance employed to assess for statistically significant variations in the exponentially weighted moving average at the 80% and 95% confidence levels.

Performance against target (long-term) is assessed using either the 12 month rolling average or year-to-date performance compared to target. Performance against target (short-term) is assessed using current month performance compared to target.

A 5% level has been used to assess for performance significantly different to target.

A manual assessment has been made of the performance of the four departments (Finance, ICT, Estates and Procurement).

For more information on the statistical techniques employed in the report please contact the performance and insight team: mi@nottinghamshire.pnn.police.uk

# **Appendix B: Additional Data Definitions**

#### **Crime Detection Rate**

The 2012/13 Police and Crime Plan target for All Crime has been set at 36.0% with this rate to include the non-Sanction Detection outcomes of Restorative Justice (RJ) and Informal Resolution. These disposal methods are a less formal method of dealing with a low level offence (such as Criminal Damage) where the victim and offender are brought together (directly or through a facilitator) in order to resolve the issue. An example of this could be a criminal damage offender apologising to the victim and cleaning up the graffiti they have caused. Please see the 2012/13 Police and Crime Plan for more information on this target. Although the overall Force Sanction Detection rate and Police and Crime Plan target quoted in this report includes these RJ disposals, the detailed analysis included in the insight section of the report will consider Sanction Detection data only (so not including RJ disposals) unless otherwise stated.

#### **Anti-Social Behaviour**

The Force has recently changed the way in which it records its Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) incidents in line with National Standards of Incident Recording (NSIR) guidance set out by the Home Office, and this has had an impact on the performance data available for this indicator. This means that at this time any analysis which breaks down the data by the type of ASB is extremely limited and can only compare monthly data back to December 2011, which is not as comprehensive a method as comparing to the same time period of previous years. The majority of the analysis for this indicator will therefore be restricted to geographical comparisons.

### Persons Killed or Seriously Injured on the Roads

This data is supplied by Nottinghamshire Police's Traffic Management Team. For more information please contact the report author or Chief Inspector Andy Charlton (Andrew.charlton@nottinghamshire.pnn.police.uk)

#### **Domestic Abuse Arrests Data**

This measure is the percentage of suspects of Domestic Violence (DV) crimes reported to the Force that are arrested within 48 hours, and the data for this indicator relies on two Force systems, the CRMS (crime recording) system and the NSPIS custody system. Because of the way that the data are recorded on these two systems there are limitations to the data for this indicator, for example, there is no direct link between the Forces Crime Recording and Custody systems and therefore collation of the data requires a fairly comprehensive process. Despite this process it may not be possible to link all incidents to arrests and therefore some data may be missing.

#### **First-Time Entrants Data**

The data for this measure are supplied by the Operational & Tactical Support Team from Target Support & Youth Justice Services. Data provided is year-to-date (YTD) as it is difficult to break the data down into individual months. An offender is described as a first time entrant into the youth justice database if they are between the ages of 10-18 yrs old and there is no record on the Police National Computer (PNC) or local Force systems that they have committed a previous offence.

#### **Assets Recovered from the Proceeds of Crime Act**

The data for this measure are received from the Financial Investigation Unit and are taken from the Joint Asset Recovery Database (JARD). Due to the fluid manner of this area of performance, data are always shown year-to-date (YTD) and it is not possible to break the data down into individual monthly performance. There are two methods of recovering assets under the Proceeds of Crime Act, these are Cash Forfeiture and Confiscation Orders. Cash forfeiture relates to cash seized from a defendant that is above £1,000 and has been shown (by the Financial Investigation Unit) to have been either from criminality or intended for use in criminality. Confiscation orders take place in the crown court following a conviction for acquisitive crime. In this process the Financial Investigation Unit will conduct an investigation into the defendant's criminality and then put a value on it, and this value is then subsequently recovered from the defendant's assets at the time of arrest, be this money, equity in property, cars, expensive goods etc.