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This chapter reports on the performance of police services. These services comprise the operations of the police agencies of each State and Territory government. The national policing function of the Australian Federal Police (AFP) and other national non-police law enforcement bodies (such as the Australian Crime Commission) are not included in this Report.

Performance is reported against four activity areas: community safety; crime; road safety; and judicial services. A general section reports on performance across all police activity areas.

The use of the term ‘offender’ in this chapter refers to a person who is alleged to have committed an offence and is not the same as the definition used in chapter 8 (‘Corrective services’), where the term ‘offender’ refers to a person who has been convicted of an offence and is subject to a correctional sentence.

Data quality information (DQI) is being progressively introduced for all indicators in the Report. The purpose of DQI is to provide structured and consistent information about quality aspects of data used to report on performance indicators. DQI in this Report cover the seven dimensions in the ABS’ data quality framework (institutional environment, relevance, timeliness, accuracy, coherence, accessibility and interpretability) in addition to dimensions that define and describe performance indicators in a consistent manner, and note key data gaps and issues identified by the Steering Committee. All DQI for the 2014 Report can be found at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014.

Major improvements in reporting on police services in this edition include data quality information (DQI) available for the first time for the road safety indicator involving measures of seat belt use, the incidence of driving above the blood alcohol limit, and speeding.

## 6.1 Profile of police services

### Service overview

Police services are the principal means through which State and Territory governments pursue the achievement of a safe and secure environment for the community. This is through investigation of criminal offences, response to life threatening situations, provision of services to the judicial process and provision of road safety and traffic management. Police services also respond to more general needs in the community — for example, working with emergency management organisations and a wide range of government services and community groups, and advising on general policing and crime issues. Additionally, police are involved in various activities which aim to improve public safety and prevent crime.

### Roles and responsibilities

Policing services are predominantly the responsibility of State and Territory government agencies. They include the ACT community policing function performed by the AFP under an arrangement between the ACT and the Commonwealth Minister for Home Affairs, Justice, Privacy and Freedom of Information for the provision of police services to the ACT. A strategic partnership with the ACT Government is underpinned by a detailed purchaser/provider agreement. The Australian Government is responsible for the AFP.

Although each jurisdiction’s police service is autonomous, there is significant cooperation at a national level, including through the Standing Council on Police and Emergency Management (SCPEM).

### Size and scope of sector

#### Client groups

Broadly, the whole community is a ‘client’ of the police. Some members of the community, who have more direct dealings with the police, can be considered specific client groups, for example:

* victims of crime
* those suspected of, or charged with, committing offences
* those reporting criminal incidents
* those involved in traffic-related incidents
* third parties (such as witnesses to crime and people reporting collisions)
* those requiring police services for non-crime-related matters.

Funding for police services comes almost exclusively from State and Territory government budgets, with some limited specific purpose Australian Government grants. Total recurrent expenditure was $9.5 billion, nationally, in 2012-13 (table 6A.10).

#### Staffing

Police staff may be categorised in two different ways:

* by ‘sworn’ status — sworn police officers exercise police powers, including the power to arrest, summons, caution, detain, fingerprint and search. Specialised activities may be outsourced or undertaken by administrative (unsworn) staff. This ‘civilianisation’ of police services has three key objectives:
* to reduce the involvement of sworn police staff in duties that do not require police powers (for example, administrative work, investigation support and intelligence analysis)
* to manage effectively the need for specialist skills
* to reduce costs.
* by operational status — an operational police staff member is any member whose primary duty is the delivery of police or police-related services to an external client (where an external client predominately refers to members of the public but may also include law enforcement outputs delivered to other government departments).

Operational status is considered the better proxy for the number of police staff actively engaged in the delivery of police-related services. Approximately 90.4 per cent of police staff were operational in Australia in 2012-13 (figure 6.1).

Figure 6.1 Police staff, by operational status, 2012-13**a**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.1 Police staff, by operational status, 2012-13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data comprise all FTE staff except in the NT where data are based on a headcount at 30 June. NT police officers include police auxiliaries and Aboriginal community police officers.

*Source:* State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 6A.11.

Nationally, there was a total of 67 770 operational plus non‑operational staff in 2012-13 (table 6.1). Nationally, on average, there were 268 operational police staff per 100 000 people (figure 6.2). The number of staff per 100 000 people varies across jurisdictions, in part, due to differing operating environments.

Table 6.1 Police staff per 100 000 people, 2012-13**a**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Total |
| **Police staff numbers** | | | | | | | | | |
| Operational | 17 272 | 14 881 | 13 360 | 6 790 | 5 253 | 1 249 | 841 | 1 651 | 61 297 |
| Total | 19 720 | 15 762 | 14 750 | 7 789 | 5 584 | 1 402 | 974 | 1 789 | 67 770 |
| **Population numbers** | | | | | | | | | |
| Estimates at 31 December 2012 (100 000) | 73.5 | 56.8 | 46.1 | 24.7 | 16.6 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 2.4 | 229.1 |
| **Police staff numbers per 100 000 people** | | | | | | | | | |
| Operational | 235 | 262 | 290 | 275 | 316 | 244 | 222 | 697 | 268 |
| Total | 268 | 278 | 320 | 315 | 336 | 274 | 257 | 755 | 296 |

a Data are FTE staff except in the NT where data are based on a headcount at 30 June.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 6A.1–6A.8

Figure 6.2 Police staff per 100 000 people, 2012-13**a**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.2 Police staff per 100 000 people, 2012-13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data comprise all FTE staff except in the NT where data are based on a headcount at 30 June.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 6.1

Time series data for police staffing are reported in tables 6A.1–6A.8, 6A.11, 6A.17 and 6A.18.

The community expects police to be available and capable of responding to calls for assistance within a reasonable time. The number of police staff per 100 000 population is sometimes used as a proxy for police responsiveness. The Steering Committee is attempting to develop more robust measures of police responsiveness, building on current response times reporting in individual jurisdictions. Comparisons of response times across jurisdictions is subject to significant variables such as legislation, systems capability and practices, infrastructure, geography and the operational environment. Although the Steering Committee is convinced that nationally comparable response times reporting is highly desirable, the SCPEM has suggested that further work is required on the costs and benefits of a national standard for police response times.

For illustrative purposes, the Steering Committee notes the following response times reporting in the Annual Reports of several Australian police agencies.

* NSW reports the number of urgent response calls and the percentage attended to within a target time (NSW Police Force 2012). Urgent calls are where there is an imminent threat to life or property. In 2011-12, NSW Police responded to 119 254 urgent response calls, attending 80 per cent of urgent duty jobs within the 12 minute target time.
* WA police reports the average and the distribution of times taken to respond to priority 1&2 calls combined, priority 3 calls, and non-urgent priority 4 calls in the Perth metropolitan area. The Annual Report contains detailed notes describing how these data are collected and how they should be interpreted (WA Police 2013). Priority 1 calls concern life threatening incidents and, because there are relatively few of these, they are combined with priority 2 incidents where life or property is or may be in danger. Priority 3 tasks cover incidents requiring immediate attention but are not life-threatening at that time. In 2012-13, the average time to respond to priority 1 and 2 calls was 9 minutes (within the target of 9 minutes) and 31 minutes for priority 3 calls (not achieving the target of 25 minutes). The priority 3 target was not achieved due to a number of factors, including:
* an increase in the number of calls
* an increase in the average time at scene mainly in the key risk situations of domestic violence incidents and persons at risk
* a greater focus on attending to priority 1 and 2 calls, and
* the continued growth and spread of the population in the metropolitan area.
* A significant systems change implementing new counting rules from late 2011, ended previous trend reporting. For 2011-12, SA Police reported that 87.5 per cent of Grade 1 taskings in the metropolitan area, were responded to within 15 minutes (*SA* *Police Annual Report* 2011-2012).
* ACT Police report response times for three incident categories. The target for Priority 1 incidents — life threatening or critical situations — is 75 per cent or more of responses within 8 minutes (78.5 per cent achieved) and 90 per cent or more within 12 minutes (94.4 per cent achieved). The targets for Priority 2 incidents were 70 per cent within 20 minutes (92.8 per cent achieved) and 95 per cent within 30 minutes (97.4 per cent achieved). The target for Priority 3 incidents is 90 per cent within 48 hours (99.7 per cent achieved) (ACT Police 2013).
* NT Police reports on the proportion of incidents where police are dispatched within 10 minutes. This is for the whole of the Northern Territory for Priority 1 incidents only. In 2011-12 and 2012-13 the NT Police responded to 64.0 per cent of incidents within 10 minutes (including remote areas). This specific indicator is not an identified measure from 2013-14 (NT Police, Fire and Emergency Service).
* Victoria Police is unable to provide response time data for RoGS reporting purposes. This is not data that is reported elsewhere in Victoria, and it does not form part of the suite of corporate performance indicators.

## 6.2 Framework of performance indicators

Performance can be defined in terms of how well a service meets its objectives, given its operating environment. Performance indicators focus on outcomes and/or outputs aimed at meeting common, agreed objectives. The Steering Committee has identified four objectives of police services for the purposes of this Report (box 6.1).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.1 Objectives for police services |
| The key objectives for police services are:   * to allow people to undertake their lawful pursuits confidently and safely (reported in section 6.4, community safety) * to bring to justice those people responsible for committing an offence (reported in section 6.5, crime) * to promote safer behaviour on roads (reported in section 6.6, road safety) * to support the judicial process to achieve efficient and effective court case management and judicial processing, providing safe custody for alleged offenders, and ensuring fair and equitable treatment of both victims and alleged offenders (reported in section 6.7, judicial services). * These objectives are to be met through the provision of services in an equitable and efficient manner. |
|  |
|  |

The performance indicator framework provides information on equity, efficiency and effectiveness, and distinguishes the outputs and outcomes of police services (figure 6.3). The performance indicator framework also shows which data are comparable in the 2014 Report. For data that are not considered complete or directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary.

The Report’s chapter 2 contains statistical data that may assist in interpreting the performance indicators presented in this chapter. These data cover a range of demographic and geographic characteristics, including age profile, geographic distribution of the population, income levels, education levels, tenure of dwellings and cultural heritage (including Indigenous and ethnic status).

Indicators relevant to all police services are discussed in section 6.3. These include:

* two ‘equity’ output indicators — ‘Indigenous staffing’ and ‘police staff by gender’
* an ‘effectiveness’ output indicator — ‘complaints’
* an ‘efficiency’ output indicator — ‘dollars per person’.

Other indicators are discussed under the activity areas ‘Community safety’ (section 6.4), ‘Crime’ (section 6.5), ‘Road safety’ (section 6.6) and ‘Judicial services’ (section 6.7).

Figure 6.3 Police services performance indicator framework

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.3 Police services performance indicator framework  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

## 6.3 Indicators relevant to all police services

The performance indicator framework identifies the principal police activity areas. Within this context, certain indicators of police performance are not specific to any one particular area, but are relevant for all. These indicators include ‘dollars per person’, ‘satisfaction with police services’, ‘perceptions of police integrity’, ‘complaints’, ‘Indigenous staffing’ and ‘police staff by gender’.

#### Outputs

Outputs are the services delivered (while outcomes are the impact of these services on the status of an individual or group) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

#### Efficiency

##### Dollars per person

‘Dollars per person’ is an indicator of governments’ objective that provision of services occurs in an efficient manner (box 6.2). Variations in policies, socioeconomic factors and geographic/demographic characteristics affect expenditure per person for police services in each jurisdiction. The scope of activities undertaken by police services also varies across jurisdictions.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.2 Dollars per person |
| ‘Dollars per person’ is defined as expenditure (adjusted for inflation) on policing per person.  All else being equal, a low or decreasing expenditure per person represents an improvement in efficiency. However, care must be taken because efficiency data are difficult to interpret. Although high or increasing expenditure per person might reflect deteriorating efficiency, it might also reflect aspects of the service or characteristics of the policing environment (such as more effective policing or more challenging crime and safety situations). Similarly, low expenditure per person may reflect more desirable efficiency outcomes or lower quality (less intensive policing) or less challenging crime and safety situations.  Efficiency indicators should be interpreted within the context of the effectiveness and equity indicators, to derive an holistic view of performance.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services across Australia was $9.5 billion (or $416 per person) in 2012-13 (figure 6.4).

Figure 6.4 Real recurrent expenditure per person (including user cost of capital less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services (2012-13 dollars)**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.4 Real recurrent expenditure per person (including user cost of capital less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services (2012-13 dollars)  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Real recurrent expenditure is recurrent expenditure, including user cost of capital, less revenue from own sources and payroll tax. Revenue from own sources includes user charges and other types of revenue (for example, revenue from sale of stores and plant). It excludes fine revenue, money received as a result of warrant execution, and revenue from the issuing of firearm licences. b Time series financial data are adjusted to 2012-13 dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2012-13 = 100) (table AA.53). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product implicit price deflator used in previous editions. See Chapter 2 (section 2.5) for details.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 6A.10.

Nationally, real recurrent expenditure on police services per person increased by an average of 0.8 per cent each year between 2007-08 and 2012-13 (table 6A.10).

Time series data for real recurrent expenditure by jurisdiction are reported in tables 6A.1–6A.8 and 6A.10. Capital costs (including depreciation and the user cost of capital) for each jurisdiction are also contained in tables 6A.1–6A.8, with associated information on treatment of assets by police agencies in table 6A.9.

#### Equity — access

This section focuses on the performance of mainstream police services in relation to Indigenous Australians and females.

*Indigenous staffing*

‘Indigenous staffing’ is an indicator of governments’ objective that provision of services occurs in an equitable manner (box 6.3). Indigenous people might feel more comfortable in ‘accessing’ police services when they are able to deal with Indigenous police staff. However, many factors influence the willingness of Indigenous people to access police services, including familiarity with procedures for dealing with police.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.3 Indigenous staffing |
| ‘Indigenous staffing’ is defined as the proportion of police staff (operational plus non‑operational) from Indigenous backgrounds compared to the proportion of people aged 20–64 years who are from Indigenous backgrounds. These data are used because a significantly larger proportion of the Indigenous population falls within the younger non-working age groupings compared with the non-Indigenous population. Readily available ABS population projections of people aged 20–64 years provide a proxy for the estimated working population.  A proportion of police staff from Indigenous backgrounds closer to the proportion of people aged 20–64 years who are from Indigenous backgrounds represents a more equitable outcome.  The process of identifying Indigenous staff members generally relies on self‑identification as being Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander. Where Indigenous people are asked to identify themselves, the accuracy of the data will partly depend on how they perceive the advantages (or disadvantages) of identification and whether these perceptions change over time.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

The proportion of Indigenous police staff in 2012-13 was similar to the representation of Indigenous people in the population aged 20–64 years for all jurisdictions except Tasmania and the NT (figure 6.5).

Figure 6.5 Proportions of Indigenous staff in 2012-13 and Indigenous people aged 20–64 years**a, b, c**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.5 Proportions of Indigenous staff in 2012-13 and Indigenous people aged 20–64 years  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Indigenous staff numbers relate to those staff who self-identify as being of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander descent. b Information on Indigenous status is collected generally at the time of recruitment. c Data comprise all FTE staff except in the NT, where data are based on a headcount at 30 June.

*Source*: ABS (2009) *Experimental Estimates and Projections,* *Indigenous population aged 20–64 years* Cat. no. 3238.0 (Series B); State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 6A.17.

Time series data for police Indigenous staffing are reported in tables 6A.1–6A.8 and 6A.17.

##### Staffing by gender

‘Staffing by gender’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide police services in an equitable manner (box 6.4). Women might feel more comfortable in ‘accessing’ police services in particular situations, such as in relation to sexual assault, when they are able to deal with female police staff.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.4 Staffing by gender |
| ‘Police staffing by gender’ is defined as the number of female police staff (sworn and unsworn) divided by the total number of police staff.  A proportion of female police staff commensurate with the proportion of females in the total population is generally more equitable.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 32.2 per cent of police staff were female in 2012-13 (figure 6.6). The proportion of female police staff was relatively unchanged for most jurisdictions over the period 2008-09 to 2012-13 (figure 6.6).

Figure 6.6 Female police staff as a proportion of all staff**a**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.6 Female police staff as a proportion of all staff  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data comprise all FTE staff except the NT from 2008-09, where data are based on a headcount at 30 June.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 6A.18.

#### Effectiveness

##### Complaints

‘Complaints’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide police services in an effective manner (box 6.5). Police services across Australia encourage and foster a code of customer service that provides for openness and accountability. Complaints made against police reflect a range of issues relating to service delivery. Complaints of a more serious nature are overseen by relevant external review bodies, such as the ombudsman, the director of public prosecutions or integrity entities in each jurisdiction.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.5 Complaints |
| ‘Complaints’ is defined as the number of complaints made by members of the public against police per 100 000 people in the total population.  A high or increasing number of complaints does not necessarily indicate a lack of confidence in police. Rather, it can indicate greater confidence in complaints resolution. It is desirable to monitor changes in the reported rate of complaints against police to identify reasons for such changes and use this information to improve the manner in which police services are delivered. Because complaints mechanisms differ between jurisdictions, data should be used only to view trends over time within jurisdictions. Therefore, the trend in complaints is presented in index form, comparing values over time to a base period or year allocated a value of 100. For complaints, the base value is calculated using a three year average for the period 2007-08 to 2009-10. A decreasing index number over time is a desirable outcome.  Rates of complaints against police are influenced by factors such as familiarity with, effectiveness of and confidence in, complaint handling procedures, as well as the definition of ‘complaint’ applicable to a particular jurisdiction.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable over time (subject to caveats) but are not comparable across jurisdictions because definitions of what constitutes a ‘complaint against police’ differ across jurisdictions. * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Complaints data are presented as an index in figure 6.7 to provide a picture of trends over time for each jurisdiction. Table 6A.16 reports numbers per 100 000 people.

Figure 6.7 Trends in complaints**a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.7 Trends in complaints  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a The underlying data on the number of complaints are not comparable across jurisdictions. Data can be used only to view trends over time within jurisdictions. Index 3-year average 2007-08 to 2009‑10 = 100. b Population data relate to 31 December, so that ERP at 31 December 2012 is used as the denominator for 2012-13. c Complaints data refer to the number of statements of complaints by members of the public regarding police conduct when a person was in police custody or had voluntary dealing with the police. d For NSW, data were revised during 2010 for the period 2007-08 to 2008‑09. The number of complaints previously published have changed due to the late receipt or removal of complaints from the complaints database. e Queensland data from 2007-08 to 2009-10 were revised in the 2012 RoGS due to retrospective capture of some complaints and improved alignment with the Report’s data dictionary. f For WA, the number of complaints is subject to revision. g SA data include complaints made to the Police Complaints Authority and internal reports of alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct. h For Tasmania, the introduction of the Graduated Management Model means that the total number of complaints handled in 2010-11 rose to include 133 Class 1 Complaints (previously Customer Service Complaints) plus 20 Class 2 Complaints (previously Serious Complaints). i For NT, the introduction of laPro, an holistic complaint and investigation system, has resulted in the consolidation and consistency of data into one system.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 6A.16.

#### Outcomes

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (while outputs are the services delivered) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

This section provides information from the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (NSCSP), plus other sources. The NSCSP collects information on community perceptions of police services provided, and personal experiences of contact with the police. It also elicits public perceptions of crime and safety problems in the community and local area, and reviews aspects of driving behaviour.

##### Satisfaction with police services

‘Satisfaction with police services’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide police services in an effective manner, specifically, of how well police services are perceived to be delivered (box 6.6).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.6 Satisfaction with police services |
| ‘Satisfaction with police services’ is defined as the proportion of people who were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with police services. Results are reported for all people aged 15 years or over in the total population.  A high or increasing proportion of people who were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ is desirable.  Client satisfaction is a widely accepted measure of service quality. Public perceptions might not reflect actual levels of police performance, because many factors — including individual experiences, hearsay and media reporting — can influence people’s satisfaction with police services.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Across the general population (whether or not people had contact with the police), the majority of people nationally (76.8 per cent) were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with the services provided by police in 2012-13, compared with 74.7 per cent in 2011-12 (figure 6.8).

Figure 6.8 People who were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with police services**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.8 People who were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with police services  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results.

*Source:* ANZPAA (unpublished); table 6A.12.

Of those people who had contact with police in 2012-13, 84.1 per cent nationally were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with the service they received during their most recent contact (figure 6.9).

Figure 6.9 People who were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with police in their most recent contact, 2012-13**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.9 People who were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with police in their most recent contact, 2012-13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix for information to assist in the interpretation of these results.

*Source*: ANZPAA (unpublished); table 6A.24.

Time series data for general satisfaction with police services (and those who had contact with police in the preceding 12 months) are reported in tables 6A.12 and 6A.24 respectively.

##### Perceptions of police integrity

‘Perceptions of police integrity’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide police services in an effective manner. It specifically aims to provide measures of perceived integrity and professionalism (box 6.7).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.7 Perceptions of police integrity |
| ‘Perceptions of police integrity’ refers to *public* perceptions and is defined by three separate measures:   * the proportion of people who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people fairly and equally * the proportion of people who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police perform the job professionally * the proportion of people who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police are honest.   A high or increasing proportion of people who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with these statements is desirable.  Public perceptions might not reflect actual levels of police integrity, because many factors, including hearsay and media reporting, might influence people’s perceptions of police integrity.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

In 2012-13, 75.1 per cent of people nationally ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people ‘fairly and equally’, compared with 74.7 per cent in 2011-12 (figure 6.10).

Figure 6.10 People who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people fairly and equally**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.10 People who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people fairly and equally  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results.

*Source*: ANZPAA (unpublished); table 6A.14.

Nationally, 85.5 per cent of people ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ in 2012-13 that police perform the job ‘professionally’, compared with the 2011-12 result of 85.2 per cent (figure 6.11).

Figure 6.11 People who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police perform the job professionally**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.11 People who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police perform the job professionally  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results.

*Source*: ANZPAA (unpublished); table 6A.13.

Police integrity can be judged to some extent by the public perception of police honesty. Nationally, 73.7 per cent of people ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ in 2012‑13 that police are ‘honest’ (figure 6.12), compared with 74.2 per cent in 2011‑12.

Figure 6.12 People who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police are honest**a, b, c**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.12 People who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police are honest  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Due to a change in the wording of this survey question in 2010-11, there is a break in the time series for these data. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results. c Data are for people aged 15 years or over.

*Source:* ANZPAA (unpublished); table 6A.15.

## 6.4 Community safety

This section reviews the role of police in preserving public order and promoting a safer community. Activities typically include:

* undertaking crime prevention and community support programs
* responding to, managing and coordinating major incidents and emergencies
* responding to calls for assistance.

Police performance in undertaking these activities is measured using a suite of indicators that draw on community perceptions data. For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

### Key community safety performance indicator results

#### Outputs

Outputs are the services delivered (while outcomes are the impact of these services on the status of an individual or group) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

#### Equity — access

The Steering Committee has identified equity and access for community safety as an area for development in future reports.

#### Outcomes

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (while outputs are the services delivered) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

##### Perceptions of safety

‘Perceptions of safety’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to maintain public safety (box 6.8).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.8 Perceptions of safety |
| ‘Perceptions of safety’ is defined by two separate measures:  • the proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home  • the proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ in public places, including ‘walking locally’ and travelling on public transport  Data are disaggregated by feelings of safety during the day and feelings of safety during the night.  For either measure, a high or increasing proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ is desirable.  Perceptions of safety may not reflect reported crime, as reported crime might understate actual crime, and many factors (including media reporting and hearsay) might affect public perceptions of crime levels and safety.  Perceptions of safety on public transport might be influenced by the availability and types of public transport (that is, trains, buses, ferries and trams) in each jurisdiction (i.e. availability and density).  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 94.7 per cent of people felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home alone during the day in 2012-13, very similar to 94.8 per cent in 2011-12 (figure 6.13a). Nationally, 87.5 per cent of people felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home alone during the night in 2012-13, very similar to 87.8 per cent in 2011-12 (figure 6.13b).

Figure 6.13 Perceptions of safety at home alone**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| **(a) Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home alone during the day**  Figure 6.13 Perceptions of safety at home alone  (a) Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home alone during the day  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |
| **(b) Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home alone during the night**  Figure 6.13 Perceptions of safety at home alone  (b) Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home alone during the night  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results.

*Source*: ANZPAA (unpublished); table 6A.19.

Nationally, 91.7 per cent of people felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ when walking locally during the day in 2012-13 (table 6A.20) and 49.8 per cent of people felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ when walking locally during the night in 2012‑13 (figure 6.14a). Nationally, 60.1 per cent of people felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ when travelling on public transport during the day in 2012‑13 (table 6A.21) and 26.0 per cent of people felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ when travelling on public transport during the night in 2012-13 (figure 6.14b).

Figure 6.14 Perceptions of safety in public places during the night**a, b, c**

|  |
| --- |
| **(a) Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ walking locally**  Figure 6.14 Perceptions of safety in public places during the night  (a) Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ walking locally  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |
| **(b) Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ travelling on public transport**  Figure 6.14 Perceptions of safety in public places during the night  (b) Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ travelling on public transport  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results. c Unlike other jurisdictions, Tasmania, the ACT and the NT do not operate a suburban train network and rely on buses as the primary means of public transportation.

*Source*: ANZPAA (unpublished); tables 6A.20 and 6A.21.

Time series data for perceptions of safety in public places are reported in   
tables 6A.20–6A.21.

##### Perceptions of crime problems

‘Perceptions of crime problems’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to reduce crime (box 6.9).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.9 Perceptions of crime problems |
| ‘Perceptions of crime problems’ is defined as the proportion of people who thought that various types of crime were a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem’ in their neighbourhood.  A low or decreasing proportion of people who thought the selected types of crime were a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem’ in their neighbourhood, is desirable.  Care needs to be taken in interpreting data on perceptions of crime, because reducing people’s concerns about crime and reducing the actual level of crime are two separate, but related challenges. Comparisons between perceptions of crime problems and the level of crime raise questions about the factors that affect perceptions. More generally, such comparisons highlight the importance of considering the full suite of performance indicators rather than assessing performance on the basis of specific measures in isolation.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, people identified the following issues as a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat a problem’) in their neighbourhoods:

* 61.1 per cent of people thought speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving’ to be a problem in 2012‑13 (figure 6.15a), down from 69.9 per cent in 2011-12 (table 6A.23)
* 37.4 per cent of people thought illegal drugs to be a problem in 2012-13 (figure 6.15b), down from 45.3 per cent in 2011-12 (table 6A.22).

Time series data for perceptions of crime problems are reported in tables 6A.22 and 6A.23.

Figure 6.15 Proportion of people who consider the identified issues to be either a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem’ in their neighbourhood, 2012-13**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving**   Figure 6.15 Proportion of people who consider the identified issues to be either a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem’ in their neighbourhood, 2012-13  (a) Speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |
| 1. **Illegal drugs**   Figure 6.15 Proportion of people who consider the identified issues to be either a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem’ in their neighbourhood, 2012-13  (b) Illegal drugs  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results.

*Source*: ANZPAA (unpublished); tables 6A.22 and 6A.23.

## 6.5 Crime

This section reviews the role of police in investigating crime and identifying and apprehending offenders. It also measures the extent of crime in the community and the number of crimes reported to the police.

### Framework of performance indicators

Police performance in undertaking these activities is measured using a suite of indicators that incorporates information on recorded crime levels. For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

### Key crime performance indicator results

#### Outcomes

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (while outputs are the services delivered) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

‘Crime victimisation’, ‘Reporting rates’ and ‘Outcomes of investigations’ are outcome indicators of governments’ objective to bring to justice those people responsible for committing an offence.

#### Victims of crime data in Australia

Information on the level of selected crimes against the person and crimes against property is obtained from two sources for this chapter. The first source is survey data in ABS *Crime Victimisation, Australia* (ABS, 2011-12). The second source is administrative data in ABS *Recorded Crime Victims Australia* (ABS, 2012).

##### Survey data

*Crime Victimisation, Australia* presents results from the national Crime Victimisation Survey for selected categories of personal and household crimes. Personal crimes include physical and threatened assault, robbery and sexual assault (reported in table 6A.27). Household crimes include break-in, attempted break-in, motor vehicle theft, theft from a motor vehicle, malicious property damage, and other theft (table 6A.28).

##### Administrative data

*Recorded Crime Victims* *Australia* presents data on selected offences reported to, or detected by, police, the details of which are subsequently recorded on police administrative systems. Victims in this collection can be people, premises or motor vehicles. Selected offences include homicide and related offences; kidnapping and abduction; sexual assault; robbery; blackmail and extortion; unlawful entry with intent; motor vehicle theft; and other theft (tables 6A.25 and 6A.26).

##### Merits of survey data and administrative data

Survey data are collected in such a way that the sample is intended to be representative of the population as a whole, whereas administrative data represent all recorded crime. Survey questions are consistent across jurisdictions, whereas there are differences in the way in which recorded crime administrative data are compiled across jurisdictions (box 6.10).

Neither the administrative data in *Recorded Crime Victims*, nor the survey data in *Crime Victimisation, Australia*, provide a definitive measure of crime victimisation but, together, these two data sources provide a more comprehensive picture of victimisation than either data source alone.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.10 ABS crime victimisation statistics |
| The ABS produces two major sources of data that can inform the user about crime victimisation. The first is direct reports from members of the public about their experiences of crime as collected in ABS household surveys. The second is a measure of crimes reported to and recorded by police, sourced from administrative records obtained from State and Territory police agencies. In some instances, the results can provide different pictures of crime in the community, with administrative data indicating a trend in one direction and personal experience indicating the opposite.  The full extent of crime is unlikely ever to be captured, because not all offences are reported to, or become known by, police. The victim’s confidence in the judicial process, the nature of the offence and the relationship between the victim and perpetrator are among the key factors that influence the propensity to report an offence.  Comparing recorded crime statistics across jurisdictions  A number of standards, classifications and counting rules are applied to recorded crime statistics, but care needs to be taken when comparing these statistics across states and territories, given the different business rules, procedures, systems, policies, legislation and recording of police agencies. The ABS has worked with police agencies to develop a National Crime Recording Standard, to improve the national comparability of the recorded crime victims’ collection. |
|  |
|  |

The most recent survey data available are from the ABS survey conducted from July 2011 to June 2012. Personal crime victimisation rates from this survey are reported in figures 6.16–6.17. Property crime victimisation rates from the survey are reported in figures 6.18–6.19.

#### Crime victimisation

‘Crime victimisation’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to reduce the incidence of crime (boxes 6.11 and 6.12).

##### Crime victimisation — crimes against the person

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.11 Crime victimisation — crimes against the person |
| Four measures of the level of crime against the person are reported:   * estimated victimisation rate for physical and threatened assault per 100 000 people aged 15 years or over * estimated victimisation rate for sexual assault per 100 000 people aged 18 years or over * estimated victimisation rate for robbery per 100 000 people aged 15 years or over   A low or decreasing rate of crime victimisation is a desirable outcome.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Based on ABS crime victimisation survey data, nationally in 2011-12 there were an estimated 6289 physical and threatened assaults, 298 sexual assaults and 368 robberies per 100 000 people. These rates varied significantly across jurisdictions (figures 6.16 and 6.17).

Figure 6.16 Estimated victims of assault and sexual assault, 2011-12**a, b, c, d**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.16 Estimated victims of assault and sexual assault, 2011-12  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a A victim is defined as a person reporting at least one of the offences included in the Crime Victimisation Survey. Persons who have been a victim of multiple offence types during the reference period were counted once for each offence type for which they were a victim of at least one incident. Individuals may be counted multiple times across offence types and consequently the estimated total number of victims cannot be calculated from this graph. b Threatened assault includes face‑to-face incidents only. c  Some robbery and sexual assault rates include data points with large standard errors so that comparisons between jurisdictions and between years should be interpreted with caution. d   Refer to the Explanatory notes in ABS Cat. no. 4530.0 (ABS 2012) for any other data quality issues.

*Source*: Based on survey data from ABS *Crime Victimisation, Australia 2011-12*, Cat. no. 4530.0; table 6A.27.

Figure 6.17 Estimated victims of robbery, 2011-12**a, b, c, d**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.17 Estimated victims of robbery, 2011-12  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data report only the prevalence of crime, not the incidence. A victim is defined as a person reporting at least one of the offences surveyed. Victims were counted once only for each type of offence, regardless of the number of incidents of that type. Robbery reported is for people aged 15 years or over. b Robbery is where someone stole (or tried to steal) property from a respondent by physically attacking them or threatening him or her with force or violence. Includes incidents of physical assault and threatened assault which also involved robbery or attempted robbery. c Some of these data are subject to standard errors of 25 per cent to 50 per cent and should be used with caution. d   Refer to the Explanatory notes in ABS Cat. no. 4530.0 (ABS 2013a) for any other data quality issues.

*Source*: Based on survey data from ABS 2013, *Crime Victimisation, Australia 2011-12*, Cat. no. 4530.0; table 6A.27.

The number of recorded personal crimes per 100 000 people in 2012, based on the ABS recorded crime victims collection, is reported in table 6A.25.

##### Crime victimisation — crimes against property

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.12 Crime victimisation — crimes against property |
| Two measures of the level of crime against property are reported:   * estimated household victims of break-in/attempted break-in per 100 000 households * estimated household victims of motor vehicle theft per 100 000 households.   A low or decreasing rate of crime victimisation is a desirable outcome.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Based on ABS crime victimisation survey data, nationally, there were 5134 estimated household victims of break-in/attempted break-in and 701 victims of motor vehicle theft per 100 000 households in 2011-12. These rates varied significantly across jurisdictions (figure 6.18).

Figure 6.18 Estimated victims of property crime, 2011-12**a, b, c, d**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

a A victim is defined as a household reporting at least one of the offences included in the Crime Victimisation Survey. Households that have been a victim of multiple offence types during the reference period were counted once for each offence type for which they were a victim of at least one incident. Individuals may be counted multiple times across offence types and consequently the estimated total number of victims cannot be calculated from this graph. b NT data refer to mainly urban areas only. c Break-in is defined as an incident where the respondent’s home, including a garage or shed, had been broken into. Break-in offences relating to respondents’ cars or gardens are excluded. Motor vehicle theft is defined as an incident where a motor vehicle was stolen from any member of the respondent’s household. It includes privately owned vehicles and excludes vehicles used mainly for commercial business/business purposes. d   Refer to the Explanatory notes in ABS Cat. no. 4530.0 (ABS 2013) for any other data quality issues.

*Source*: Based on *Crime Victimisation, Australia 2011-12*, Cat. no. 4530.0; table 6A.28.

The number of recorded property crimes per 100 000 people in 2011 and 2012 is based on the ABS recorded crime victims collection, sourced from State and Territory administrative data, is reported in table 6A.26.

#### Reporting rates

‘Reporting rates’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to engender public confidence in the police and judicial systems (box 6.13).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.13 Reporting rates |
| ‘Reporting rates’ is defined as the total number of the most recent incidents of a particular offence that were reported to police, as a percentage of the total number of victims estimated using ABS crime victimisation survey data. It is reported separately for several categories of crimes against the person and crimes against property.   * Reporting rates for crimes against the person are defined as the total number of the most recent incidents of a particular offence that were reported to police, as a percentage of the total number of victims, reported separately for: * physical assault * threatened assault (face-to-face incidents only) * robbery. * Reporting rates for crimes against property are defined as the total number of the most recent incidents of a particular offence that were reported to police, as a percentage of the total number of victims, reported separately for: * break-in * attempted break-in * motor vehicle theft * theft from motor vehicle * malicious property damage * other theft.   A high or increasing reporting rate is desirable.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time. * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2011-12 data are available for all jurisdictions. Although survey data are reported for all measures, the associated standard errors can be large for some jurisdictions. Also, reporting rates vary across different crime types. This indicator does not provide information on why some people choose not to report particular offences to the police.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Based on ABS crime victimisation survey data, nationally, reporting rates for selected offences against the person for people aged 15 years or over in 2011-12, by offence were:

* 49.0 per cent for physical assault
* 38.1 per cent for threatened assault (face-to-face incidents only)
* 51.5 per cent for robbery
* 30.5 per cent for sexual assault.

A national total for sexual assault cannot be calculated because data are not available for all jurisdictions.

Figure 6.19 Reporting rates for selected offences against the person, by offence type, 2011-12**a, b, c, d, e, f**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.19 Reporting rates for selected offences against the person, by offence type, 2011-12  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data report only the prevalence of crime, not the incidence. A victim is defined as a person reporting at least one of the offences surveyed. Victims were counted once only for each type of offence, regardless of the number of incidents of that type. Data are for people aged 15 years or over for all except sexual assault (18 years and over). b Threatened assault includes face-to-face incidents only. Robbery is where someone stole (or tried to steal) property from a respondent by physically attacking them or threatening him or her with force or violence. c NT data refer to mainly urban areas and were available for physical assault only. Robbery also includes incidents of physical assault and threatened assault which also involved robbery or attempted robbery. d Most robbery and sexual assault rates are subject to standard errors of 25 to 50 per cent and should be used with caution. e Sexual assault data not available for Qld, SA, Tas and NT. f   Refer to the Explanatory notes in ABS Cat. no. 4530.0 (ABS 2013) for any other data quality issues.

*Source*: Based on ABS *Crime Victimisation, Australia 2011-12*, Cat. no. 4530.0; table 6A.29.

Based on ABS crime victimisation survey data, nationally, reporting rates for selected offences against property for people aged 15 years or over, in 2011-12, by offence were:

* 79.3 per cent for break-in offences
* 40.5 per cent for attempted break-in offences
* 90.7 per cent for motor vehicle theft
* 50.7 per cent for theft from motor vehicles
* 46.4 per cent for malicious property damage
* 37.5 per cent for other theft (figure 6.20).

Figure 6.20 Reporting rates for selected offences against property, by offence type, 2011-12**a, b, c, d**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.20 Reporting rates for selected offences against property, by offence type, 2011-12  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data report only the prevalence of crime, not the incidence. A victim is defined as a household reporting at least one of the offences surveyed. Victims were counted once only for each type of offence, regardless of the number of incidents of that type. Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b NT data refer to mainly urban areas. c Reporting rates for Motor Vehicle Theft were not available for publication by the ABS for some states/territories due to data confidentialisation. In general, only a small number of people do not report motor vehicle theft to police. Consequently, to avoid potential identification of individuals, the number of people who do and do not report to police are not published. d   Refer to the Explanatory notes in ABS Cat. no. 4530.0 (ABS 2013) for any other data quality issues.

*Source*: Based on data from ABS *Crime Victimisation, Australia 2011-12*, Cat. no. 4530.0; table 6A.30.

#### Outcomes of investigations

‘Outcomes of investigations’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to bring offenders to justice. It is reported separately for personal crimes (box 6.14) and property crimes (boxes 6.15).

##### Outcomes of investigations — personal crimes

‘Outcomes of investigations — personal crimes’ is a measure of the effectiveness of police investigations (box 6.14).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.14 Outcomes of investigations — personal crimes |
| ‘Outcomes of investigations’ – personal crimes is defined by two separate measures:   * the proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police * the proportion of the investigations finalised within 30 days (as above) where proceedings were instituted against the offender.   Measures are reported for a range of offences against the person including homicide and armed robbery.  A high or increasing proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police is desirable. Similarly, a high or increasing proportion of finalised investigations where proceedings had started against the alleged offender within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police, is desirable.  Data reported for this measure are:   * not directly comparable across jurisdictions because of differences in the way data are compiled. A number of standards, classifications and counting rules have been developed since the inception of this collection to improve national comparability. However, over time significant differences and changes in the business rules, procedures, systems, policies and recording practices of police agencies across Australia have resulted in some discrepancies in data across states and territories for some offence types. * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions..   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Activities associated with ‘outcomes of investigations — personal crimes’ include gathering intelligence on suspects and locations to assist with investigations, and collecting and securing evidence in relation to both the offence and the suspect.

The ABS collects data on the 30 days status of investigations — that is, the stage that a police investigation has reached 30 days after the recording of the incident by the police.

Figure 6.21a presents for each jurisdiction in 2012, the per cent of investigations finalised for homicide and related offences, and for armed robbery. For the percentage of these finalised investigations for which proceedings had commenced against an alleged offender, see figure 6.21b.

Figure 6.22a presents, for each jurisdiction in 2012, the proportion of recorded unarmed robbery investigations, kidnapping/abduction investigations and blackmail/extortion investigations that were finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police. For these finalised investigations, figure 6.22b presents the proportion for which proceedings had started against an alleged offender.

Figure 6.21 Crimes against the person: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2012**a, b, c**

|  |
| --- |
| **(a) Proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence   becoming known to police**  Figure 6.21 Crimes against the person: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2012  (a) Proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |
| **(b) Proportion of finalised investigations for which proceedings had begun   within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police**  Figure 6.21 Crimes against the person: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2012  (b) Proportion of finalised investigations for which proceedings had begun within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Armed robbery data include persons and organisations. b Caution should be used in making comparisons between states and territories. Investigation has found significant differences in business rules, procedures, systems, policies and recording practices of police agencies across Australia. c Refer to the Explanatory notes in ABS Cat. no. 4510.0 (ABS 2012) for any other data quality issues.

*Source*: ABS (2012) *Recorded Crime – Victims,* Cat. no. 4510.0; table 6A.31.

Figure 6.22 Crimes against the person: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2012**a, b, c**

|  |
| --- |
| **(a) Proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police**  Figure 6.22 Crimes against the person: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2012  (a) Proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |
| **(b) Proportion of finalised investigations for which proceedings had begun within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police**  Figure 6.22 Crimes against the person: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2012  (b) Proportion of finalised investigations for which proceedings had begun within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Kidnapping/abduction and blackmail/extortion data on investigations finalised are not published or are rounded to zero for some jurisdictions due to small numbers and ABS confidentiality rules. bCaution should be used in making comparisons between states and territories. Investigation has found significant differences in business rules, procedures, systems, policies and recording practices of police agencies across Australia. c Refer to the Explanatory notes in ABS Cat. no. 4510.0 (2012) for any other data quality issues.

*Source*: Based on data from ABS (2012) *Recorded Crime – Victims*, Cat. no. 4510.0; table 6A.31.

##### Outcomes of investigations — property crimes

‘Outcomes of investigations — property crimes’ is a measure of the effectiveness of police investigations (box 6.15).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.15 Outcomes of investigations — property crimes |
| ‘Outcomes of investigations — property crimes’ is defined by two separate measures:   * the proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police * the proportion of the investigations finalised within 30 days (as above) where proceedings were instituted against the offender.   Outcomes of investigations measures are reported for three property offences: unlawful entry with intent, motor vehicle theft and other theft.  A high or increasing proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police is desirable. Similarly, a high or increasing proportion of finalised investigations where proceedings had started against the alleged offender within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police is desirable.  Data reported for this measure are:   * not directly comparable across jurisdictions because of differences in the way data are compiled. A number of standards, classifications and counting rules have been developed since the inception of this collection to improve national comparability. However, over time significant differences and changes in the business rules, procedures, systems, policies and recording practices of police agencies across Australia have resulted in some discrepancies in data across states and territories for some offence types. * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014 |
|  |
|  |

Figure 6.23a reports for each jurisdiction in 2012, the proportion of recorded unlawful entry with intent investigations, motor vehicle theft investigations and other theft investigations that were finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police. For these finalised investigations, figure 6.23b presents the proportion for which proceedings had started against an alleged offender.

Figure 6.23 Crimes against property: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2012**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| **(a) Proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police**  Figure 6.23 Crimes against property: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2012  (a) Proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |
| **(b) Proportion of finalised investigations for which proceedings had begun within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police**  Figure 6.23 Crimes against property: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2012  (b) Proportion of finalised investigations for which proceedings had begun within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Caution should be used in making comparisons between states and territories. Investigation has found significant differences in business rules, procedures, systems, policies and recording practices of police agencies across Australia. b Refer to the Explanatory notes in ABS Cat. no. 4510.0 (2012) for any other data quality issues.

*Source*: Based on data from ABS (2012) Recorded *Crime – Victims*, Cat. no. 4510.0; table 6A.32.

## 6.6 Road safety

This section reviews the role of police in maximising road safety through targeted operations to reduce the incidence of traffic offences and through attendance at, and investigation of, road traffic collisions and incidents.

Activities typically include:

* monitoring road user behaviour, including speed and alcohol-related traffic operations
* undertaking general traffic management functions
* attending and investigating road traffic collisions and incidents
* improving public education and awareness of traffic and road safety issues.

Police performance in undertaking road safety activities is measured using a suite of indicators that includes people’s behaviour on the roads and the number of land transport hospitalisations and road fatalities. For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

### Key road safety indicator results

#### Outputs

Outputs are the services delivered (while outcomes are the impact of these services on the status of an individual or group) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

#### Equity — access

The Steering Committee has identified equity and access for road safety as an area for development in future reports.

#### Outcomes

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (while outputs are the services delivered) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

The objective of police road safety programs is to promote safer behaviour on roads and influence road user behaviour so as to reduce the incidence of road collisions and the severity of road trauma. Many of these programs target the non-wearing of seat belts, excessive speed and drink driving.

This section reports data from the *National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing* (NSCSP) about driver behaviour.

##### Road safety

‘Road safety’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of promoting road safety (box 6.16).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.16 Road safety |
| Three road safety measures are reported:   * use of seatbelts, defined as the proportion of people who had driven in the previous 6 months and who indicated that, in that time, they had driven without wearing a seatbelt * driving under the influence, defined as the proportion of people who had driven in the previous 6 months and who indicated that, in that time, they had driven when possibly over the alcohol limit * degree of speeding, defined as the proportion of people who had driven in the previous 6 months and who indicated that, in that time, they had driven 10 kilometres per hour or more above the speed limit.   A low or decreasing proportion of people who stated that they had driven without wearing a seatbelt, driven when possibly over the alcohol limit and/or driven 10 kilometres per hour or more above the speed limit is desirable.  The use of seatbelts, the prevalence of driving under the influence of alcohol and speeding in the population is affected by a number of factors in addition to activities undertaken by police services, such as driver education and media campaigns.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, in 2012-13, 5.4 per cent of people who had driven in the previous six months said they had ‘rarely’ or more often (‘sometimes’, ‘most of the time’ or ‘always’) driven without wearing a seat belt (down from 6.2 per cent in 2011‑12 and 6.7 per cent in 2010-11) (figure 6.24).

Figure 6.24 People who had driven in the previous six months without wearing a seat belt ‘rarely’ or more often**a,** **b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.24 People who had driven in the previous six months without wearing a seat belt ‘rarely’ or more often  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results.

*Source:* ANZPAA (unpublished); table 6A.33.

Nationally, in 2012-13, 7.8 per cent of people who had driven in the previous six months indicated that they had ‘rarely’ or more often (‘sometimes’, ‘most of the time’ or ‘always’) driven when possibly over the blood alcohol limit (down from 10.3 per cent in 2011-12 and 9.6 per cent in 2010-11) (figure 6.25).

Figure 6.25 People who had driven in the previous 6 months when possibly over the alcohol limit ‘rarely’ or more often**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.25 People who had driven in the previous 6 months when possibly over the alcohol limit ‘rarely’ or more often  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results.

*Source:* ANZPAA (unpublished); table 6A.34.

Nationally, in 2012-13, 55.6 per cent of people who had driven in the previous 6 months reported travelling 10 kilometres per hour or more above the speed limit ‘rarely’ or more often (‘sometimes’, ‘most of the time’ or ‘always’) (down from 60.4 per cent in 2011-12 and 58.7 per cent in 2010-11) (figure 6.26).

Figure 6.26 People who had driven in the previous six months 10 kilometres per hour or more above the speed limit ‘rarely’ or more often**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.26 People who had driven in the previous six months 10 kilometres per hour or more above the speed limit ‘rarely’ or more often  More details can be found within the text surroundiing this image. |

a Data are for people aged 15 years or over. b Survey results are subject to sampling error. Refer to the Statistical appendix section A.5 for information to assist in the interpretation of these results.

*Source:* ANZPAA (unpublished); table 6A.35.

##### Road deaths

‘Road deaths’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of promoting road safety (box 6.17). One aim of policing is to contribute to a reduction in road crashes and related road deaths and hospitalisations.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.17 Road deaths |
| ‘Road deaths’ is defined as the number of road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles.  A low or decreasing rate of road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles is desirable.  The rate of road deaths is affected by a number of factors in addition to activities undertaken by police services, such as the condition of roads, driver education and media campaigns.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, there were 1269 road deaths in 2012-13 (down from 1279 in 2011-12). Road fatalities for all jurisdictions from 2002-03 to 2012-13 are reported in table 6A.36. There were 7.4 road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles in Australia in 2012-13, (compared with 7.6 in 2011-12) (figure 6.27).

Figure 6.27 Road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles**a**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.27 Road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles  More details can be found within the text surroundiing this image. |

a Registered vehicles data have been used for earlier years and Motor Vehicle Census data have been used for 2011-12 and 2012-13.

*Source:* Australian Road Fatality Statistics at www.infrastructure.gov.au/roads/safety/road\_fatality\_statistics/ fatal\_road\_crash\_database (data accessed on 14 November 2013); ABS *Motor Vehicle Census* (various years), Australia, Cat. no. 9309.0; table 6A.36.

##### Land transport hospitalisations per registered vehicle

‘Land transport hospitalisations per registered vehicle’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of promoting road safety (box 6.18).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.18 Land transport hospitalisations per registered vehicle |
| ‘Land transport hospitalisations per registered vehicle’ is defined as the number of hospitalisations from traffic accidents per 100 000 registered vehicles.  A low or decreasing number of hospitalisations from traffic accidents per 100 000 registered vehicles is desirable.  Hospitalisations from traffic accidents is affected by a number of factors in addition to activities undertaken by police services, such as the condition of roads, driver education and media campaigns.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, there were 243 land transport hospitalisations per 100 000 registered vehicles in 2011-12 (figure 6.28).

Figure 6.28 Land transport hospitalisations per 100 000 registered vehicles

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.28 Land transport hospitalisations per 100 000 registered vehicles  More details can be found within the text surroundiing this image. |

*Source*: AIHW (various years) *Australian Hospital Statistics* (unpublished); ABS (various years) *Motor Vehicle Census*, Cat. no. 9309.0; table 6A.37.

## 6.7 Judicial services

This section reviews the role of police in providing effective and efficient support to the judicial process, including the provision of safe custody for alleged offenders and fair and equitable treatment of both victims and alleged offenders.

Activities typically include:

* preparing briefs
* presenting evidence at court
* conducting court and prisoner security (although the role of police services in court and prisoner security differs across jurisdictions).

Police performance in undertaking these activities is measured using a suite of indicators that include the percentage of prosecutions where costs are awarded against police, the proportion of defendants pleading guilty or being found guilty, and the effectiveness of police in diverting offenders from the criminal justice system. For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

### Key judicial services performance indicator results

#### Outputs

Outputs are the services delivered (while outcomes are the impact of these services on the status of an individual or group) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

##### Equity — access

The Steering Committee has identified equity and access to judicial services as an area for development in future reports.

##### Efficiency

##### Percentage of prosecutions where costs are awarded against police

‘Percentage of prosecutions where costs are awarded against police’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to undertake police activities associated with the judicial process efficiently (box 6.19).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.19 Percentage of prosecutions where costs are awarded against police |
| Percentage of prosecutions where costs are awarded against police’ is a measure of police efficiency in preparing evidence that is relevant to, and supports, a prosecution.  Court costs are generally awarded against police when a criminal action against an offender has failed; in this respect, it represents at least some of the resources expended when a prosecution fails. A low or decreasing percentage of prosecutions where costs are awarded against police in criminal actions is therefore desirable.  Data reported for this measure are:   * not comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions because the process by which costs are awarded differs between jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period (2012-13).   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

The process by which costs are awarded differs between jurisdictions. The proportion of prosecutions where costs were awarded against the police in 2012-13 was low (less than 1.5 per cent) in all jurisdictions (table 6A.41).

#### Effectiveness

##### Juvenile diversions

‘Juvenile diversions’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to divert juveniles from the criminal justice system where appropriate (box 6.20).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.20 Juvenile diversions |
| ‘Juvenile diversions’ is defined as the number of juveniles who would otherwise be proceeded against (that is, taken to court) but who are diverted by police, as a proportion of all juvenile offenders formally dealt with by police. Offenders who would not normally be sent to court for the offence detected, and who are treated by police in a less formal manner (for example, those issued with infringement notices), are not included in this measure.  A high or increasing proportion of juvenile diversions as a proportion of juvenile offenders represents a desirable outcome.  This indicator does not provide information on the relative success or failure of diversionary mechanisms.  When police apprehend offenders, they have a variety of options available. They can charge the offender (in which case criminal proceedings occur through the traditional court processes) or they can use their discretion to divert the offender away from this potentially costly, time consuming and stressful situation (for both the offender and victim). Diversionary mechanisms include cautions and attendances at community and family conferences. These options can be beneficial because they allow the offender to be admonished, without the necessity of traditional court processes. They are particularly useful mechanisms for dealing with juvenile offenders.  The term ‘diverted’ includes diversions of offenders away from the courts by way of community conference, diversionary conference, formal cautioning by police, family conferences, and other programs (for example, drug assessment/treatment). Not all options are available or subject to police discretion in all jurisdictions.  Data reported for this measure are:   * not comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions because the process by which juvenile diversions are recorded differs between jurisdictions * not complete for the current (2012-13) reporting period, with data for NSW and the NT not available.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

The proportion of juvenile offenders undergoing diversionary programs varied across jurisdictions in 2012-13. Within most jurisdictions, proportions of juvenile offenders undergoing diversionary programs were relatively consistent over time (table 6.2).

Table 6.2 Juvenile diversions as a proportion of juvenile offenders (per cent)**a, b, c, d, e**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSWb | Vicc | Qld | WAd | SA | Tas | | ACTe | NT |
| 2008-09 | 51 | 40 | 47 | 47 | 52 | | 61 | 47 | 41 |
| 2009-10 | 57 | 39 | 47 | 47 | 52 | | 58 | 42 | 42 |
| 2010-11 | 57 | 33 | 44 | 49 | 51 | | 60 | 38 | 49 |
| 2011-12 | 61 | 31 | 39 | 50 | 47 | | 61 | 40 | 35 |
| 2012-13 | na | 29 | 36 | 47 | 49 | | 60 | 38 | 28 |

a Juvenile diversion is defined as juveniles who would otherwise be proceeded against (that is, taken to court) but who are diverted by police as a proportion of all juvenile offenders formally dealt with by police. The term diverted includes diversions of offenders away from the courts by way of: community conference, diversionary conference, formal cautioning by police, family conferences; and other diversionary programs (for example, to drug assessment/treatment). Offenders who would not normally be sent to court for the offence detected and are treated by police in a less formal manner (for example, issued infringement notices) are excluded. b NSW data series revised based on improved data extraction methodology. Data include juveniles diverted by police via Caution, Compliance Notice, Youth Conference or Warning as a proportion of all juveniles so diverted or sent to court. Data exclude Breach of Bail Legal Actions and Non-NSW Charges; juveniles issued with Infringement Notices; and Cautions and Youth Conferences issued by Courts. Data collection system enhancements in 2009-10 improved recording of Warnings under the Young Offenders Act (Warnings were inconsistently recorded in previous years). c Victorian data reflect only those instances where a juvenile is taken into police custody and subsequently issued with a formal caution or placed on an alcohol diversion. Instances where a juvenile is released into non-police care or involving a safe‑custody application are not included. d WA juvenile diversions include formal cautions and referrals to Juvenile Justice Teams as a proportion of the total recorded number of juveniles diverted or arrested. e In the ACT, the proportion of juvenile diversions has been calculated on total recorded police contacts with juveniles comprising juvenile cautions, referrals to diversionary conferencing, juveniles taken into protective custody and charges pertaining to juveniles. **na** Not available.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 6A.39.

#### Outcomes

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (while outputs are the services delivered) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

##### Deaths in police custody and Indigenous deaths in custody

‘Deaths in police custody’, and ‘Indigenous deaths in police custody’ are indicators of governments’ objective to provide safe custody for alleged offenders, and ensure fair and equitable treatment for both victims and alleged offenders (box 6.21).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.21 Deaths in police custody, and Indigenous deaths in police custody |
| ‘Deaths in police custody’ and ‘Indigenous deaths in police custody’ are defined as the number of non-Indigenous and Indigenous deaths in police custody and custody‑related operations.  A low or decreasing number of deaths in custody and custody-related operations is desirable.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, there were 18 deaths in police custody and custody-related operations in 2012-13. Of these 18 deaths, 5 were Indigenous (table 6.3). Time series data are available in table 6A.38.

Table 6.3 Deaths in police custody and custody-related operations**a, b**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust |
| Non-Indigenous deaths | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007-08 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | – | 3 | 29 |
| 2008-09 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 4 | – | 1 | 1 | 29 |
| 2009-10 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 21 |
| 2010-11 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | – | 18 |
| 2011-12 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 3 | – | – | – | 32 |
| 2012-13 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | – | – | – | – | 13 |
| Indigenous deaths | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007-08 | – | – | 1 | – | 2 | – | – | 2 | 5 |
| 2008-09 | – | – | 1 | 1 | 2 | – | – | 4 | 8 |
| 2009-10 | 2 | – | – | 2 | – | – | – | 2 | 6 |
| 2010-11 | 1 | – | 1 | 5 | – | – | – | – | 7 |
| 2011-12 | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | 2 | 3 |
| 2012-13 | – | – | 1 | 3 | 1 | – | – | – | 5 |
| **Total Indigenous deaths 2007–08 to 2012-13** | 3 | – | 5 | 11 | 5 | – | – | 10 | 34 |
| Total deaths | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007-08 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | – | 5 | 34 |
| 2008-09 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 6 | – | 1 | 5 | 37 |
| 2009-10 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 27 |
| 2010-11 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | – | 25 |
| 2011-12 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 3 | – | – | 2 | 35 |
| 2012-13 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | – | – | – | 18 |
| **Total deaths 2007–08 to 2012-13** | 39 | 26 | 39 | 32 | 17 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 176 |

a Deaths in police custody include: deaths in institutional settings (for example, police stations/lockups and police vehicles, or during transfer to or from such an institution, or in hospitals following transfer from an institution); and other deaths in police operations where officers were in close contact with the deceased (for example, most raids and shootings by police). Deaths in custody-related operations cover situations where officers did not have such close contact with the person as to be able to significantly influence or control the person’s behaviour (for example, most sieges and most cases where officers were attempting to detain a person, such as pursuits). b The AIC data are subject to revision and data in other publications might differ. Also, data for historic years were revised during 2010 and are now presented on a financial year basis so they differ from those in earlier reports. – Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: AIC (various years, unpublished) *Deaths in Custody*, Australia; table 6A.38.

##### Magistrates court defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding

The police assist the judicial process in a variety of ways, including collecting evidence and providing testimony in court. Police work in this area can be measured to some extent by the success in achieving a guilty plea or finding in court. ‘Magistrates court defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding’ is an indicator of

governments’ objective for police to support the judicial process to achieve efficient and effective court case management for judicial processing (box 6.22).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6.22 Magistrates court defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding |
| ‘Magistrates court defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding’ is defined as the number of finalised adjudicated defendants in lower courts who either submitted a guilty plea or were found guilty, as a proportion of the total number of magistrates court adjudicated defendants.  A high or increasing proportion of magistrates court adjudicated defendants submitting a guilty plea or being the subject of a guilty finding is desirable.  This indicator does not provide information on the number of cases where police have identified a likely offender but choose not to bring the likely offender to court due to a number of factors.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012-13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, the proportion of magistrates court adjudicated defendants who either submitted a guilty plea or were found guilty was 96.7 per cent in 2011-12, very similar to the 96.8 per cent in 2010-11 (figure 6.29).

Figure 6.29 Proportion of magistrates court finalised adjudicated defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding**a**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.29 Proportion of magistrates court finalised adjudicated defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a A defendant can be either a person or organisation against whom one or more criminal charges have been laid.

*Source*: ABS Criminal Courts, Australia (various years) Cat. no. 4513.0; table 6A.40.

Time series data for magistrates court finalised adjudicated defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding are reported in table 6A.40.

## 6.8 Future directions in performance reporting

The Steering Committee continues to examine alternative indicators of performance, consistent with the ongoing development of performance evaluation and reporting frameworks in individual jurisdictions. New data sets, such as that released by the ABS on the characteristics of offenders, will suggest future directions in reporting.

The development of efficiency indicators for police services is a challenging and complex process. There are significantly different costing methodologies in each jurisdiction that affect the availability of comparative data. Research is ongoing into efficiency indicators used by police services overseas and other areas of government service delivery.

The Steering Committee is convinced that nationally comparable response times reporting is highly desirable, although the Standing Council on Police and Emergency Management (SCPEM) has suggested that further work is required on the costs and benefits of a national standard for police response times.

Two particular issues currently present challenges to performance evaluation and reporting:

* Police are increasingly required to work in close partnership with other sectors of government, including health and community services, corrections, courts, other emergency service providers and transport. Police services are also working more frequently with Australian Government agencies on crime data issues, to combat the threat and impact of terrorism, and to manage environmental issues such as the policing response to emergencies and natural disasters. These partnerships address the need to deliver agreed whole-of-government outcomes at the State and Territory and national levels. Measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of police contributions to these outcomes is particularly challenging.
* A number of police jurisdictions are moving towards using more locally focused service delivery models, recognising that communities and the people who live in them demand more direct participation in service delivery priorities and approaches. This accords with the now well established policing emphasis on localised performance planning, measurement and accountability for internal and external performance reporting purposes. However, the indicators used in this report, which generally represent State and Territory and national results, are difficult to disaggregate for reflection on performance at the local community level.

## 6.9 Jurisdictions’ comments

This section provides comments from each jurisdiction on the services covered in this chapter.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | New South Wales Government comments | **”** |
| 2012-2013 was another year of strong achievements right across the NSW Police Force, accompanied by positive outcomes for the communities we serve.  NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (BOCSAR) confirms that most crime categories are stable or have fallen over the 12 months to June 2013, continuing the positive trend that has been maintained over several years. The most recent Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) figures indicate that the number of people recorded as being victims of crime is falling faster in New South Wales than for Australia as a whole.  Our significant focus on frontline policing continued, with police tackling issues such as street offences, alcohol related crime and antisocial behaviour. Our Vikings Unit supported Local Area Commands (LACs) with local operations targeting these issues and other crime types throughout the year across NSW.  Along with other police agencies across Australia and New Zealand, we played our part in Operation Unite 2012, targeting alcohol related violence and antisocial behaviour. Our Drug & Alcohol Coordination Team hosted the Australasian Drug & Alcohol Strategy Conference in Sydney, with local and international speakers.  Our officers worked closely with other emergency service agencies to respond to emergencies throughout the year, particularly the bushfires and floods that occurred in early January 2013. We policed a number of major events this financial year, including the welcome home for athletes returning from the London Olympics in August 2012.  The NSW Police Force continued to take advantage of new technology, with faster fingerprint identifications, the rollout of the Electronic Evidence First Responders Program and improvements to our information systems, including the development of a new Data Security Framework for our Computerised Operational Policing System (COPS). Our Marine Area Command launched their new fleet of fast response multi-purpose vessels, enhancing our capacity for search and rescue operations at sea and marine policing in general.  New and amended legislation introduced throughout the year brought more flexibility for police across a range of policing portfolios, including serious and organised crime, firearms licensing, the security industry and illicit drugs and alcohol. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Victorian Government comments | **”** |
| During 2012-13, Victoria Police faced many challenges. The total crime rate, measured as a rate per 100,000 of population, increased by 1.6 per cent from the 2011-12 rate. While there have been increases across a range of offence types, a significant part of this can be attributed to the deployment of additional police on our streets, resulting in more offences being detected.  Family violence continued to be a major focus for Victoria Police in 2012-13, and there is a continuing increase in the reporting of family violence across Victoria. While this is a positive trend, as more victims are willing to report family violence offences to police, everyone deserves to be safe from violence. In February 2013, Victoria Police and the Victorian Government launched the ‘Go4Zero’ campaign, sending the message that violence of any kind, whether it is happening in the home or on the streets, is unacceptable. Victoria Police will continue to strengthen partnerships with government, courts, and our community stakeholders to respond more effectively to family violence, sexual assault and child abuse.  In 2012-13, Victoria Police also noted some positive results. There was a 4.8 per cent decrease in road fatalities compared to the 2011-12 period, with total injuries also decreasing by 6.0 per cent. Whilst the continued decrease in fatalities and injuries is a positive result, there are still too many people being killed or injured on Victoria’s roads. During 2012-13, 256 Victorians were killed, and a further 17,947 people were injured. Victoria Police is working with its road safety partners to ensure everyone plays a part in reducing the road toll. In May 2013, the Victorian Government launched *Victoria’s Road Safety Strategy (2013-2022)* which provides Victoria Police with a solid framework for road policing over the next decade. In addition, Victoria Police released the *2013-18 Victoria Police Road Safety Strategy* which aligns with the framework and works towards achieving the Victorian government road trauma reduction targets.  The recruitment, training and deployment of an additional 1,700 frontline police and 940 Protective Services Officers (PSOs) has continued to be a priority for Victoria Police over the previous 12 months, and this will continue until Victoria Police targets are reached in November 2014. At 30 June 2013, an additional 1,200 new police had been allocated since the 1,700 initiative commenced in November 2010, with a further 103 recruits in training at the Police Academy. An additional 308 PSOs were also deployed to railway stations across the metropolitan area in 2012-13. As at 30 June 2013, PSOs had been deployed at 53 stations across the rail network, having a positive impact on commuter safety. In 2012-13, Victoria Police maintained its focus on strengthening community engagement and improving service delivery to all Victorians. 86.0 per cent of Victorians surveyed in the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (NSCSP) report that they have confidence in Victoria Police, and that 84.8 per cent of all Victorians who have had direct contact with Victoria Police during 2012-13 were satisfied with the service they received. |
| **“** | Queensland Government comments | **”** |
| The National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing indicates that general satisfaction with police in 2012-13 was 77.8 per cent. Also in 2012‑13, 86.9 per cent of Queenslanders indicated they had confidence in police. Both of these outcomes were above the national average.  During 2012-13, compared to the previous financial year, there was a 2 per cent increase in the rate of total offences. However, the crime rate is still considerably lower than it was in 2000-01. There were 12 424 total offences per 100 000 population in 2000-01, which compares to 9 561 per 100 000 population in 2012-13.  The road toll for 2012 was 280, with 6.13 fatalities per 100 000 population. This was the third lowest fatality rate recorded in Queensland for a calendar year since accurate records began in July 1952.  Despite the many positive aspects of QPS performance, there is always room for improvement. There is an opportunity for the QPS to contribute to, and lead, reform to improve public services to the community.  In August 2012, the QPS commenced an internal review guided by the Public Sector Renewal Program. The Review Report, *Overview of the proposed changes to the structure and governance of the Queensland Police Service*, outlined the proposed new future for the Queensland Police.  In the future we will be a Police Service that works with the community to stop crime and make Queensland safer, including stopping road trauma. We will:   * provide more options for the community to communicate with police; * build relationships with the community, based on fairness and integrity; * release police from tasks that don’t add value or can be completed by other means; * be more mobile, flexible and capable of working across boundaries, to deliver the services the community needs; * focus on proactive work and be able to respond quickly when needed; and * act with courage and be proud of our contribution to the community.   Moving toward the future state starts with the implementation of a streamlined organisational structure. However, this is just the beginning.  In 2013-14, the Queensland Police Service will progress a range of renewal initiatives and the implementation of accepted recommendations from the Police and Community Safety Review. |
| **“** | Western Australian Government comments | **”** |
| In 2012-13, the Western Australia Police maintained its focus on tackling crime and keeping the community safe. These frontline policing priorities are influenced by a range of social issues and WA Police continues to work with other government and non government agencies to prevent and reduce crime.  An ever increasing demand has driven the need for a more mobile and responsive policing style. ‘Carombola’ was the first of a planned series of long term, flexible operations where strike teams of police were deployed to high crime locations south of the city targeting specific offence types.  Crime prevention is at the core of all WA Police activity and a number of strategies were adopted in response to emerging trends. A Vehicle Crime Unit was established to address a rise in stolen motor vehicles and re-birthing offences.  Operation Redirect apprehended children ‘at risk’ who were on the street unaccompanied during school hours while the child abuse intervention strategy, Operation Reset, continued its multi agency work in remote and regional WA. The Family and Domestic Violence Response Team was also established.  Alcohol misuse has a major impact on police resources and liquor restrictions were successfully sought in a number of high risk locations around the State. This past year has seen an increase in applications for Prohibited Behaviour Orders to target offenders committing lower level, higher volume anti social crimes.  WA Police conducted a series of targeted campaigns and sustained enforcement effort to reduce injury on our roads and ensure road users were protected from unlawful and anti social road behaviour. The opening of the new Perth Police Complex and watch house provided a state of the art facility in the city precinct.  During the year, laws were introduced giving police greater powers to deal with public disorder at ‘out of control’ gatherings. Changes to the Community Protection (Offender Reporting) Act 2004 gave the Commissioner of Police the authority to release information about dangerous sex offenders.  WA Police commenced work on its comprehensive reform program, Frontline 2020, to create a sustainable and effective policing model for the future. Frontline 2020 will position the agency to continue to provide quality core policing services despite the challenges of increasing demand and finite resources. Frontline 2020 is the highest priority corporate project for WA Police. |
| **“** | South Australian Government comments | **”** |
| In 2012-13 Commissioner Burns completed his first year as Commissioner of South Australia Police (SAPOL).  His focus was on improving services around the basic priorities of policing; protecting life and property, reducing road trauma and managing emergencies, for a safe and reassured South Australian community.  Commissioner Burns delivered an innovative and significant program of structural change across SAPOL. At the heart of this was a focus on achieving greater efficiencies in tight financial times while increasing support to front-line officers and improving service delivery.  Metropolitan and regional services were realigned and new areas of focus in security and emergency management and serious and organised crime implemented, for better support to SAPOL’s Local Service Areas.  Introduction of a new dark blue uniform, the biggest visual difference to SAPOL for 30 years, resulted in very positive public feedback.  The community also continued to enthusiastically interact with SAPOL’s more proactive online spaces, through our Internet site and social media platforms of Facebook, Twitter and YouTube.  Victim reported crime again reduced, with thousands less offences occurring in South Australia. The community also had high levels of satisfaction and confidence in SAPOL’s policing services.  More work remains to be done to reduce the road toll wherever it is possible, as these are not just numbers. They represent individuals, families, and communities, who may carry the consequences for the rest of their lives.  SAPOL will also continue to think innovatively about future service delivery models for ongoing improved efficiency and effectiveness and to support wider justice system reform programs. This will help meet the challenges of financial constraints and evolving crime trends.  Finally, 2013 marked 175 years of policing in South Australia.  SAPOL has the honour of being the oldest centrally-controlled police service in Australia and one of the oldest in the world. This is a rich and proud history and SAPOL remains committed to honouring it through continued dedicated and professional policing services to the South Australian community. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Tasmanian Government comments | **”** |
| 2012-13 was a challenging year for Tasmania Police in which a voluntary redundancy program was necessary to meet budget targets. Despite these difficulties crime fell by 4 per cent, with decreases in Offences Against the Person and Offences Against Property. There were reductions in Assault, Stolen Motor Vehicles and Injure/Destroy Property. National recorded crime statistics show that Tasmania’s victimisation rate in 2012 was the lowest in the country for most offence categories.  Results from the *National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing 2012‑13* show that a higher proportion of Tasmanians are satisfied with their Police Service than the national average. Tasmania also scored above the national average for persons having confidence in police and who believe police perform their job professionally, treat people fairly and equally and are honest.  More Tasmanians felt safe at home in in their local neighbourhood than was the case nationally. 96.6 per cent of Tasmanians felt safe at home alone during the day and 90.0 per cent during the night. 92.8 per cent felt safe walking in their neighbourhood during the day 55.5 per cent during the night.  Tasmania Police maintained a high-visibility strategy on arterial roads and focused on decreasing speeding, drink driving and drug driving offences. Replacement of ageing speed camera technology was also undertaken during this period. The 229 fatal and serious injury crashes recorded in 2012-13 was a ten per cent reduction on the previous year and the lowest number recorded in over forty years.  A restructuring project was undertaken during 2012-13 to redesign our operating structure for a reduced workforce. The project resulted in the Southern and East Police Districts being amalgamated and the creation of specialist groups Road and Public Order Services, and Community Support Services.  This period also saw the implementation of the *Support to the Frontline* Strategy, which ensured that members working in non-frontline roles could be deployed to the frontline, providing a more flexible and responsive workplace. Recruiting processes recommenced in April 2013 for the first time since 2011 and the State Government has committed to maintaining current police levels.  Tasmania Police reached out to the community and embraced social media with the publication of a Facebook page in April 2013. Facebook allows police to directly engage with the community on matters such as missing persons, witnesses to incidents, road closures and emergency warnings.  New technology was embraced with a mobile data tablet trial commencing in Kingston Division in April 2013. Forty data tablets were deployed, enabling police to have real-time access to operational information. The trial will evaluate the feasibility of a mobility business model. |
| **“** | Australian Capital Territory Government comments | **”** |
| In 2012-13, ACT Policing met or exceeded the majority of its key performance indicators (KPIs) with 27 of the 32 measures being achieved. During this time ACT Policing continued to develop new and improve current initiatives to further reduce crime in the ACT.  ACT Policing remains supportive of the 2012-2015 ACT Property Crime and Reduction Strategy and is committed to working with the ACT Justice and Community Safety Directorate (JaCSD) to ensure the targets for reducing burglary and motor vehicle theft victims are achieved. The target for the 2012-15 Property Crime Reduction Strategy is to reduce reported ACT burglary crime by a further 10 per cent and motor vehicle theft by a further 20 per cent by 31 December 2015. The 2012 results for burglary show a 43.7 per cent decrease in property crime from the original 2010 baseline. A decrease of 27.3 per cent is reported for motor vehicle theft compared to the 2010 baseline.  With high quality roads and low density traffic in the region, ACT Policing maintains a strong focus on reducing dangerous driving behaviour. In July 2012, ACT Policing for the first time was awarded a grant from the 2012-13 NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust Grant Program. This grant was allocated to ACT Policing to undertake market segmentation research into dangerous driving behaviour such as speeding. The research grant has assisted ACT Policing to continue developing more effective road safety strategies and communication channels by having a greater understanding of the profile of dangerous drivers and their motivations. From the nine organisations awarded trust grants by the NRMA, ACT Policing received the largest grant allocation of $75,900. The research grant coincided with other ACT Policing road safety strategies that aim to enforce traffic laws and promote safer behaviour on ACT roads. Since being awarded the grant there has been a downward trend in the number of Infringement Notices issued for speeding, however, dangerous driving behaviour continues to be an area of focus for ACT Policing as self-reported levels in the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing remain above the benchmark agreed with the ACT Government.  During 2012-13 ACT Policing enhanced one of its most innovative strategies. In 2011 a joint initiative was undertaken between ACT Policing and ACT Health, known as the Mental Health and Community Policing Initiative (MHCPI) to build effective partnerships and enhance the care and treatment of individuals experiencing mental illness or dysfunction. One of the main components of the MHCPI was the placement of ACT Health clinicians in ACT Policing Operations part-time. Almost two years since the launch of the successful MHCPI this component has been expanded so that clinicians now provide police officers with frontline support seven days a week. Clinicians have access to the ACT Health database and are able to triage and provide timely and direct information to police in the field. Since the launch the clinicians have been involved with more than 2000 cases, and data shows a steady increase in the percentage of cases where police are actively seeking clinician assistance in determining whether an emergency apprehension order is required for an individual. |
| **“** | Northern Territory Government comments | **”** |
| During 2012-13, the Northern Territory Police Force (NTPF) conducted and implemented numerous operational and corporate initiatives to meet its primary policing objectives under the *Operational Excellence* strategic direction.  The NTPF welcomed 184 new police recruits and an additional Assistant Commissioner position based in Alice Springs was created to reinforce the NTPF focus on policing the urban and remote communities across the Territory. Police stations and housing were built at Ramingining and Gapuwiyak.  Our Memorandum of Understanding with the Commonwealth Department of Immigration and Citizenship has transformed our business model in relation to how we respond to incidents at immigration detention centres and has seen the establishment of dedicated public order units, Police Mounted and Dog Operation Units, under the Special Operations Command (SOC). A purpose built SOC Headquarters was commissioned in July 2012.  In 2012, "Project Respect" was implemented which is a three-dimensional strategy aimed at reducing domestic and family violence crime and supporting victims.  The zero tolerance and pro-arrest approach to domestic and family violence aims to reduce this type of offending in the long term for the Northern Territory community.  The Family Safety Framework (FSF) was introduced in Alice Springs in July 2012 to provide an action based, integrated service response to individuals and families experiencing family or domestic violence that are at high risk of injury or death. The FSF is a co-ordinated effort between key agencies in Alice Springs and is led by the NTPF.  Custody nurses have continued to deliver a vital role through the joint partnership between the NTPF and the Department of Health. The presence of custody nurses in watch houses provides for the application of best practice in custody matters and allow for timely health intervention and for the assessment, treatment, referral and management of police prisoners in custody. The program was expanded during 2012-13 with increased nurses in Alice Springs, Darwin and Katherine watch houses.  The NTPF has taken the lead on the development, implementation and ownership of Community Safety Action Plans across the Northern Territory. The plans will focus on four key goals being: mutual respect and working partnerships; reduce domestic and family violence; reduce substance abuse; and improve community amenity. Central to the plan is the involvement of community members.  Key projects that will continue to progress will include mobile technology solutions to make policing more efficient and ensure our officers are available on the frontline to assist and respond to community needs and to keep the community safe. |

## 6.10 Definitions of key terms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Adjudicated defendant** | A defendant is a person or organisation against whom one or more criminal charges have been laid and which are heard together as one unit of work by a court level. An adjudicated finalisation is a method of finalisation based on a judgement or decision by the court as to whether or not the defendant is guilty of the charge(s) laid against them. |
| **Armed robbery** | Robbery conducted with the use (actual or implied) of a weapon, where a weapon can include, but is not restricted to:   * firearms — pistol, revolver, rifle, automatic/semi-automatic rifle, shotgun, military firearm, airgun, nail gun, cannon, imitation firearm and implied firearm * other weapons — knife, sharp instrument, blunt instrument, hammer, axe, club, iron bar, piece of wood, syringe/hypodermic needle, bow and arrow, crossbow, spear gun, blowgun, rope, wire, chemical, acid, explosive, vehicle, bottle/glass, other dangerous article and imitation weapons. |
| **Assault** | The direct (and immediate/confrontational) infliction of force, injury or violence on a person(s) or the direct (and immediate/confrontational) threat of force, injury or violence where there is an apprehension that the threat could be enacted. |
| **Available full time equivalent staff** | Any full time equivalent category where the individual is on duty performing a function. To be measured using average staffing level for the whole reporting period. |
| **Average non-police staff salaries** | Salaries and payments in the nature of salary paid to civilian and other employees, divided by the total number of such employees. |
| **Average police salaries** | Salaries and payments in the nature of salary paid to sworn police officers, divided by the number of sworn officers. |
| **Blackmail and extortion** | Unlawful demanding with intent to gain money, property or any other benefit from, or with intent to cause detriment to, another person, accompanied by the use of coercive measures, to be carried out at some point in the future if the demand is not met. This may also include the use and/or threatened use of face-to-face force or violence, provided there is a threat of continued violence if the demand is not met. |
| **Cautioning** | A formal method of dealing with young offenders without taking court proceedings. Police officers may caution young offenders instead of charging them if the offence or the circumstance of the offence is not serious. |
| **Civilian staff** | Unsworn staff, including specialists (civilian training and teaching medical and other specialists) and civilian administrative and management staff. |
| **Complaints** | Number of statements of complaint by members of the public regarding police conduct. |
| **Death in police custody and custody-related incident** | Death of a person who was in police custody; death caused or contributed to by traumatic injuries while in custody; death of a person who was fatally injured when police officers attempted to detain that person; or death of a person who was fatally injured when escaping or attempting to escape from police custody. |
| **Depreciation** | Where possible, based on current asset valuation. |
| **Executive staff** | Number of sworn and unsworn staff at the rank of chief superintendent or equivalent grade to assistant commissioner grade. |
| **Full time equivalent (FTE)** | The equivalent number of full time staff required to provide the same hours of work as performed by staff actually employed. A full time staff member is equivalent to a full time equivalent of one, while a part time staff member is greater than zero but less than one. |
| **Higher court defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding** | Total number of higher courts finalised defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding, as a proportion of the total number of higher courts finalised defendants. A defendant can be either a person or organisation against whom one or more criminal charges have been laid.  A higher court is either:   * an intermediate court (known either as the district court or county court) that has legal powers between those of a court of summary jurisdiction (lower level courts) and a supreme court, and that deals with the majority of cases involving serious criminal charges * a supreme court (a higher court level which deals with the most serious criminal charges and has the greatest legal powers of all the State and Territory court levels).   Guilty finding is an outcome of a trial in which a court determines that the criminal charge against a defendant has been proven. |
| **Indigenous staff** | Number of staff who are identified as being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent. |
| **Juvenile diversions** | Total number of juvenile offenders who are diverted by police (for example, through the use of cautions, official warnings or other diversionary programs) away from the criminal justice system, as a proportion of the total number of juvenile offenders either diverted from or dealt with by the criminal justice system (that is, those who are either diverted or prosecuted). |
| **Land transport hospitalisations** | Hospitalisations due to traffic accidents that are likely to have required police attendance; these may include accidents involving trains, bicycles and so on. |
| **Lower court defendants resulting in guilty plea or finding** | Total number of cases (excluding committal hearings) heard before lower courts of law only, for which there was a plea of guilty, as a proportion of the total number of cases (excluding committal hearings) heard before lower courts of law only.  A lower court is a court of summary jurisdiction (commonly referred to as magistrates’ court, local court or court of petty sessions) that deals with relatively less serious charges and has the most limited legal powers of all State and Territory court levels. Such courts are presided over by a magistrate and have jurisdiction to hear trial and sentence matters relating to summary offences. Under some circumstances, this court level may also deal with the less serious indictable offences known as ‘minor indictable’ or ‘triable either way’ offences.  A guilty plea is the formal statement by a defendant admitting culpability in relation to a criminal charge. A not guilty plea is the formal statement by a defendant denying culpability in relation to a charge. For this data collection, a plea of ‘not guilty’ should also include ‘no plea’, ‘plea reserved’ and ‘other defended plea’.  Further, these definitions:   * exclude preliminary (committal) hearings for indictable offences dealt with by a lower court * count cases that involve multiple charges as a ‘lower court case resulting in a plea of guilty’ if a plea of guilty has resulted for at least one of those charges. |
| **Management full time equivalent staff** | Number of management full time equivalent staff, including civilian (managers) and sworn (inspector to superintendent) staff. |
| **Motor vehicle theft** | The taking of another person’s motor vehicle illegally and without permission. |
| **Murder** | The wilful killing of a person either intentionally or with reckless indifference to life. |
| **Non-Indigenous full time equivalent staff** | Number of full time equivalent staff who do not satisfy the Indigenous staff criteria. |
| **Non-operational full time equivalent staff** | Any person who does not satisfy the operational staff criteria, including functional support staff only. Functional support full time equivalent staff include any person (sworn or unsworn) not satisfying the operational or operational support staff criteria (for example, finance, policy, research, personnel services, building and property services, transport services, and management above the level of station and shift supervisors). |
| **Offender** | In the Police Services chapter, the term ‘offender’ refers to a person who is alleged to have committed an offence. This definition is not the same as the definition used in chapter 8 (Corrective services). |
| **Operational staff** | An operational police staff member (sworn or unsworn) is any member of the police force whose primarily duty is the delivery of police or police related services to an external customer (where an external customer predominately refers to members of the public but may also include law enforcement outputs delivered to other government departments).  Operational staff include: general duties officers, investigators, traffic operatives, tactical officers, station counter staff, communication officers, crime scene staff, disaster victim identification, and prosecution and judicial support officers. |
| **Other recurrent expenditure** | Maintenance and working expenses; expenditure incurred by other departments on behalf of police; expenditure on contracted police services; and other recurrent costs not elsewhere classified. Expenditure is disaggregated by service delivery area. |
| **Other theft** | The taking of another person’s property with the intention of depriving the owner of the property illegally and without permission, but without force, threat of force, use of coercive measures, deceit or having gained unlawful entry to any structure, even if the intent was to commit theft. |
| **Outcome of investigations** | The stage reached by a police investigation after a period of 30 days has elapsed since the recording of the incident. |
| **Practitioner staff** | Number of practitioner staff, including civilian (administration) and sworn (constable to senior constable) staff. |
| **Property crimes** | Total recorded crimes against property, including:   * unlawful entry with intent * motor vehicle theft * other theft. |
| **Real expenditure** | Actual expenditure adjusted for changes in prices. Time series financial data are adjusted to 2012-13 dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2012-13 = 100) (table AA.53). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product implicit price deflator used in previous editions. See Chapter 2 (section 2.5) for details.GDP price deflator, and expressed in terms of final year prices. |
| **Recorded crime** | Crimes reported to (or detected) and recorded by police. |
| **Registered vehicles** | Total registered motor vehicles, including motorcycles. |
| **Reporting rate** | The proportion of crime victims who told police about the last crime incident of which they were the victim, as measured by a crime victimisation survey. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Revenue from own sources** | Revenue from activities undertaken by police, including revenue from the sale of stores, plant and vehicles; donations and industry contributions; user charges; and other revenue (excluding fine revenue and revenue from the issuing of firearm licenses). |
| **Road deaths** | Fatal road injury accidents as defined by the Australian Transport Safety Bureau. |
| **Robbery** | The unlawful taking of property from the immediate possession, control, custody or care of a person, with the intent to permanently deprive the owner of the property accompanied by the use, and/or threatened use of immediate force or violence. |
| **Salaries and payments in the nature of salary** | Includes:   * base salary package * motor vehicle expenses that are part of employer fringe benefits * superannuation, early retirement schemes and payments to pension schemes (employer contributions) * workers compensation (full cost) including premiums, levies, bills, legal fees * higher duty allowances (actual amounts paid) * overtime (actual amounts paid) * actual termination and long service leave * actual annual leave * actual sick leave * actual maternity/paternity leave * fringe benefits tax paid * fringe benefits provided (for example, school fee salary sacrifice at cost to the government, car parking, duress alarms, telephone account reimbursements, ‘gold passes’, other salary sacrifice benefits, frequent flyer benefits, overtime meals provided and any other components that are not part of a salary package) * payroll tax. |
| **Senior executive staff** | Number of senior executive staff, including civilian (top senior executive service) and sworn (commissioner, deputy commissioner and equivalent civilian executives) staff. |
| **Sexual assault** | Physical contact of a sexual nature directed towards another person where that person does not give consent, that person gives consent as a result of intimidation or fraud, or consent is proscribed (that is, the person is legally deemed incapable of giving consent as a result of youth, temporary/permanent (mental) incapacity or a familial relationship).  Includes rape, attempted rape, indecent assault and assault with intent to commit sexual assault. Excludes sexual harassment not leading to assault. |
| **Supervisory full time equivalent staff** | Number of supervisory full time equivalent staff, including civilian (team leaders) and sworn (sergeant to senior sergeant) staff. |
| **Sworn staff** | Sworn police staff recognised under each jurisdiction’s Police Act. |
| **Total capital expenditure** | Total expenditure on the purchase of new or second hand capital assets, and expenditure on significant repairs or additions to assets that add to the assets’ service potential or service life. |
| **Total expenditure** | Total capital expenditure plus total recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total FTE staff** | Operational staff and non-operational staff, including full time equivalent staff on paid leave or absence from duty (including secondment and training), as measured using absolute numbers for the whole reporting period. |
| **Total number of staff** | Full time equivalent staff directly employed on an annual basis (excluding labour contracted out). |
| **Total recurrent expenditure** | Includes:   * salaries and payments in the nature of salary * other recurrent expenditure * depreciation * less revenue from own sources. |
| **Unarmed robbery** | Robbery conducted without the use (actual or implied) of a weapon |
| **Unavailable full time equivalent staff** | Any full time equivalent category where the individual is on paid leave or absent from duty (including secondment and training), as measured using the average staffing level for the whole reporting period. |
| **Unlawful entry with intent — involving the taking of property** | The unlawful entry of a structure (whether forced or unforced) with intent to commit an offence, resulting in the taking of property from the structure. Includes burglary and break-in offences. Excludes trespass or lawful entry with intent. |
| **Unlawful entry with intent — other** | The unlawful entry of a structure (whether forced or unforced) with intent to commit an offence, but which does not result in the taking of property from the structure. Excludes trespass or lawful entry with intent. |
| **User cost of capital** | The opportunity cost of funds tied up in the capital used to deliver services. Calculated as 8 per cent of the current value of non-current physical assets (excluding land). |
| **Value of physical assets — buildings and fittings** | The value of buildings and fittings under the direct control of police. |
| **Value of physical assets — land** | The value of land under the direct control of police. |
| **Value of physical assets — other** | The value of motor vehicles, computer equipment, and general plant and equipment under the direct control of police. |

## 6.11 List of attachment tables

Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this chapter by an ‘6A’ prefix (for example, table 6A.1 is table 1). Attachment tables are provided on the Review website (www.pc.gov.au/gsp).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 6A.1** | Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NSW |
| **Table 6A.2** | Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Victoria |
| **Table 6A.3** | Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Queensland |
| **Table 6A.4** | Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, WA |
| **Table 6A.5** | Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, SA |
| **Table 6A.6** | Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Tasmania |
| **Table 6A.7** | Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, ACT |
| **Table 6A.8** | Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NT |
| **Table 6A.9** | Treatment of assets by police agencies |
| **Table 6A.10** | Real recurrent expenditure (including user cost of capital, less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services (2012-13 dollars) |
| **Table 6A.11** | Police staff, by operational status (per cent) |
| **Table 6A.12** | General satisfaction with services provided by the police |
| **Table 6A.13** | Opinions on statement 'police perform job professionally' |
| **Table 6A.14** | Opinions on statement 'police treat people fairly and equally' |
| **Table 6A.15** | Opinions on statement 'police are honest' |
| **Table 6A.16** | Trends in complaints |
| **Table 6A.17** | Indigenous, sworn and unsworn police staff |
| **Table 6A.18** | Police staff, sworn and unsworn, by gender (per cent) |
| **Table 6A.19** | Feelings of safety at home alone |
| **Table 6A.20** | Feelings of safety walking or jogging locally |
| **Table 6A.21** | Feelings of safety on public transport |
| **Table 6A.22** | Opinion on whether illegal drugs are a problem in the neighbourhood |
| **Table 6A.23** | Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving are problems in the neighbourhood |
| **Table 6A.24** | Satisfaction of those who had contact with police in the previous 12 months |
| **Table 6A.25** | Victims of recorded crime — crimes against people (per 100 000 people) |
| **Table 6A.26** | Victims of recorded crime — property crime (per 100 000 people) |
| **Table 6A.27** | Estimated total victims of crime (unreported and reported) — crimes against the person (per 100 000 people) |
| **Table 6A.28** | Estimated total household victims of crime, reported and unreported — crimes against property (per 100 000 households) |
| **Table 6A.29** | Reporting rates of selected personal crimes experienced and reported to police (number in '000 and proportion) |
| **Table 6A.30** | Reporting rates for selected property crimes |
| **Table 6A.31** | Outcomes of investigations of crimes against the person: 30 day status, 1 January to 31 December |
| **Table 6A.32** | Outcomes of investigations of crimes against property: 30 day status, 1 January to 31 December |
| **Table 6A.33** | People who had driven in the previous 6 months without wearing a seat belt |
| **Table 6A.34** | People who had driven in the previous 6 months when possibly over the alcohol limit |
| **Table 6A.35** | People who had driven in the previous 6 months more than 10 kilometres above the speed limit |
| **Table 6A.36** | Road deaths |
| **Table 6A.37** | Land transport hospitalisations |
| **Table 6A.38** | Number of deaths in police custody and custody-related operations |
| **Table 6A.39** | Juvenile diversions as a proportion of offenders (per cent) |
| **Table 6A.40** | Courts adjudicated defendants who submitted a guilty plea or were found guilty |
| **Table 6A.41** | Percentage of prosecutions where costs were awarded against the police |
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