

## NORTH YORKSHIRE POLICE POLICING PLEDGE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK - FORCE

<p><b>Pledge 1:</b> Although the satisfaction levels for initial stages of contact and treatment show slight decreases, the overall percentage change is minor over the course of the year and 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 are lower than 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> NYP's performance at force level for pledge 2 is mixed compared to the previous year. Using historic survey data, the % of people who are aware of their Safer Neighbourhood Team was 50% as at March 2009, and the level is now 43.5%. However, the % of people who are aware of how to contact their Safer Neighbourhood Team has increased slightly from 38.5% last year to 39.4% this year. However, it must be stressed that the data from the new Public Attitude survey adopts different methodologies from the previous survey and as such this is likely to have impacted on the change in results.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 3:</b> Across the force, the amount of time that SNT officers spend working in their local area is above the target of 80%, and is equal to last year at 96%. The % of people who have spoken to their local officer or PCSO is just under 50%.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 4:</b> The nature of this priority means that it is difficult to accurately performance monitor this through availability of electronic Management Information. NYP is using this iteration of the Pledge pack as a method for exploring a time and cost-effective method of a dip-sampling/mystery shopping exercise related to this priority. (Further work is continuing around the monitoring of pledge 4. The indicators shown are the best available at present)</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 5:</b> NYP can report a marked improvement for January-March 2010 compared to the same period in 2009 with the % of 999 calls answered within 10 seconds. This can be presented alongside decreases in the average time to answer a 999 call for the same period. Call handling and dispatch times are comparable to the previous year. However, attendance to immediate urban and rural incidents continues to be some cause for concern with NYP missing the attendance targets.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 6:</b> Over the past 7 months, NYP has constantly improved its performance in attending Neighbourhood Priority incidents within one hour. Attendance to Vulnerable Persons incidents within target has remained stable at around 65% over the past six months. Exact comparisons with the previous year is not possible as integrating local priority information into the command and control environment is a new process for NYP. It is recognised that the volumes of Neighbourhood Priority and Vulnerable Person incidents are small so we should be pushing for a higher attendance rate. Through the Daily Management Meeting process pledge attendance is being actively monitored and Safer Neighbourhood Commanders are provided with contact details for callers in order to attempt to recover service failures. Attendance within target to Priority incidents has increased by 19% points, and attendance to Scheduled incidents within target has increased by 24% points compared to last year (Jan-March 2010 compared to Jan-March 2009).</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 7:</b> Data for Pledge 7 has only recently been populated and therefore it is not possible to provide a trend or analysis of performance.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 8:</b> At force level, the % of people who feel well informed about what the police have been doing is 63%, which is 37% points higher than at the same time last year. Though it must be noted that there has been changes in the survey methodology.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 9:</b> The satisfaction with follow up rate has improved by 2% points compared to last year, however the level is still below the force's strategic target. The % of victims kept informed without asking has increased compared to last year.</p>	
<p><b>Pledge 10:</b> The total number of complaints received by the force has increased slightly between January and March compared to the same period last year. The number of Direction and Control issues raised shows a small increase of 1 complaint over the three month period.</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	Jan - Mar 10	Jan - Mar 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	10	11	-1	✓	11.5	✓	Decrease	
Average number of Letters of Appreciation received within a month by P.S.D	P.S.D	17	10	7	✓	12.7	✓	Random	✗
The % of victims who were satisfied with how easy it was to contact someone who could assist them?	User Satisfaction Survey	91.7%	93.1%	-1.4%	✗	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	93.0%	93.2%	-0.2%	✗	93.1%	✗	Decrease**	
The % of people who agree the police treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are	^ Public Attitude Survey	74.4%	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	86.9%							
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	Mar-10	Mar-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	43.5%	50.0%	-6.5%	✗	53.4%	✗	Decrease***	✓✓
The % of people who know how to contact their Safer Neighbourhood Team	^ Public Attitude Survey	39.4%	38.5%	0.9%	✓	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									

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.								
Indicator	Source	Mar-10	Mar-09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation	
% of time SNT officers spend working in their local area	NSPIS HR	96.0%	95.9%	0% ✓	97% ✗	Random		
Attrition rate for Safer Neighbourhood Staff (calculated over a rolling 3 month period)	NSPIS HR	WILL BE POPULATED WITH DATA FROM 2010						
The % of people who have spoken to their local officer or PCSO	New Public Attitude Survey	48.3%	HISTORICAL DATA PRESENTLY UNAVAILABLE					✓✓
The % of people who never see a police officer or PCSO patrolling their area	New Public Attitude Survey	43.5%	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 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.								
Indicator	Source	Mar-10	Mar-09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation	
Measures are to be confirmed. Based on dip-sampling - guidance to be developed and actioned								

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	Jan - Mar 10	Jan - Mar 09	Change		Average 2008/09		Trend	Outside Historical Variation
% of 'Immediate Urban' incidents attended within 15 minutes	Force Control Room	77.3%	80.0%	-2.7%	✗	79%	✗	Decrease***	
% of 'Immediate Rural' incidents attended within 20 minutes	Force Control Room	73.7%	72.2%	1.4%	✓	73%	✓	Decrease**	
% of 999 calls answered within 10 seconds	# Force Control Room	95.5%	88.2%	7.3%	✓	80%	✓	Increase**	✓✓
Average speed of answer of 999 calls	Force Control Room	4.5	5.8	-1.3	✓	7.8	✓	Decrease***	✓✓
Amount of time spent at Call Handling stage taking initial details (minutes)	Force Control Room	1.3	1.3	0.0	✗	1.7	✓	Decrease	
Amount of time taken at Dispatch stage before a resource is proceeded (minutes)	Force Control Room	4.2	4.0	0.2	✗	4.6	✓	Random	
% of people that believe the police can be relied on to respond quickly to emergencies	^^ Public Attitude Survey	55.7%		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 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 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	Jan - Mar 10	Jan - Mar 09	Change	Average 2008/09	Trend	Outside Historical Variation
% of Incidents attended within 60 minutes (Vulnerable)	Force Control Room	62.0%	65.3%	-3% ✘	82% ✘	Random	
% of Incidents attended within 60 minutes (Priority)	Force Control Room	82.7%	68.6%	14% ✔	56% ✔	Increase**	✔
% of 'PRIORITY' incidents attended within 60 minutes	Force Control Room	73.0%	53.9%	19% ✔	52% ✔	Increase**	✔✔
% of 'SCHEDULED' incidents attended within 48 hours	Force Control Room	71.0%	47.3%	24% ✔	44% ✔	Random	✔✔
% of non-emergency calls answered within 30 seconds	# Force Control Room	91.2%	65.3%	26% ✔	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 NYPAs 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

<b>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.</b>							
Indicator	Source	Mar-10	Mar-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	43.1%					
The % of people who think that the police are interested in issues that concern people living in the local area	# ^Public Attitude Survey	60.7%					
The % of people who think that the police get involved in activities within the local community	^Public Attitude Survey	41.2%					
The % of people who think that the police are in touch with the local community	^Public Attitude Survey	57.0%					
The % of people who agree that they can influence decisions in their local areas	^Public Attitude Survey	38.5%					
% of SNTs that have had at least one publically advertised meeting	Community Consultation	88%					
The % of people who have attended a local meeting where the police were involved	^Public Attitude Survey	18.0%					
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 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.</b>							
Indicator	Source	Mar-10	Mar-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	63.6%	26.9%	37% ✓	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	49.3%				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	Mar-10	Mar-09	Change		Average 2008/09		Trend	Outside Historical Variation
% victims who were provided with progress updates without asking	User Satisfaction Survey	55.2%	48.1%	7%	✓	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.										
(It is acknowledged that the below indicators do not reflect the full scope of Pledge 10 - further work is ongoing to identify further measures)	Indicator	Source	Jan - Mar 10	Jan - Mar 09	Change		Average 2008/09		Trend	Outside Historical Variation
The average number of complaints received in a month		^ P.S.D	167	163	4	✗	166	✗	Random	✗✗
Average number of days taken to record a complaint		^ P.S.D	5	14	-8.8	✓	8	✓	Random	
Average number of Direction and Control complaints received in a month		^ P.S.D	10	9	1.666667	✗	11	✓	Random	✓
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										



























