

APPENDIX A: SELECTION OF TARGETS FOR THE LAA

Partnership priority	Proposed indicators with strengths, weaknesses and risks (favoured options shown in bold)
1. Anti-Social Behaviour	<p>National Indicator 17 Perceptions of anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>This is a perceptual indicator rather than an objective one, but there is no generally accepted or reliable method of measuring ASB. We have a baseline from the national BVPI survey (also known as Local Government User Satisfaction Survey) undertaken in late 2006. A weakness of this indicator, and a risk attached to it, is that local activity and progress on ASB could be overwhelmed by media coverage and / or by the Middlesbrough dominated agenda of the Evening Gazette.</p> <p>The Council has previously set a target against this indicator, as part of the BVPI process, to achieve a 3% reduction in the average level of concern from 29% to 26%.</p> <p>Other potential candidates for an indicator in this area are:-</p> <p>NI 21 Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local council and police – this option would shift the focus from outcomes to agency performance, (and for two agencies only);</p> <p>NI 25 Satisfaction of different groups with the way the police and local council dealt with anti-social behaviour – a variation of NI 21: and</p> <p>NI 27 Understanding of local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local council and police, which would shift the focus even further away from outcomes, and introduce an element of ‘double perception’, i.e. public perceptions of agency perceptions.</p>
2. Drug related offending	<p>In order to do justice to the breadth of this area, two Indicators are likely to be needed.</p> <p>National Indicator 38 Drug – related (Class A) offending rate.</p> <p>This may be a reasonable indicator, depending on the definition, which is still not fully available. However, there is a suggestion in the Measurement Annex to PSA 25 (page 21, Indicator 3) that it may be based on tracking a cohort of individuals, established in January – March 2008. If so, this could be problematic, as experience elsewhere (e.g. Youth Justice Board recidivism targets) suggests that a quarterly cohort can turn out not to be typical of global performance (as well as being difficult and relatively expensive to track).</p> <p>An alternative may be to stick with one of our preferred Local Indicators, which is simply to achieve reductions in the numbers of positive drug tests on arrest. We only have data for 2006 / 07 and 2007 / 08 to date.</p> <p>NI 42 Perceptions of drug use or drug dealing as a problem – taken in tandem with NI 38 or the Local Indicator outlined above, this would help to give a more balanced assessment of the success of our interventions in relation to drugs.</p>

	<p>Other potential candidates for an Indicator in this area are:-</p> <p>NI 40 Drug users in effective treatment – but this is simply a throughput, not an outcome (given that only about 4% of those on treatment emerge as ‘completed, drug free’), and there is scope for considerable debate about what constitutes effectiveness in treatment.</p> <p>NI 16 Serious acquisitive crime rate – reflects levels of burglary, robbery and vehicle crime. We have made massive progress in these areas in recent years but this could be seen as a reasonable proxy.</p> <p>NI 30 Re-offending rate of prolific and priority offenders – another possible proxy</p>
<p>3. Violent Crime</p>	<p>National indicator 15 Serious violent crime rate.</p> <p>This is an objective measure, and figures are readily available, but the concern is that the definition as suggested in the Measurement Annex to PSA 23 may draw the definition so tightly as to cover only a very small number of crimes (< 50?) each year in our Borough.</p> <p>If it were possible to negotiate a variation on this Indicator, to include a broader group of offence codes, so that the baseline figures were of the order of 500 per year, then it would offer a strong indicator and would reflect the public concern about serious violent crime. It is worth noting that at September 2007 Stockton had the lowest rate of ‘most serious violent crime’ in our Most Similar Basic Command Unit (BCU) group. Stockton reporting rates are higher than national averages - we have 86% for theft from the person / mugging / robbery and snatch theft, against a national average of 47%, and we have 79% for violent crime / common assault against a national average of 35%.</p> <p>NI 28 Serious knife crime rate } local figures are too small to provide the basis for a sensible target. NI 29 Gun crime rate }</p> <p>NI 32 Repeat incidents of domestic violence – would focus on one category of violent crime only (about 20 – 25% of total violent crime).</p>
<p>4. Criminal Damage</p>	<p>There is no direct reference to criminal damage within the national list of 198.</p> <p>The nearest proxy may be NI 195 Street and environment cleanliness (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting). Even this indicator makes no direct reference to vandalism, although the issues listed are often associated with vandalism.</p> <p>An alternative may be to negotiate the use of a Local Indicator based on a straightforward reduction of criminal damage as a recorded crime, e.g. a reduction of x% on the three year average baseline for 2005 / 06, 2006 / 07 and 2007 / 08.</p> <p>Figures are readily available. The British Crime Survey suggests that criminal damage only reports at 26% for vandalism to vehicles and 40% for vandalism to homes (BCS 2005 / 06)]. Our local figures from the Council’s two-yearly MORI survey show much higher rates of 58% (vehicle) and 64% (homes). (MORI 2006).</p>

<p>5. Diverting Young People from Offending</p>	<p>NI 111. First time entrants (FTEs) to the Youth Justice System.</p> <p>As discussed at our Partnership in summer 2007, there is tension between the aim to reduce FTEs and the aim to increase the numbers of Offences Brought to Justice (OBTJ). This tension may be substantially reduced if current plans to limit the OBTJ targets to serious offences come to fruition given that most FTEs are for relatively minor offences. The process of 'defusing' the tension could be completed if it were possible to negotiate a variation to exclude from this target (and the baselines) the relatively small number of young people who have become FTEs for more serious offences.</p> <p>PSA 14 Increase the number of children and young people on the path to success states:</p> <p><i>'The police also contribute to this PSA through the operational decisions they take about dealing with low-level misbehaviour. The police and other criminal justice agents will continue to respond proportionately and effectively to local concerns. In the case of low-level offending by juveniles, this does not always entail giving the young person a formal criminal justice disposal. While it would be entirely inappropriate for this PSA to be met by the police not giving a formal disposal to a young person where this is clearly needed, the police must continue to ensure that decisions they take in responding to young people are proportionate and are based on the best interests of the young person, the victim and the community. This sometimes includes an informal or restorative intervention rather than a formal disposal.'</i></p>
<p>Other comments</p>	
	<p>NI 5 Overall / general satisfaction with local area: this may be an indicator with appeal across the LSP membership, as it reflects at a very broad level a lot of what we are all trying to achieve, and should be supported by this Partnership (as an additional Indicator, not as a substitute for one of our first five choices).</p> <p>NI 151 – 153 are concerned with employment and benefit rates. Any of these indicators would be useful from our point of view, given the high proportion of offending carried out by individuals who are not in gainful employment (a sizeable number of which are problem drug users in receipt of Incapacity Benefit). The best of these from our point of view would be NI 152 Working age people on out of work benefits, but the views of the Economic, Regeneration and Transport Partnership should take precedence.</p>