

2005/06 PPAF Assessment

How does it work?

The assessment groups 32 SPIs and HMIC judgements on 25 aspects of police work e.g. forensics, specialist operational support called baselines into seven domains. Each SPI and baseline is given a delivery grade based on 'excellent' (E), 'good' (G), fair (F) and poor (P) and a direction grade on change since last year based on 'improving' (I), stable (S) and deteriorating (D). Those component grades are averaged out to provide a delivery and direction grade for each domain. There is no grade overall for each force as that was felt to be too simplistic for the range of activities police forces perform.

In general, the grades for SPIs are usually calculated according to the ratio or difference of the force's performance to the 2004/05 average for that item for the most similar forces (MSF) group (includes the force itself). The MSF for the MPS has Greater Manchester, West Midlands, West Yorkshire & Merseyside as well as the MPS.

Annex A (available to members and on our website) provides all the grades for the SPS and baselines for 2005/06 and for 2004/05 where they are different.

Delivery

In 2004/05 (first year of public PPAF assessments), the MPS scored 'poor' in three domains, Investigating Crime, Promoting Safety and Citizen Focus. For 2005/06, Investigating Crime is now a 'good', while Promoting Safety and Citizen Focus are now 'fair'. Local policing went up from a 'good' to an 'excellent'. The other three domains, Reducing Crime, Providing Assistance, & Resource Use maintained their grades respectively of 'fair', 'good' and 'good' for 2005/06.

Thus on delivery the MPS made improvements in the three areas it was doing badly in with Investigating Crime doing particularly well going from 'poor' to 'good'.

Turning to the **Direction** part of the assessment, the MPS achieved 'improving' in all the domains except Reducing Crime where it was an 'stable'. The only component SPI or baseline that had a 'deteriorating' was the SPI for the robbery rate. Investigating Crime went from 'stable' to 'improving' for all but one of its component SPIs and baselines.

Good SPIs & baselines

The SPIs for arrest rate for domestic violence incidents, victims satisfaction with action taken by the police and victim satisfaction with overall service by the police showed the best improvements going from 'poor' to 'good' as a result of increased focus on these issues by the MPS.

The MPS got Es in the baselines for Managing Critical Incidents & Major Crime, Tackling Serious & Organised Criminality, Roads Policing and for the

SPI Officer Sickness. It got 'good'/'excellent' (highest grade for these items) for Residents Satisfaction with Local Policing & Fairness of Stop & Search Towards Minority Ethnic Groups. (The last item's grades are assessed in a different way from that for 2004/05.)

The MPS achieved a 'good' in efficiency savings, which was an SPI for the first time in 2005/06.

Other good points are:

- The Forensics baseline improved to a 'good' from an 'fair'
- The Perception of Anti-social Behaviour (one of the MPS's 13 critical areas for 2006/07) went from a 'poor' to an 'fair'
- The Sanction Detection Rate SPI (also one of the 13) went from a 'poor' to an 'fair' but MPS is still last in its MSF on current statistics.
- The baselines for Training & Development, Race & Diversity and Performance Management & improvement went from 'fair' to 'good'

Areas for further attention

The MPS received 'poor' for the SPIs for residents' fear of violent crime, comparative satisfaction of minority ethnic groups, and minority ethnic recruitment. The last two items are not assessed against the MSF. The satisfaction rate of minority ethnic groups is compared to that of whites and the recruitment rate of officers is measured against the proportion of minority ethnic groups in the local economically active population. All the other forces in the MSF were given a 'poor' for comparative satisfaction and all but one got a 'poor' in the recruitment SPI.

The SPI for front line policing declined from 'good' to a 'fair' but this was due to a change in the way the indicator is calculated. The MPS would have been a 'fair' in 2004/05 if the result for that year were worked out in the same way as 2005/06.

Annex A to Appendix 5 Final 2005/06 PPAF Results

green = good improvement, red = deterioration

PPAF MEASURES	E/G/F/P		I/S/D		1-5, 1 = Good
	PPAF 0506 Delivery	0405 grade if different	PPAF 0506 Direction	0405 grade if different	1-5, Latest Iquanta MSF Rank 06/07
REDUCING CRIME	F		S		
Component indicators					
4a Comparative risk of personal crime *	F		S	I	5
4b Comparative risk of household crime *	F		S		2
BCS Comparator Crime					
5a Domestic burglary rate	G		S	I	3
5b Violent crime rate	F		S	D	5
5c Robbery rate	F		D	S	5
5d Vehicle crime rate	F		S	I	4
5e Life threatening and gun crime rate	G		S		2
Component baselines					
Reducing volume crime	F	P	I		
INVESTIGATING CRIME	G	P	I	S	
Component indicators					
6b % of offences brought to justice	F	P	I		5
7a % of SDs	F	P	I		5
8a DVarrest rate	G	P	I		
Component baselines					
Major and serious crime investigation	E		S	n/a	
Tackling serious + org.criminality	E		I	n/a	
Volume crime investigation	F	P	I		
Forensic management	G	F	I		
Criminal justice processes	F		I		
CITIZEN FOCUS	F	P	I	S	
Component indicators					
1a Satisfaction with making contact	F		I	n/a	3
1b Satisfaction with action taken	G	P	I	n/a	3
1c Satisfaction with progress updates	F	P	I	n/a	4
1d Satisfaction with treatment by staff	G	F	I	n/a	3
1e Satisfaction with overall service	F	P	I	n/a	3
Component baselines					
3a Satisfaction of victims of racism (1)	F	P	I	n/a	1
3b Comparative satisfaction of minority ethnic groups (2)	P		S	n/a	
3c Fairness of stop and search towards minority ethnic groups (2) & (3)	G/E	P	S		
Component baselines					
Fairness and equality	F		I		
Customer service + accessibility	F		I		
Professional standards	G		n/a		
RESOURCE USE	G		I		
Component indicators					
3e Minority ethnic recruitment (2)	P		S	n/a	
3g Female % of force (2)	F		I		
12a Eff savings - Total (2)	G		I	n/a	
12b Eff. Savings - cashable					
Component baselines					
13a Officer sick absence (2)	E		S	I	7 / 40 forces
13b Staff sick absence (2)	G		S	I	20 / 38 forces
Component baselines					
Human resource management	G		I		
Training and development	G	F	I		
Diversity	G	F	I	n/a	
Resource management	F	G	S	I	
Information & comm. Technology management				I	
National Intelligence Model	G		I		
Leadership	G		n/a		
Performance management and improvement	G	F	I		
LOCAL POLICING	E	G	I		
Component indicators					
2a Resids perception of police perform	E/G	F	S		1
Component baselines					
Neighbourhood policing	G		I		
PROMOTING SAFETY	F	P	I	S	
Component indicators					
9a Road traffic safety	F	P	I		
Component baselines					
10a Residents fear of crime - burglary *	F		S		3
10a Residents fear of crime - car *	F		S		2
10a Residents fear of crime - violent *	P		S		3
10b Perceptions of anti-social behaviour *	F	P	I		4
10c Perceptions of drug use/dealing *	F	n/a	S		3
Component baselines					
Reducing anti-social behaviour	G	F	I		
Protecting vulnerable people	F		I		
PROVIDING ASSISTANCE	G		I		
Component indicators					
11a Front line policing (2)	F	G	S		
Component baselines					
Contact management	F		I		
Specialist operational support	G		I		
Roads policing	E		S		

(1) almost G/E

(2) = grade not based on MSF

(3) = grade calculated in a different way in 2004/05 so jump from P to G/E not comparable

* = BCS indicator