SINGLE SET OF NATIONAL INDICATORS

1. Attached to this report is the initial DCLG (Department for Communities and Local Government) statement setting out the 'menu' of 198 National Indicators from which Local Strategy Partnerships can choose up to 35 for inclusion in their Local Area Agreements. Targets will need to be set for those which are chosen. Informal feedback suggests that GONE may be looking for Targets to be set only in areas of genuine challenge (i.e. not in areas where performance is really good).

2. The indicators of particular interest to this Partnership are highlighted in pink. We have an indirect interest in many of the others. For, example, anything which reduces worklessness is likely to contribute to downward pressure on levels of crime and disorder, as, in the long term is anything which improves life chances for children and young people.

3. Of the 198 indicators, 35 appear under the heading of 'Safer Communities'. All but two of them, which relate to road safety, are directly relevant to the work of this Partnership.

4. The indicators vary significantly in at least three ways:

   a) whether they are clear, or interpretable / ambiguous;
   b) whether they are objective, or based on perceptions; and
   c) whether the numbers involved are relatively large (and therefore offer a good basis for target setting) or small (and therefore probably volatile – some of these are likely to be very small at the level in our Borough).

   They may also differ in terms of availability of baseline data.

5. Some initial comments have been added to the text. When further detail is available it should be possible to arrive at more informed judgements.

6. On the basis of proportionality, we may expect 5 or 6 'Safer Communities' indicators to be included in the LAA.

7. The choice of indicators and targets should also reflect other priorities as identified by our Community Safety plan consultation programme i.e.
   a) ASB
   b) Drug related offending
   c) Violent Crime
   d) Criminal damage
   e) Diverting young people from offending

8. Previous experience suggests that setting targets in relation to one year's worth of baseline data is a risky business because the year in question may prove to be atypical. A better approach, wherever possible, is to set targets against a three or five year average baseline.

9. On the current knowledge base, it is RECOMMENDED that the Partnership gives initial consideration to prioritising indicators as follows:-

   a) NI 17 Perceptions of anti social behaviour (provided that the key question is posed in terms of 'in your area / neighbourhood', so as to reduce the impact of national media trends).

   b) NI 38 Drug related (Class A) offending rate (depending on the detail of measurement – allied to our current local target for reducing the numbers of positive tests on arrest, but may not sit well with police targets to increase the number of interventions).

   c) NI 15 Serious violent crime rate.

   d) Consider the option of NI 195 (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting) as a rough proxy for criminal damage (or develop our own local indicators based on the recorded crime category).

   e) NI 111 First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10 – 17 (if tension with OBTJ targets, can be removed or substantially reduced, and taking care to use the most realistic possible baseline).

10. It is also RECOMMENDED that the Partnership receives a further report on this issue, once there has been the opportunity to do some further research on values and baselines.