

North Yorkshire Police Service Standards  
Commitment 2010 – 2012

**Safer**  
Neighbourhoods

NYP  
North Yorkshire Police



**YORK**  
**MONTHLY SERVICE STANDARDS PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR JAN-12**

**WE ARE COMMITTED TO BEING THERE WHEN YOU NEED US:**

| Key Performance Indicator                                    | Objective        | Year To Date |         |        | Compared to monthly ave |         |     |
|--|------------------|--------------|---------|--------|-------------------------|---------|-----|
|  |                  | 2011/12      | 2010/11 | +/-    | Jan-12                  | Average | +/- |
| (NYP) % of emergency calls answered within 10 seconds:       | Achieve 90%      | 83%          | 96%     | -12.7% | 89%                     | 95%     | -7% |
| (NYP) Avg time to answer an emergency call (seconds):        | 10 Seconds       | 7.5          | 4.2     | 3.3    | 5.3                     | 4.3     | 1.0 |
| (NYP) % of Public Enquirer calls answered within 30 seconds: | Achieve 90%      | 77%          |         |        | 81%                     |         |     |
| (NYP) % of Operator calls answered within 30 seconds:        | Achieve 90%      | 85%          |         |        | 90%                     |         |     |
| % of Immediate Urban incidents attended in 15 minutes:       | Improve on 81.1% | 82%          | 77%     | 4.6%   | 84%                     | 78%     | 7%  |
| Avg time to attend Immediate Urban incidents (mins):         | 15 mins          | 11           | 12      | -1     | 10                      | 12      | -2  |
| % of Immediate Rural incidents attended in 20 minutes:       | Improve on 76.9% | 82%          | 78%     | 3.3%   | 82%                     | 79%     | 3%  |
| Avg time to attend Immediate Rural incidents (mins):         | 20 mins          | 15           | 17      | -1     | 14                      | 16      | -2  |
| % of Vulnerable Person Incidents attended in 60 minutes:     | Improve on 70.5% | 69%          | 69%     | -0.2%  | 76%                     | 67%     | 8%  |
| Avg time to attend Vulnerable Person incidents (mins):       | 60 mins          | 57           | 77      | -20    | 55                      | 76      | -20 |
| % of Priority Incidents attended in 60 minutes:              | Monitor          | 74%          | 73%     | 0.8%   | 75%                     | 72%     | 3%  |
| Avg time to attend Priority incidents (mins):                | 60 mins          | 63           | 79      | -16    | 56                      | 79      | -23 |
| % of victims satisfied with the time it took to arrive :     | Monitor          | 89%          | 83%     | 5.5%   | 89%                     | 83%     | 6%  |

Please note that call handling stats are presented for NYP only - they are not split by district or Safer Neighbourhood Command. In addition it is no longer possible to measure '0845' performance as a combined figure since the introduction of the Automated Switchboard on 21st November because of how the calls are now routed to the FCR

**WE ARE COMMITTED TO BEING YOUR LOCAL POLICE SERVICE:**

| Key Performance Indicator                    | Objective | Year To Date |         |      | Compared to monthly ave |         |     |
|--|-----------|--------------|---------|------|-------------------------|---------|-----|
|  |           | 2011/12      | 2010/11 | +/-  | Jan-12                  | Average | +/- |
| % of victims satisfied with ease of contact: | Monitor   | 94%          | 93%     | 1.3% | 94%                     | 92%     | 2%  |

**WE ARE COMMITTED TO LISTENING TO YOU:**

| Key Performance Indicator  | Objective        | Year To Date |         |       | Compared to monthly ave |         |     |
|--|------------------|--------------|---------|-------|-------------------------|---------|-----|
|  |                  | 2011/12      | 2010/11 | +/-   | Jan-12                  | Average | +/- |
| % of victims satisfied with actions taken by NYP:  | Monitor          | 82%          | 82%     | 0.5%  | 82%                     | 81%     | 1%  |
| % of victims who felt informed about what the police would do regarding their crime/incident : | Monitor          | 61%          | 59%     | 1.3%  | 61%                     | 58%     | 3%  |
| % of victims who thought their questions were answered adequately :                            | Monitor          | 81%          | 85%     | -3.5% | 81%                     | 83%     | -2% |
| % of victims who felt reassured by what the police did :                                       | Monitor          | 89%          | 92%     | -2.8% | 89%                     | 90%     | -1% |
| % of victims satisfied with the treatment they received:                                       | Monitor          | 94%          | 98%     | -3.9% | 94%                     | 96%     | -2% |
| % of victims satisfied with being kept informed of progress (follow up):                       | Achieve 73%      | 67%          | 68%     | -0.8% | 67%                     | 65%     | 2%  |
| % of victim given updates without asking :   | Improve on 56.8% | 53%          | 55%     | -2.3% | 53%                     | 54%     | -1% |
| % of victims satisfied with overall service:   | Achieve 85%      | 84%          | 84%     | 0.1%  | 84%                     | 82%     | 1%  |

**Notes:**

User Satisfaction Survey data is based on a representative sample of Burglary, Violence, Autocrime and RTC victims and is captured and produced in accordance with Home Office guidance

The accuracy of the survey data is approximately +/- 2% at force level and between +/- 4 and 5 at SNC level

If the current quarter performance is highlighted in red or green this means it represents a statistically significant change from 2010/11

Trend analysis is calculated based on the latest 6 months of data