## Data quality information — Police services, chapter 6

|  |
| --- |
| Data quality information |
| Data quality information (DQI) provides information against the seven Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data quality framework dimensions, for a selection of performance indicators and/or measures in the Corrective services chapter. DQI for additional indicators will be progressively introduced in future reports.  Technical DQI has been supplied or agreed by relevant data providers. Additional Steering Committee commentary does not necessarily reflect the views of data providers. |
|  |
|  |

DQI are available for the following performance indicators

Satisfaction with police services 2

Perceptions of police integrity 4

Perceptions of Safety 6

Perceptions of crime problems 8

Crime victimisation 10

Reporting rates 13

Outcomes of investigations 15

Road Safety 18

Road deaths 20

Land transport hospitalisations 23

Deaths in custody 25

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths in custody 31

Magistrates court defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding 37

### Satisfaction with police services

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Satisfaction with police services is an effectiveness indicator in the police services performance indicator framework. | | | |
| Indicator | The indicator 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.  The data for this indicator are obtained from the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (NSCSP). | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  For the measure ‘the proportion of people who were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with police services’, survey respondents are invited to provide a personal response using one of six incidence descriptors:   * Very satisfied * Satisfied * Neither * Dissatisfied * Very dissatisfied * Don’t know.   The incidence for the six descriptors adds to 100 per cent. | | | |
| Data source/s | The NSCSP is conducted and the results compiled annually by a private sector survey company under the direction of Australia’s police services. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | ANZPAA (Australia and New Zealand Police Advisory Agency) has management responsibility for the NSCSP survey contract. Jurisdictions manage the survey collectively through a national police committee. | | | |
| Relevance | The objective of perceptions of safety is to support governments’ aims of maintaining public safety and reducing fear of crime in the community. The six perceptions of safety measures in the NSCSP survey do not reflect levels of reported crime as many other factors including media reporting and hearsay can affect public perceptions of crime levels and safety. Perceptions of safety on public transport can be influenced by the availability and types of transport methods (trains, buses, ferries or trams) in each jurisdiction. | | | |
| Timeliness | The NSCSP survey is conducted on a rolling 12 monthly basis. The most recent results are available annually in the Report on Government Services. | | | |
| Accuracy | The accuracy of the telephone survey data collected in the NSCSP is largely contingent on the following three factors:   * the accuracy of information provided by respondents * the accuracy of its compilation by the survey provider * the extent to which information is checked against replies to similar questions in previous years | | | |
| Coherence | Annual NSCSP data are consistent to the extent that replies to the same questions are collected each year, with consistent data collection processes and research methodology having been applied over many years. Questions are reviewed on an on‑going basis and amended or replaced as policies and practices change.  All States and Territories participate in the survey. | | | |
| Accessibility | Some data is published annually in the Report on Government Services. Other data is published in jurisdictional government reports such as Annual Reports and budget reporting. These data are available for general research purposes without charge. Particular requests for unpublished data can be received by individual police jurisdictions and dealt with on a case by case basis. | | | |
| Interpretability | A high or increasing proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ for all measures is desirable. There are no published reports linking the measures to improved safety outcomes such as reduced crime levels for the reasons given above. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | None. | | | |

### Perceptions of police integrity

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Perceptions of police integrity is an effectiveness indicator in the police services performance indicator framework. | | | |
| Indicator | The indicator comprises 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.   Results are reported for all people aged 15 years or over in the total population.  The data for this indicator are obtained from the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (NSCSP). | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  For each of the three perceptions of police integrity measures, survey respondents are invited to provide a personal response using one of six incidence descriptors:   * Strongly agree * Agree * Neither * Disagree * Strongly disagree * Don’t know.   The incidence for the six descriptors adds to 100 per cent. | | | |
| Data source/s | The NSCSP is conducted and the results compiled annually by a private sector survey company under the direction of Australia’s police services. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | ANZPAA (Australia and New Zealand Police Advisory Agency) has management responsibility for the NSCSP survey contract. Jurisdictions manage the survey collectively through a national police committee. | | | |
| Relevance | The objective of perceptions of safety is to support governments’ aims of maintaining public safety and reducing fear of crime in the community. The six perceptions of safety measures in the NSCSP survey do not reflect levels of reported crime as many other factors including media reporting and hearsay can affect public perceptions of crime levels and safety. Perceptions of safety on public transport can be influenced by the availability and types of transport methods (trains, buses, ferries or trams) in each jurisdiction. | | | |
| Timeliness | The NSCSP survey is conducted on a rolling 12 monthly basis. The most recent results are available annually in the Report on Government Services. | | | |
| Accuracy | The accuracy of the telephone survey data collected in the NSCSP is largely contingent on the following three factors:   * the accuracy of information provided by respondents * the accuracy of its compilation by the survey provider * the extent to which information is checked against replies to similar questions in previous years | | | |
| Coherence | Annual NSCSP data are consistent to the extent that replies to the same questions are collected each year, with consistent data collection processes and research methodology having been applied over many years. Questions are reviewed on an on‑going basis and amended or replaced as policies and practices change.  All States and Territories participate in the survey. | | | |
| Accessibility | Some data is published annually in the Report on Government Services. Other data is published in jurisdictional government reports such as Annual Reports and budget reporting. These data are available for general research purposes without charge. Particular requests for unpublished data can be received by individual police jurisdictions and dealt with on a case by case basis. | | | |
| Interpretability | A high or increasing proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ for all measures is desirable. There are no published reports linking the measures to improved safety outcomes such as reduced crime levels for the reasons given above. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | None. | | | |

### Perceptions of Safety

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Perceptions of safety is an outcome indicator in the police services performance indicator framework. The indicator comprises two aspects of community perceptions; the proportion of people who felt safe or very safe at home; and the proportion of people who felt safe or very safe in public places. The data for this indicator are obtained from the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (NSCSP). | | | |
| Indicator | The five measures for the indicator are:   * Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home alone during the night. * Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ walking locally during the day. * Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ walking locally during the night. * Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ travelling on public transport during the day. * Proportion who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ travelling on public transport during the night. | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The latest NSCSP reported data obtained from 28 301 respondents drawn from all jurisdictions in Australia.  For each of the five measures above, survey respondents could report their feeling of safety as falling within one of five response categories:   * very safe * safe * neither safe nor unsafe * unsafe * very unsafe   Respondents to survey questions could also say ‘not applicable’ and with respect to safety on public transport only, respond to the category of ‘do not use’. A significant proportion of respondents do not use public transport as they do not wish to use it or have access to it or it is not available where they live. | | | |
| Data source/s | The NSCSP is conducted and the results compiled annually by a private sector survey company under the direction of Australia’s police services. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | ANZPAA (Australia and New Zealand Police Advisory Agency) has management responsibility for the NSCSP survey contract. Jurisdictions manage the survey collectively through a national police committee. | | | |
| Relevance | The objective of perceptions of safety is to support governments’ aims of maintaining public safety and reducing fear of crime in the community. The five perceptions of safety measures in the NSCSP survey do not reflect levels of reported crime as many other factors including media reporting and hearsay can affect public perceptions of crime levels and safety. Perceptions of safety on public transport can be influenced by the availability and types of transport methods (trains, buses, ferries or trams) in each jurisdiction. | | | |
| Timeliness | The NSCSP survey is conducted on a rolling 12 monthly basis. The most recent results are available annually in the Report on Government Services. | | | |
| Accuracy | The accuracy of the telephone survey data collected in the NSCSP is largely contingent on the following three factors:   * the accuracy of information provided by respondents * the accuracy of its compilation by the survey provider * the extent to which information is checked against replies to similar questions in previous years | | | |
| Coherence | Annual NSCSP data are consistent to the extent that replies to the same questions are collected each year, with consistent data collection processes and research methodology having been applied over many years. Questions are reviewed on an on‑going basis and amended or replaced as policies and practices change.  All States and Territories participate in the survey. | | | |
| Accessibility | Some data is published annually in the Report on Government Services. Other data is published in jurisdictional government reports such as Annual Reports and budget reporting. These data are available for general research purposes without charge. Particular requests for unpublished data can be received by individual police jurisdictions and dealt with on a case by case basis. | | | |
| Interpretability | A high or increasing proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ for all measures is desirable. There are no published reports linking the measures to improved safety outcomes such as reduced crime levels for the reasons given above. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | None. | | | |

### Perceptions of crime problems

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Perceptions of crime problems is an effectiveness indicator in the police services performance indicator framework. | | | |
| Indicator | The indicator 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. Results are reported for all people aged 15 years or over in the total population.  The data for this indicator are obtained from the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (NSCSP). | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  For the measure “people who thought that various types of crime were a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem’ in their neighbourhood”, survey respondents are invited to provide a personal response using one of four incidence descriptors:   * Major problem * Somewhat a problem * Not a problem * Don’t know.   The incidence for the four descriptors adds to 100 per cent. | | | |
| Data source/s | The NSCSP is conducted and the results compiled annually by a private sector survey company under the direction of Australia’s police services. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | ANZPAA (Australia and New Zealand Police Advisory Agency) has management responsibility for the NSCSP survey contract. Jurisdictions manage the survey collectively through a national police committee. | | | |
| Relevance | The objective of perceptions of safety is to support governments’ aims of maintaining public safety and reducing fear of crime in the community. The six perceptions of safety measures in the NSCSP survey do not reflect levels of reported crime as many other factors including media reporting and hearsay can affect public perceptions of crime levels and safety. Perceptions of safety on public transport can be influenced by the availability and types of transport methods (trains, buses, ferries or trams) in each jurisdiction. | | | |
| Timeliness | The NSCSP survey is conducted on a rolling 12 monthly basis. The most recent results are available annually in the Report on Government Services. | | | |
| Accuracy | The accuracy of the telephone survey data collected in the NSCSP is largely contingent on the following three factors:   * the accuracy of information provided by respondents * the accuracy of its compilation by the survey provider * the extent to which information is checked against replies to similar questions in previous years | | | |
| Coherence | Annual NSCSP data are consistent to the extent that replies to the same questions are collected each year, with consistent data collection processes and research methodology having been applied over many years. Questions are reviewed on an on‑going basis and amended or replaced as policies and practices change.  All States and Territories participate in the survey. | | | |
| Accessibility | Some data is published annually in the Report on Government Services. Other data is published in jurisdictional government reports such as Annual Reports and budget reporting. These data are available for general research purposes without charge. Particular requests for unpublished data can be received by individual police jurisdictions and dealt with on a case by case basis. | | | |
| Interpretability | A high or increasing proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ for all measures is desirable. There are no published reports linking the measures to improved safety outcomes such as reduced crime levels for the reasons given above. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | None. | | | |

### Crime victimisation

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Crime — Outcomes | | | |
| Indicator | Crime victimisation (against the person and against property). | | | |
| Measure (computation) | The indicator is defined by measures of the number of victims of crime per 100 000 people for selected personal offences and 100 000 households for selected property offences. | | | |
| Data source/s | Numerator  Number of victims of crime data extracted from Crime Victimisation, Australia, ABS cat. no. 4530.0, Canberra.  Denominator  Population data extracted from Australian Demographic Statistics, ABS Cat. no. 3101.0, Canberra.  Computation/s  Division (victims of crime per 100 000 people), rate. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | Numerator  For information on the institutional environment of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), including the legislative obligations of the ABS, financing and governance arrangements, and mechanisms for scrutiny of ABS operations, please see ABS Institutional Environment.  Denominator  This publication uses data sourced from a variety of institutional environments. Much of the data is administrative by‑product data collected by other organisations for purposes other than estimating the population. Births and deaths statistics are extracted from registers administered by the various State and Territory Registrars of Births, Deaths and Marriages. Medicare Australia client address data is used to estimate interstate migration. Passenger card data and related information provided by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) is used to calculate Net Overseas Migration (NOM).  ABS Census of Population and Housing and Post Enumeration Survey (PES) data are used to determine a base population from which Estimated Resident Population (ERP) is calculated and to finalise all components of population change. For information on the institutional environment of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), please see ABS Institutional Environment. | | | |
| Relevance | The main purpose of this survey was to collect information on the experience of crime victimisation for people aged 15 years and over (or 18 years and over for incidents of sexual assault). In 2011‑12, the survey collected information about people’s experience of selected personal and household crimes. | | | |
| Accuracy | Numerator  The initial total sample for the crime 2011‑12 victimisation topic included in the MPHS consisted of 38,079 private dwelling households. Of the 33,079 private dwelling households that remained in the survey after sample loss, approximately 26,382 or 80 per cent were fully responding to the crime victimisation topic. The exclusion of people living in very remote parts of Australia had only a minor impact on aggregate estimates, except for the Northern Territory where these people account for about 23 per cent of the population.  Two types of error are possible in an estimate based on a sample survey: non‑sampling error and sampling error. Non‑sampling error arises from inaccuracies in collecting, recording and processing the data. Every effort is made to minimise reporting error by the careful design of questionnaires, intensive training and supervision of interviewers, and efficient data processing procedures. Non‑sampling error also arises because information cannot be obtained from all persons selected in the survey.  Sampling error occurs because a sample, rather than the entire population, is surveyed. One measure of the likely difference resulting from not including all dwellings in the survey is given by the standard error. There are about two chances in three a sample estimate will differ by less than one standard error from the figure that would have been obtained if all dwellings had been included in the survey, and about 19 chances in 20 the difference will be less than two standard errors. Measures of the relative standard error for this survey are included with this release. In general, standard errors are relatively high for robbery and sexual assault and these data in particular should be treated with caution.  Denominator  All ERP data sources are subject to non‑sampling error. Non‑sampling error can arise from inaccuracies in collecting, recording and processing the data. In the case of Census and PES data every effort is made to minimise reporting error by the careful design of questionnaires, intensive training and supervision of interviewers, and efficient data processing procedures. The ABS does not have control over any non‑sampling error associated with births, deaths and migration data (see institutional environment).  Another dimension of non‑sampling error in ERP is the fact that the measures of components of population growth become more accurate as more time elapses after the reference period. As discussed under Timeliness, the trade off between timeliness and accuracy means that a user can access more accurate data by using the revised or final ERP data. While the vast majority of births and deaths are registered promptly, a small proportion of registrations are delayed for months or even years. As a result, preliminary quarterly estimates can be an underestimate of the true number of births and deaths occurring in a reference period. Revised figures for a reference period incorporate births and deaths registrations that were received after the preliminary data collection phase as well as the estimated number of registrations that have still not been received for that reference period. For more information see the Demography Working Paper 1998/2 ‑ Quarterly birth and death estimates, 1998 (cat. no. 3114.0) and Population Estimates: Concepts, Sources and Methods, 2009 (cat. no. 3228.0.55.001).  After each Census the ABS uses the Census population count to update the original series of published quarterly population estimates since the previous Census. For example, 2006 Census results were used to update quarterly population estimates between the 2001 and 2006 Census. The PES is conducted soon after the Census to estimate the number of Australians not included in the Census. Adding this net undercount of people back into the population is a crucial step in arriving at the most accurate ERP possible. For more information on rebasing see the feature article in the December quarter 2007 issue of Australian Demographic Statistics (cat. no. 3101.0). | | | |
| Coherence | Numerator  The ABS Crime Victimisation Survey was redesigned in 2008‑09, which means data presented from this release onwards cannot be compared to previous crime and safety data.  The ABS conducted National Crime and Safety Surveys in 1975, 1983, 1993, 1998, 2002 and 2005. In 2006‑07, a review of the survey found a need for more timely and regular crime victimisation headline indicators on an annual basis, and the need for flexibility to cater for new and emerging areas of crime.  Consistent with the findings of this review, the national Crime Victimisation Survey has been conducted annually from 2008‑09 using a different survey vehicle, the MPHS, which is run as a supplement to the LFS. The survey is conducted by telephone, rather than the mail‑out mail‑back method used for the survey in the past. Furthermore, questions about non face‑to‑face threatened assault, theft from a motor vehicle, malicious property damage and other theft have been added to the survey; a number of questions have been altered; and some data collected in the 2005 National Crime and Safety Survey have not been collected from 2008‑09 onwards. These changes result in a break in series, and data are not comparable to previous crime and safety data. Therefore, a new time series will begin from this period.  The terms used to describe the various types of offences in this publication may not necessarily correspond with legal or police definitions.  Denominator  ERP was introduced in 1981 and backdated to 1971 as Australia's official measure of population based on place of usual residence. ERP is derived from usual residence census counts, to which is added the estimated net census undercount and Australian residents temporarily overseas at the time of the census (overseas visitors in Australia are excluded from this calculation). Before the introduction of ERP, the Australian population was based on unadjusted census counts on actual location basis. It is important to note this break in time series when comparing historical population estimates.  An improved method for calculating NOM was applied from September quarter 2006 onwards. The key change is the introduction of a '12/16 month rule' for measuring a person's residency in Australia replacing the '12/12 month rule'. This change results in a break in time series therefore it is not advised that NOM data calculated using the new method is compared to data previous to this. For further information see Information Paper: Improving Net Overseas Migration Estimation, 2009 (cat. no. 3412.0.55.001).  The births and deaths data in this publication are not coherent with the data found in ABS births and deaths publications. This is because the revision cycle necessary to produce ERP results in a mix of preliminary births and deaths data, based on date of registration, and revised data which is a modelled estimate of births and deaths by date of occurrence. By contrast, the main tables of data in the births and deaths publications are based wholly on registration in the reference year, with some tables and analysis based wholly on date of occurrence data. | | | |
| Accessibility | Numerator  In addition to the Adobe PDF publication, the tables and associated relative standard errors are available in Microsoft Excel spreadsheet form on the website.  Additional data may be available on request. For a list of data items see the Downloads tab of the publication. Note that detailed data can be subject to high relative standard errors and, in some cases, may result in data being confidentialised.  Microdata for the Crime Victimisation topic area available through the TableBuilder product – an online tool for creating tables and graphs that can be accessed from the Microdata entry page on the ABS website.  Denominator  ERP data is available in a variety of formats on the ABS website under the 3101.0 and 3201.0 product families. The formats available free on the web are:  The main features which has the key figures commentary.   * a pdf version of the publication * time series spreadsheets on population change, components of change and interstate arrivals and departures * a data cube (in Supertable format) containing quarterly interstate arrivals and departures data.   If the information you require is not available as a standard product, then ABS Consultancy Services can help you with customised services to suit your needs. For inquiries contact the National Information and Referral Service on 1 300 135 070. Alternatively, please email client.services@abs.gov.au. | | | |
| Interpretability | Rates of escape of prisoners and periodic detainees should be interpreted with caution. A single occurrence in a jurisdiction with a relatively small prisoner population, can significantly increase the rate in that jurisdiction, but would have only a minor impact in jurisdictions with larger prisoner populations. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | None. | | | |

### Reporting rates

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Crime — Outcomes | | | |
| Indicator | Reporting rates | | | |
| Measure (computation) | This indicator is defined as the total number of victims of a particular offence whose most recent incident was reported to police, as a percentage of the total victims of that offence.  Numerator/s  The total number of incidents reported to police are published by the ABS for the following nine offence types, although not all nine are reported in RoGS:   * Physical assault * Threatened assault * Robbery * Break‑in * Attempted break‑in * Motor vehicle theft * Theft form a motor vehicle * Malicious property damage * Other theft   Denominator/s  The total number of victims for the preceding nine offence types, which includes incidents experienced in the 12 months prior to the survey.  Computation/s:  Division (expressed as a percentage). | | | |
| Data source/s | *Crime Victimisation, Australia*, ABS 4530.0, Canberra. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | Numerator and denominator  For information on the institutional environment of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), including the legislative obligations of the ABS, financing and governance arrangements, and mechanisms for scrutiny of ABS operations, please see ABS Institutional Environment. | | | |
| Relevance | Numerator and denominator  The main purpose of this survey was to collect information on the experience of crime victimisation for people aged 15 years and over (or 18 years and over for incidents of sexual assault). In 2013‑14, the survey collected information about people’s experience of selected crimes. | | | |
| Timeliness | Numerator and denominator  Crime victimisation data for 2013‑14 were collected as part of the MPHS, which was collected from July 2013 to June 2014. The survey reference period was the 12 months prior to the survey interview. Data from the survey were released in February 2015, approximately eight months after completion of enumeration. | | | |
| Accuracy | Numerator and denominator  The initial total sample for the crime victimisation topic included in the MPHS 2011‑12 consisted of 38 079 private dwelling households. Of the 33 079 private dwelling households that remained in the survey after sample loss, approximately 26 382 or 80 per cent were fully responding to the crime victimisation topic. The exclusion of people living in very remote parts of Australia had only a minor impact on aggregate estimates, except for the Northern Territory where these people account for about 23 per cent of the population.  Two types of error are possible in an estimate based on a sample survey: non‑sampling error and sampling error. Non‑sampling error arises from inaccuracies in collecting, recording and processing the data. Every effort is made to minimise reporting error by the careful design of questionnaires, intensive training and supervision of interviewers, and efficient data processing procedures. Non‑sampling error also arises because information cannot be obtained from all persons selected in the survey.  Sampling error occurs because a sample, rather than the entire population, is surveyed. One measure of the likely difference resulting from not including all dwellings in the survey is given by the standard error. There are about two chances in three a sample estimate will differ by less than one standard error from the figure that would have been obtained if all dwellings had been included in the survey, and about 19 chances in 20 the difference will be less than two standard errors. Measures of the relative standard error for this survey are included with this release. | | | |
| Coherence | Numerator and denominator  The ABS conducted National Crime and Safety Surveys in 1975, 1983, 1993, 1998, 2002 and 2005. In 2006‑07, a review of the survey found a need for more timely and regular crime victimisation headline indicators on an annual basis, and the need for flexibility to cater for new and emerging areas of crime.  Consistent with the findings of this review, the national Crime Victimisation Survey has been conducted annually from 2008‑09 using a different survey vehicle, the MPHS. The survey is conducted by telephone, rather than the mail‑out mail‑back method used for the survey in the past. Furthermore, questions about non face‑to‑face threatened assault, theft from a motor vehicle, malicious property damage and other theft have been added to the survey; a number of questions have been altered; and some data collected in the 2005 National Crime and Safety Survey have not been collected from 2008‑09 onwards. These changes result in a break in series, and data are not comparable to previous crime and safety data.  The terms used to describe the various types of offences in this publication may not necessarily correspond with legal or police definitions. | | | |
| Accessibility | Numerator and denominator  In addition to the Adobe PDF publication, the tables and associated relative standard errors are available in Microsoft Excel spreadsheet form on the website.  Additional data may be available on request. For a list of data items see the Downloads tab of the publication. Note that detailed data can be subject to high relative standard errors and, in some cases, may result in data being confidentialised.  Microdata for the Crime Victimisation topic area available through the TableBuilder product – an online tool for creating tables and graphs that can be accessed from the Microdata entry page on the ABS website. | | | |
| Interpretability | Numerator and denominator  The Crime Victimisation, Australia publication contains tables with footnoted data and a Summary of Findings to aid interpretation of the survey's results. Detailed Explanatory Notes, a Technical Note and a Glossary are also included to provide information on the terminology, classifications and other technical aspects associated with these statistics. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | Data are both comparable and complete for the reporting rates categories reported.  The indicator does not address why some people choose not to report an offence to police.  Data for selected crimes recorded by the administrative systems of police agencies are available in ABS Recorded Crime ‑ Victims, Australia (cat. no. 4510.0). Crime Victimisation, Australia (ABS 4530.0) provides an additional source of data on crime victimisation for the selected crimes, including crime not reported to or detected by police. | | | |

### Outcomes of investigations

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Crime — Outcomes | | | |
| Indicator | Outcomes of investigations | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Outcome of investigations is defined by two separate measures:   * the proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police * the proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days where proceedings were instituted against the offender.   A higher proportion of investigations finalised is desirable, as is the proportion of finalised investigations where proceedings had started against the alleged offender.  Computation/s  Division (percentage of finalised investigations as a percentage of all investigations). | | | |
| Data source/s | *Recorded Crime Victims, Australia*, ABS Cat. no. 4510.0, Canberra. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | Numerator and denominator  In November 1990 an Inter‑Governmental Agreement (IGA) was made between the Commonwealth and the states and territories concerning the establishment of the National Crime Statistics Unit (NCSU) as a National Common Police Service, with a role to initiate, coordinate and oversee the development and production of national uniform crime statistics. The statistics contained in this publication are derived from administrative systems maintained by the state and territory police. | | | |
| Relevance | Numerator and denominator  Recorded Crime ‑ Victims, Australia (cat. no. 4510.0) presents national crime statistics relating to victims of a selected range of offences that have been recorded by police.  The 2010 publication marked a break in series for the collection; therefore comparisons should not be made between data in this publication and victims data published prior to 2011.  The scope of this collection includes victims of attempted and completed offences classified to divisions and/or subdivisions of the Australian & New Zealand Standard Offence Classification (ANZSOC). Depending on the type of offence, a victim can be a person, a premises, an organisation or a motor vehicle. Selected offences include:   * homicide and related offences (including murder, attempted murder and manslaughter) * assault * sexual assault * kidnapping/abduction * robbery * blackmail/extortion * unlawful entry with intent * motor vehicle theft * other theft.   Outputs include:   * victim counts for selected offences (for Australia and states/territories) * victim details (age of victim, sex of victim) for offences where the victim is a person * Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status and relationship of offender to victim is included for selected offences and selected states/territories * type of location where the criminal incident occurred * use of weapon in the commission of the offence * victim counts for selected offences by outcome of investigation at 30 days   Comparable statistics are provided for each of the states and territories. National data are available for all offences excluding assault. Assault data are available for the individual states and territories, however, assault data should not be compared across jurisdictions due to a lack of comparability. | | | |
| Timeliness | Numerator and denominator  The Recorded Crime ‑ Victims collection is conducted annually for a selected range of offences recorded by police during the reference period of 1 January ‑ 31 December. Information from the collection is generally released within six months of the reference period. | | | |
| Accuracy | Numerator and denominator  The collection has been designed to facilitate comparisons of states and territories through the application of national statistical standards and counting rules. However, some legislative and processing differences remain which may include different recording practices, legislation or policy across the various jurisdictions, including pro‑active policing campaigns to encourage reporting by the public.  As a result of the findings from the DiRCS project, the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) was developed to address the lack of uniform practices in initial police recording processes. The NCRS, comprising a uniform set of business rules and requirements, was developed in collaboration with police agencies across Australia to guide the recording and counting of criminal incidents for statistical purposes.  In evaluating the implementation of the NCRS and statistical impacts visible in the Recorded Crime – Victims collection, the ABS compared these data with state and territory data obtained from the Crime Victimisation Survey, observing that the assault data provided by police still had residual differences between jurisdictions that affected comparability.  As a result of the different business practices across the states and territories it is deemed that statistics for assault are not comparable across jurisdictions. ABS recommends that the crime victimisation survey is used to make these comparisons, as this data is collected in a uniform way across jurisdictions, and is therefore not affected by differences in legislation, business practices or recording. | | | |
| Coherence | Numerator and denominator  A National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) has been developed to address the lack of a uniform standard in the initial police recording processes. This standard complements the already established classifications and counting rules for the Recorded Crime ‑ Victims collection to improve the level of comparability of these statistics across jurisdictions.  The collection uses the ANZSOC to classify offences for the 2010 reference period and applies a set of national counting rules to establish the number of victims. Due to differing scope and counting rules, the data in the Recorded Crime ‑ Victims publication may not be comparable to data published in other national and state/territory publications. | | | |
| Accessibility | Numerator and denominator  In addition to the information provided in the publication, a series of supplementary data cubes providing detailed breakdowns by states and territories are also be available. | | | |
| Interpretability | Numerator and denominator  The Recorded Crime ‑ Victims publication contains detailed Explanatory Notes, Technical Note, Appendices and Glossary that provide information on the data sources, counting rules, terminology, classifications and other technical aspects associated with these statistics. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | Data reported for this measure are:   * not directly comparable across jurisdictions because of differences in the way data are compiled. Changes in the business rules, procedures, systems, policies and recording practices of police agencies across Australia have resulted in some discrepancies in data between states and territories for some offence types. * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2013‑14 data are available for all jurisdictions.   The indicator does not identify why some people choose not to report an offence to police.  Data for selected crimes recorded by the administrative systems of police agencies are available in ABS Recorded Crime ‑ Victims, Australia (cat. no. 4510.0). Crime Victimisation, Australia (ABS 4530.0) provides an additional source of data on crime victimisation for the selected crimes, including crime not reported to or detected by police. | | | |

### Road Safety

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Road safety is an outcome indicator in the police services performance indicator framework. | | | |
| Indicator | The indicator comprises three road safety behaviour measures:   * the use of seat belts, * the incidence of driving above the blood alcohol limit and * the incidence of speeding.   The data for this indicator are obtained from the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (NSCSP). | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  For each of the three road safety measures, survey respondents are invited to provide a personal response using one of seven incidence descriptors:   * Always * Most of the time * Sometimes * Rarely * Never. * Refused * Don’t know.   The incidence for the seven descriptors adds to 100 per cent. | | | |
| Data source/s | The NSCSP is conducted and the results compiled annually by a private sector survey company under the direction of Australia’s police services. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | ANZPAA (Australia and New Zealand Police Advisory Agency) has management responsibility for the NSCSP survey contract. Jurisdictions manage the survey collectively through a national police committee. | | | |
| Relevance | The objective of perceptions of safety is to support governments’ aims of maintaining public safety and reducing fear of crime in the community. The six perceptions of safety measures in the NSCSP survey do not reflect levels of reported crime as many other factors including media reporting and hearsay can affect public perceptions of crime levels and safety. Perceptions of safety on public transport can be influenced by the availability and types of transport methods (trains, buses, ferries or trams) in each jurisdiction. | | | |
| Timeliness | The NSCSP survey is conducted on a rolling 12 monthly basis. The most recent results are available annually in the Report on Government Services. | | | |
| Accuracy | The accuracy of the telephone survey data collected in the NSCSP is largely contingent on the following three factors:   * the accuracy of information provided by respondents * the accuracy of its compilation by the survey provider * the extent to which information is checked against replies to similar questions in previous years | | | |
| Coherence | Annual NSCSP data are consistent to the extent that replies to the same questions are collected each year, with consistent data collection processes and research methodology having been applied over many years. Questions are reviewed on an on‑going basis and amended or replaced as policies and practices change.  All States and Territories participate in the survey. | | | |
| Accessibility | Some data is published annually in the Report on Government Services. Other data is published in jurisdictional government reports such as Annual Reports and budget reporting. These data are available for general research purposes without charge. Particular requests for unpublished data can be received by individual police jurisdictions and dealt with on a case by case basis. | | | |
| Interpretability | A high or increasing proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ for all measures is desirable. There are no published reports linking the measures to improved safety outcomes such as reduced crime levels for the reasons given above. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | None. | | | |

### Road deaths

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Road safety — Outcomes | | | |
| Indicator | Road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles. | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles. | | | |
| Data source/s | Numerator  Number of road deaths derived from Department of Infrastructure and Transport, Australian Road Fatality Statistics, Australian Government; http://www.infrastructure.gov.au/roads/safety/road\_fatality\_statistics/ fatal\_road\_crash\_database.aspx, accessed 13 September 2012.  Denominator  Number of registered vehicles from ABS Motor Vehicle Census (various years), Australia, ABS Cat. no. 9309.0, Canberra.  Computation/s:  Number of road deaths / (Number of registered vehicles/100 000) | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | Numerator  Road deaths are collected as part of the Australian Government’s concern to monitor and enhance the safety of Australia’s roads.  The Australian Road Deaths Database provides basic details of road transport crash fatalities in Australia as reported by the police each month to the State and Territory road safety authorities.  Denominator  For information on the institutional environment of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), including the legislative obligations of the ABS, financing and governance arrangements, and mechanisms for scrutiny of ABS operations, please see ABS Institutional Environment.  The Motor Vehicle Census collates vehicles which were registered with a motor vehicle registration authority. The data is collected under the legislation of each state and territory for the purposes of licensing vehicles to drive on public roads and the collection of third party insurance. | | | |
| Relevance | Numerator  The data focus on road death rates within Australia. The database summarises all fatal road crashes that have occurred in Australia since January 1989. It is updated monthly.  It enables count of fatalities or fatal crashes, or both. Available data to search upon include :   * State/Territory * Crash type * Posted speed limit * Road user type * Age * Gender * Articulated truck involved * Rigid truck involved * Bus involved * Date (DD/MM/YYYY) * Year * Month * Day of month * Hour of day * Day of week.   Denominator  The Motor Vehicle Census includes all vehicles registered with a state, territory or other government motor vehicle registry for unrestricted use on public roads with the following exceptions:   * recreational vehicles such as trail bikes and sand dune buggies intended for off‑road use in most states and territories (in Victoria and Queensland these vehicles must be registered and are thus included in the statistics); * consular vehicles; and * vehicles registered by the defence forces.   Vehicles on register are defined as those vehicles registered at the date of the census, or had registration expire less than one month before that date. Data reflects the information as recorded in registration documents.  Motor Vehicle Censuses have been conducted regularly since 1971 but not every year and not always at the same time of the year. Refer to paragraph 2 of the Explanatory Notes for a list of snapshot dates from 1971.  Data are classified geographically by state or territory of registration and postcode of owner. | | | |
| Timeliness | Numerator  Data are available on a monthly basis, becoming available within one month after the reference period.  Denominator  The snapshot date for the annual Motor Vehicle Census is currently 31 March of the reference year. The statistics are generally released within 8 months of the snapshot being taken. | | | |
| Accuracy | Numerator  Information included in the Fatal Road Crash Database / Australian Road Deaths Database ‑ Online is the result of a cooperative effort between DoIT and State Road Safety Authorities. However, all of the data is supplied to the department by these authorities. Data quality, national consistency in particular, is thus dependent upon the efforts of the State Road Safety Authorities.  Denominator  The size of the registered motor vehicle fleet (above 15 million vehicles) dictates that quality assurance of each record is not possible. Considerable effort is made by the ABS, to improve data quality with consistency checks and comparisons but records are not queried with the motor vehicle registries.  Care should be taken when comparing data items across jurisdictions as there is variation in the reporting from different states and territories.  In addition, data items where conversions eg fuel type or reconfigurations of vehicles have occurred, may not be accurately reported or recorded at the Registry.  For vehicles manufactured during or after 1990, the statistics eg identifying make and model information are based on procedures using the VIN, adopted by state and territory motor vehicle registration authorities. | | | |
| Coherence | Numerator  Data are presented as comparable over time, however, it is unclear whether data are collected against nationally agreed definitions and if so whether the definitions have been revised over time.  Denominator  The types of fuel being used for motor vehicles has undergone some change in recent years. Leaded petrol is no longer available for sale, however, some older vehicles are still recorded as this fuel type by the MVRs. Hybrid vehicles are increasing, however, not all state and territory MVRs are identifying these vehicles separately.  Statistics from the annual MVC are comparable to previous censuses.  Data from the MVC when categorised by year of manufacture can be confronted with Sales of New Motor Vehicles, Australia, cat. no. 9314.0. In addition, the MVC is used as a frame for the Survey of Motor Vehicle Use, Australia cat. no. 9208.0. | | | |
| Accessibility | Numerator  DoITdata road fatality data are available for public use, free of charge, from http://www.infrastructure.gov.au/roads/safety/road\_fatality\_statistics/ fatal\_road\_crash\_database.aspx  Data are available in a time series from 1989 and are reported in the RoGs by financial year.  Denominator  Data are available from the ABS website. | | | |
| Interpretability | Numerator  Data categories are clear, however there is limited information available about the context the data should be considered within, definitions and classification systems used.  Denominator  The Motor Vehicle Census publication contains detailed Introductory Notes, Explanatory Notes and Glossary that provide information on the data sources, terminology, classifications and other technical aspects associated with these statistics. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | Data are both comparable and complete for road deaths reported.  The rate of road deaths per number of registered vehicles is affected by a number of activities undertaken by state and federal governments, such as the condition of roads, driver education and media campaigns. | | | |

### Land transport hospitalisations

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | The indicator is an outcome indicator of the government’s objective of promoting road safety. | | | |
| Indicator | Land transport hospitalisations per 100 000 registered vehicles. | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The number of hospitalisations from traffic accidents per 100 000 registered vehicles. | | | |
| Data source/s | Numerator  The number of hospitalisations from traffic accidents is calculated by the AIHW (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare) based on data from the national minimum data set (NMDS) for Admitted patient care.  Denominator  The data for vehicle registrations is obtained from the ABS Motor Vehicle Census Cat no. 9309.0, AusInfo, Canberra. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | The AIHW is an independent statutory authority within the Health and Ageing portfolio, which is accountable to the parliament of Australia through the Minister for Health and Ageing.  The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) is the national statistics collection agency and it collates vehicle registration data collected under state legislation by state motor vehicle registration authorities. | | | |
| Relevance | The objective of police road safety campaigns is to reduce the incidence of road collisions and the severity of road trauma resulting in hospitalisation. | | | |
| Timeliness | The AIHW provide hospitalisation data annually but with a lag, whereby the latest data able to be published in the 2016 RoGS relates to the 2013‑14 financial year. | | | |
| Accuracy | Almost all public hospitals and the majority of private hospitals provide data for the NHMD.  States and territories are primarily responsible for the quality of the data they provide. However, the AIHW undertakes extensive validations on data. Data are checked for valid values, logical consistency and historical consistency. Where possible, data in individual data sets are checked against data from other data sets. Potential errors are queried with jurisdictions, and corrections and resubmissions may be made in response to these queries. The AIHW does not adjust data to account for possible data errors or missing or incorrect values.  Data on procedures are recorded uniformly using the Australian Classification of Health Interventions.  Variations in admission practices and policies lead to variation among providers in the number of admissions for some conditions.  Cells have been suppressed to protect confidentiality where the presentation could identify a patient or a service provider or where rates are likely to be highly volatile. | | | |
| Coherence | The information presented for this indicator is calculated using the same methodology as data published by the AIHW in Australian Hospital Statistics. All States and territories participate in the survey.  The data can be meaningfully compared across reference periods for all jurisdictions except Tasmania. 2008‑09 data for Tasmania does not include two private hospitals that were included in 2007‑08 and 2009‑10 data reported in National Healthcare Agreement performance reports. | | | |
| Accessibility | The AIHW provides a variety of products that draw upon the NHMD. The relevant published product available on the AIHW website is Australian hospital statistics with associated Excel tables. | | | |
| Interpretability | Supporting information on the quality and use of the NHMD are published annually in Australian hospital statistics (technical appendixes), available in hard copy or on the AIHW website. Readers are advised to note caveat information to ensure appropriate interpretation of the performance indicator. Supporting information includes discussion of coverage, completeness of coding, the quality of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander data, and changes in service delivery that might affect interpretation of the published data. Metadata information for the NMDS for Admitted patient care is published in the AIHW’s online metadata repository METeOR and the National health data dictionary. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | None have been identified for this indicator. | | | |

### Deaths in custody

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Effectiveness and Equity (in regard to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons) in the Justice System: Corrections and Juvenile Justice/Detention, and Police. In addition, ROGS presents ‘apparent non‑natural cause deaths’ as a measure for Corrections and Juvenile Justice/Detention. | | | |
| Indicator | Deaths in (crime‑related) custody and custody‑related operations (i.e. deaths of persons in the process of being detained or escaping) | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  In short, deaths are in scope for this monitoring program if they occur in custody for a crime‑related matter, or involve persons who die in the process of being detained or escaping.  Note, the issue of whether deaths in immigration detention centres should be included is being discussed with DIAC and such deaths are currently not in scope unless the death occurs while in the custody of police, prison or a juvenile justice agency.  In more detail, the definition of a death in scope is as follows:  The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (RCIADIC) outlined the types of deaths that would require notification to the NDICP (rec 41). They are:   * A death, wherever occurring, of a person who is in prison custody, police custody or detention as a juvenile * A death, wherever occurring, of a person whose death is caused or contributed to by traumatic injuries sustained, or by lack of proper care, while in such custody or detention * A death, wherever occurring, of a person who dies, or is fatally injured, in the process of police or prison officers attempting to detain that person * A death, wherever occurring, of a person attempting to escape from prison, police custody or juvenile detention.   This definition has been used by the NDICP since its establishment in 1992. The definition by the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (Recommendation 41, RCIADIC 1992, pp135‑139) remains relevant and has been mirrored in coronial and related legislation (e.g. the NSW Coroner’s Act 1980). This definition results in the decision about whether a death is in scope for the NDICP hinging on whether the deceased was in custody for a breach of the law, regardless of the circumstances, e.g. they may be in a vehicle staffed by contractors for transporting prisoners, or they may be on remand or sentenced in a mental health institution. It also includes persons who are temporarily absent from prison or police custody e.g. day release programs (see for example, s13A NSW Coroner’s Act 1980) and those who are ‘sentenced to a ‘live‑in’ substance abuse program’, since persons in such circumstances have their personal liberty restricted and are under the control of a custodial authority. NDICP excludes persons on community corrections or on parole, since they are ‘free to come and go at will’, which is a common law test for the absence of custody‘. Additionally, ‘home detention’ should be excluded because there is a third party custodial authority involved.  Following a decision of the Federal Court (Eatts vs Dawson: G208 of 1990), and a decision by the Australasian Police Minsters’ Council in 1994 together with associated changes to legislation and practice circulars, the scope of the NDICP was extended to deaths of persons in the process of being detained or escaping, whether technically they are in custody or not – such deaths under the NDICP are called ‘custody‑related operations’. The definition of a death in a ‘custody‑related operation’ for the purposes of the NDICP was discussed in a meeting of the Australasian Police Ministers Council in 1994. At that meeting it was agreed that the scope of monitoring deaths in police custody by the NDICP also include deaths in the following three circumstances:   * Deaths which occur while the person is in the custody of police officers * Deaths which occur while police are attempting to detain a person * Deaths which occur while a person is escaping from custody.   It was agreed that the NDICP should exclude deaths which occur in police search and rescue operations where the goal of police officers was rescue per se, rather than the goal of detaining the deceased for any reason.  Also excluded from the NDICP are self‑inflicted deaths where the police officers’ involvement is limited to attempting to prevent the suicide or to obtain medical attention needed as a result of the suicide attempt. A self‑inflicted death will be included in the monitoring process, however, if the police operation had, as one of its goals, the detaining of the person for any reason (other than simply to prevent suicide or to seek medical attention needed as a result of the attempted suicide).  NDICP Monitoring Framework  There are currently three key measures for monitoring deaths in custody:   * trends in numbers of deaths in prisons, police and juvenile detention, and the proportion of total deaths in each setting involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons * trends in the rate of death per 100 relevant adult prisoners\* and the rate ratio (over‑representation) for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non‑Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths in prison * trends in causes and circumstances of deaths – in this regard ROGS presents ‘apparent non‑natural cause deaths’ as a measure for Corrections and Juvenile Justice/Detention.   **Numerator/s and Denominator/s ‑ Computation/s**  **Indicator 1**  Numerator  Number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths in each custody setting.  Denominator  Total number of deaths in each custody setting.  Computation  (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths ÷ Total deaths) x 100  **Indicator 2**  Numerator  Number of deaths in prison.  Denominator  Historically, the denominator used to calculate rates has been the relevant prison population at 30 June (taken from the ABS series Prisoners in Australia 4517.0).  Computation  Historical approach – (Number of deaths in prison ÷ relevant 30 June prison population) x 1000  Proposed new calculation – (Number of deaths in prison ÷ relevant average annual prison population) x 100  **Indicator 3:**  Numerator  Number of deaths falling within each cause of death category and falling within each category relating to circumstances of deaths, occurring in each custody setting.  Denominator  Total number of deaths in each category.  Computation  (Cause of death ÷ Total deaths in each custody setting) x 100 | | | |
| Data source/s | Numerator/s  The AIC is notified about deaths in custody and custody‑related operations from the custodial authority involved, in some cases within a matter of days after the death occurs. The custodial authority completes a NDICP data collection form, which includes information about the deceased, criminal and medical history, and the specific location at death. Information is also collected from the custodial authority regarding the apparent cause of death and circumstances leading to the death. Occasionally a case may not be provided to the AIC by the custodial authority.  All the information provided by custodial authorities is then cross‑checked with records held by the National Coronial Information System (NCIS) as coronial enquiries are completed and formal findings handed down.  As part of the data validation process each year, keyword searches of the NCIS database are undertaken to ensure any missing cases are identified. Moreover, to further ensure accuracy, annual totals are also cross‑checked and validated by the relevant custodial authority. Finally, prior to the publication of NDICP Monitoring Reports, custodial authorities are given an opportunity to provide comments and feedback relating to the presentation of data and analysis.  Denominator/s:  Historically, prison populations used to calculate rates of death are taken from the annual ABS publication Prisoners in Australia (cat. no. 4517.0), which is a census of persons in prison custody on 30 June each year. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | Numerator/s  The responsibility for monitoring deaths in custody nationally was given to the AIC by the RCIADIC. State and Territory Governments unanimously agreed to support the implementation of recommendations relating to the establishment of the NDICP and its ongoing role in collecting and analysing information about deaths in custody and reporting regularly to government.  Information about each death in custody or custody‑related operation is provided to the AIC by the relevant custodial authority. As cases are received, they are manually coded by AIC research staff and entered into the NDICP database. Information obtained from custodial authorities is then cross‑checked against coronial findings as they become available. Coronial findings are sourced from the National Coronial Information System (NCIS), which is a database that collects information about deaths reported to a Coroner from every state and territory.  The NCIS dataset commenced from 2000 and is currently operated under a Heads of Agreement document made between the Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine and each State/Territory Government in Australia. The NCIS is not covered by legislation and is not a legal entity.  The NCIS is provided with information about each death via a secure regular (nightly or weekly) upload from local data systems in each coronial jurisdiction. The NCIS Unit has a quality assurance process in which the completeness and accuracy of cases that have been coded and closed on the NCIS are reviewed.  The AIC’s access to the NCIS database is subject to strict ethics arrangements as well as annual reporting requirements and regular ethics reviews.  Deaths of persons in custody and custody‑related operations are subject to a mandatory coronial inquest in every jurisdiction. However, where a person is charged in relation to a death in custody, coroners will terminate their inquest pending the resolution of the matter through criminal court proceedings. In such cases, information about the deceased, including the cause of death, will still be provided to the AIC by the relevant custodial authority. These cases will also be included in the NCIS database. However, due to the fact that the circumstances leading to the death are documented via court proceedings in the criminal justice system and not a coronial inquest, only limited information can be cross‑checked through the NCIS. In the majority of cases, sufficient information will be available through the NCIS to cross‑check information provided by the custodial authority about the deceased ‑ such as name, date of birth/death, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status, location, and the cause and circumstances of the death. The AIC does not validate its deaths in custody data against court findings and, therefore, it is often difficult to determine responsibility in such cases – however undertaking validation against court findings is being considered by AIC.  The number of deaths in custody falling under the category ‘unlawful homicides’ each year is very small (usually less than five). Over the thirty years for which data is available, it is estimated that such deaths represent less than four per cent of the total number of deaths in custody cases recorded by the NDICP since 1980, however they are often the most controversial deaths and therefore AIC is considering undertaking validation against court findings.  Denominator/s  All denominators used by the AIC in the NDICP are taken from ABS published reports. The quality of this data is ultimately a matter for the ABS and we suggest the Commission refer to ABS submissions regarding the quality of their data. | | | |
| Relevance | Numerator/s  Collecting timely information about deaths occurring in custodial settings and custody‑related operations is highly relevant to assessing equity and effectiveness in the criminal justice system, most particularly for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. The ongoing monitoring of deaths in custody in Australia serves as an accountability and performance measure for custodial authorities, as well as providing the community with a better understanding of the trends and issues. As the former NSW State Coroner, Kevin Waller, observed:  *'The rationale is that by making mandatory a full and public inquiry into deaths in prison and police cells the government provides a positive incentive to custodians to treat their prisoners in a humane fashion, and satisfies the community that deaths in such places are properly investigated' (Waller, K. (AM), Coronial Law and Practice in NSW, 3rd Edition, p. 28).*  Among the concerns expressed by the RCIADIC was that statistics on both deaths in prison custody and juvenile detention and the related issue of the numbers of persons dying in police custody were at best poor, if not simply unavailable. It is the role of the NDICP to fill this data gap, as well as to identify emerging trends and issues relating to deaths in custody, particularly with regards to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. The data collected in the NDICP has become one of the only Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander‑specific indicators for equity and effectiveness in the criminal justice system.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Timeliness | Numerator/s  Subsequent reports will move to financial year reporting and data will be validated to the extent possible against NCIS data and coronial findings.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Accuracy | Numerator/s  The accuracy of the data collected by the NDICP is largely contingent on the following three factors:   * the accuracy of information provided by custodial authorities * the accuracy of information in the NCIS database * the regularity with which information is cross‑checked between these two sources.   How does the NDICP ensure every case is collected?  The data obtained from custodial authorities is continuously validated against NCIS and also reviewed annually and as needed by corrections, juvenile justice and police agencies. The main risk to accuracy relates to ensuring that only deaths that are within scope for this monitoring program are collected and validated against the NCIS database as explained above.  Currently the NCIS does not have a coding flag to identify which cases have been confirmed as deaths in custody by the Coroner. Consequently, several mechanisms must be used to identify possible missing cases that fall within scope. These include searching for cases where the incident location is recorded as a Correctional Institution, or cases that involved a Legal Intervention. Not all deaths which are coded under these values fit the AIC criteria for a death in custody. In most cases, the AIC also receives direct notification of completed coronial inquiries into deaths in custody from the relevant State Coroner.  For the purposes of greater transparency with regards to the quality of deaths in custody data, included with all future releases of NDICP data will be information about the proportion of cases under each of the following three categories:   * ‘possible death in custody’ – deaths where it is not clear from available information whether the deaths falls within scope or not. These deaths will not be reported or included in analysis until coronial findings allow this to be determined * ‘confirmed death in scope’ and checked against the NCIS to validate basic information about the death, but no coronial findings available to confirm many details of death ie. cause of death * ‘validated deaths in custody’ – those deaths that have been fully validated against a coronial finding in the NCIS.   Indicators 1 and 2, see above, will include deaths categorised under b) and c), and the percentage of deaths which are b) or c).  For example: There were X number of deaths in prison custody in 2010; X per cent of these have been validated against coronial findings (across as many variables as possible). As deaths under category a) become resolved those in scope will be retrospectively added to the numbers under category c).  Indicator 3 will only include deaths under c), i.e. validated against coronial findings, in order to avoid findings on sensitive matters that require correction in later years as coronial findings become available.  In this way, the AIC will be able to provide more accurate data to ROGS on all non‑natural cause deaths, broken down by ‘apparent non‑natural cause deaths’ and non‑natural cause deaths confirmed by coronial findings.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Coherence | Numerator/s  For information on deaths occurring in prison custody and in police institutional settings (eg. Police cells) since 1980, data is internally consistent as the same definition, data collection process and research methodology has been applied consistently over the last twenty years (data throughout the 1980’s was collected by the RCIADIC).  For information on deaths occurring in police custody‑related operations, accurate and internally consistent information is only available from the year 1990 and onwards. Prior to 1990, only deaths occurring in police institutional settings are recorded.  AIC undertook a review of the program in 2011 and has specifically considered improving coherence with other key datasets and standards e.g. ABS, AIHW, ROGS, and PC.  All State/Territory Coroners and custodial authorities (corrections and juvenile justice agencies, police and the AFP) use the same Data Definitions and all relevant stakeholders will be invited to comment on and agree to revisions and improvements to key documents underpinning the NDICP.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Accessibility | Numerator/s  The data is reported in regular NDICP Monitoring Reports and also through occasional in‑depth research papers when resources allow. Publications are available on the AIC website and also in hard copy free of charge.  Requests for NDICP data from interested parties such as the media and academics are dealt with on a case‑by‑case basis; data is usually provided if it relates to data already available through published Monitoring Reports. All legitimate requests for data are provided without charge. Only de‑identified data is ever provided, consistent with ethics requirements.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Interpretability | Numerator/s  A key matter relevant to interpretability is the lack of data on a range of matters linked to Indicator 3, such as evidence for successful preventative measures for reducing deaths in custody. It is proposed that the Monitoring Reports will include thematic analysis of findings and recommendations made by Coroners to improve the evidence base in this area.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues: (Insert key points)  If resources were made available to allow validation of aspects of deaths against court findings, such as in cases where there has been a charge laid in respect of the death, this would add value to the program. This is because such deaths, while in the minority, often are of greatest interest in regard to equity and effectiveness. | | | |

### Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths in custody

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Effectiveness and Equity (in regard to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons) in the Justice System.  The data is obtained from the National Deaths in Custody Program (NDICP) which covers both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non‑Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths in police custody and custody‑related operations, as well as in prisons (reported in the Corrective Services chapter of the RoGS) and in juvenile detention. | | | |
| Indicator | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths in (crime‑related) police custody and custody‑related operations (i.e. deaths of persons in the process of being detained or escaping)  Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status is not always collected; and when it is, the recording is not always consistent. Moreover, the way in which Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status is determined varies between jurisdictions. | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  In short, deaths are in scope for this monitoring program if they occur in custody for a crime‑related matter, or involve persons who die in the process of being detained or escaping.  In more detail, the definition of a death in scope is as follows:  The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (RCIADIC) outlined the types of deaths that would require notification to the NDICP (rec 41). They are:   * a death, wherever occurring, of a person who is in prison custody, police custody or detention as a juvenile * a death, wherever occurring, of a person whose death is caused or contributed to by traumatic injuries sustained, or by lack of proper care, while in such custody or detention * a death, wherever occurring, of a person who dies, or is fatally injured, in the process of police or prison officers attempting to detain that person * a death, wherever occurring, of a person attempting to escape from prison, police custody or juvenile detention.   This definition has been used by the NDICP since its establishment in 1992. The definition by the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (Recommendation 41, RCIADIC 1992, pp135‑139) remains relevant and has been mirrored in coronial and related legislation (e.g. the NSW Coroner’s Act 1980). This definition results in the decision about whether a death is in scope for the NDICP hinging on whether the deceased was in custody for a breach of the law, regardless of the circumstances, e.g. they may be in a vehicle staffed by contractors for transporting prisoners, or they may be on remand or sentenced in a mental health institution. It also includes persons who are temporarily absent from prison or police custody e.g. day release programs (see for example, s13A NSW Coroner’s Act 1980) and those who are ‘sentenced to a ‘live‑in’ substance abuse program’, since persons in such circumstances have their personal liberty restricted and are under the control of a custodial authority. NDICP excludes persons on community corrections or on parole, since they are ‘free to come and go at will’, which is a common law test for the absence of custody‘. Additionally, ‘home detention’ should be excluded because there is a third party custodial authority involved.  Following a decision of the Federal Court (Eatts vs Dawson: G208 of 1990), and a decision by the Australasian Police Minsters’ Council in 1994 together with associated changes to legislation and practice circulars, the scope of the NDICP was extended to deaths of persons in the process of being detained or escaping, whether technically they are in custody or not – such deaths under the NDICP are called ‘custody‑related operations’. The definition of a death in a ‘custody‑related operation’ for the purposes of the NDICP was discussed in a meeting of the Australasian Police Ministers Council in 1994. At that meeting it was agreed that the scope of monitoring deaths in police custody by the NDICP also include deaths in the following three circumstances:   * deaths which occur while the person is in the custody of police officers * deaths which occur while police are attempting to detain a person * deaths which occur while a person is escaping from custody.   It was agreed that the NDICP should exclude deaths which occur in police search and rescue operations where the goal of police officers was rescue per se, rather than the goal of detaining the deceased for any reason.  Also excluded from the NDICP are self‑inflicted deaths where the police officers’ involvement is limited to attempting to prevent the suicide or to obtain medical attention needed as a result of the suicide attempt. A self‑inflicted death will be included in the monitoring process, however, if the police operation had, as one of its goals, the detaining of the person for any reason (other than simply to prevent suicide or to seek medical attention needed as a result of the attempted suicide).  NDICP Monitoring Framework  There are currently three key measures for monitoring deaths in custody:   * trends in numbers of deaths in prisons, police and juvenile detention, and the proportion of total deaths in each setting involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons * trends in the rate of death per 100 relevant adult prisoners\* and the rate ratio (over‑representation) for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non‑Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths in prison * trends in causes and circumstances of deaths – in this regard ROGS presents ‘apparent non‑natural cause deaths’ as a measure for Corrections and Juvenile Justice/Detention.   \*Note: In the next NDICP Monitoring Report due to be released in early 2012 the rate of death under Indicator 2 (per 100 relevant population) will be used, replacing the calculation used in previous reports (per 1000 relevant population). The purpose of this is to be more consistent with the ROGS Report.  In post‑2012 Monitoring Reports, a new indicator will be developed and reported on:   * International comparisons of trends relevant to the NDICP Framework for monitoring, particularly focusing on New Zealand and Canada due to their similarity to the Australian criminal justice system and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations.   Numerator/s and Denominator/s ‑ Computation/s:  Indicator 1  Numerator: Number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths in each custody setting.  Denominator: Total number of deaths in each custody setting.  Computation: (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander deaths ÷ Total deaths) x 100  Indicator 2  Prison custody ‑ Numerator: Number of deaths in prison.  Denominator: Historically, the denominator used to calculate rates has been the relevant prison population at 30 June (taken from the ABS series Prisoners in Australia 4517.0). For future NDICP Monitoring Reports, the AIC is proposing to use an annual average prison population taken from the ABS series Corrective Services, Australia 4512.0. The calculation to be used in deriving the denominator for these statistics is yet to be finalised and is currently being discussed with data agencies.  Computation:  Historical approach –  (Number of deaths in prison ÷ relevant 30 June prison population) x 1000  Proposed new calculation –  (Number of deaths in prison ÷ relevant average annual prison population) x 100  Indicator 3:  Numerator: Number of deaths falling within each cause of death category and falling within each category relating to circumstances of deaths, occurring in each custody setting.  Denominator: Total number of deaths in each category.  Computation: (Cause of death ÷ Total deaths in each custody setting) x 100 | | | |
| Data source/s | Numerator/s  The AIC is notified about deaths in custody and custody‑related operations from the custodial authority involved, in some cases within a matter of days after the death occurs. The custodial authority completes a NDICP data collection form, which includes information about the deceased, criminal and medical history, and the specific location at death. Information is also collected from the custodial authority regarding the apparent cause of death and circumstances leading to the death. Occasionally a case may not be provided to the AIC by the custodial authority.  All the information provided by custodial authorities is then cross‑checked with records held by the National Coronial Information System (NCIS) as coronial enquiries are completed and formal findings handed down.  As part of the data validation process each year, keyword searches of the NCIS database are undertaken to ensure any missing cases are identified. Moreover, to further ensure accuracy, annual totals are also cross‑checked and validated by the relevant custodial authority. Finally, prior to the publication of NDICP Monitoring Reports, custodial authorities are given an opportunity to provide comments and feedback relating to the presentation of data and analysis.  Denominator/s  Historically, prison populations used to calculate rates of death are taken from the annual ABS publication Prisoners in Australia (cat. no. 4517.0), which is a census of persons in prison custody on 30 June each year. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | Numerator/s  The responsibility for monitoring deaths in custody nationally was given to the AIC by the RCIADIC. State and Territory Governments unanimously agreed to support the implementation of recommendations relating to the establishment of the NDICP and its ongoing role in collecting and analysing information about deaths in custody and reporting regularly to government.  Information about each death in custody or custody‑related operation is provided to the AIC by the relevant custodial authority. As cases are received, they are manually coded by AIC research staff and entered into the NDICP database. Information obtained from custodial authorities is then cross‑checked against coronial findings as they become available. Coronial findings are sourced from the National Coronial Information System (NCIS), which is a database that collects information about deaths reported to a Coroner from every state and territory.  The NCIS dataset commenced from 2000 and is currently operated under a Heads of Agreement document made between the Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine and each State/Territory Government in Australia. The NCIS is not covered by legislation and is not a legal entity.  The NCIS is provided with information about each death via a secure regular (nightly or weekly) upload from local data systems in each coronial jurisdiction. The NCIS Unit has a quality assurance process in which the completeness and accuracy of cases that have been coded and closed on the NCIS are reviewed. This process is currently around 12 months behind the relevant reference period (i.e. the quality assurance team is currently reviewing deaths closed in September 2010).  The AIC’s access to the NCIS database is subject to strict ethics arrangements as well as annual reporting requirements and regular ethics reviews. The AIC currently only has online access to those cases in the NCIS database which are closed, with a formal finding being handed down by a Coroner. The AIC is in the process of seeking approval from every State Coroner to access information about active coronial enquiries via the NCIS. It is anticipated that AIC will have access to open cases by early 2012.  Deaths of persons in custody and custody‑related operations are subject to a mandatory coronial inquest in every jurisdiction. However, where a person is charged in relation to a death in custody, coroners will terminate their inquest pending the resolution of the matter through criminal court proceedings. In such cases, information about the deceased, including the cause of death, will still be provided to the AIC by the relevant custodial authority. These cases will also be included in the NCIS database. However, due to the fact that the circumstances leading to the death are documented via court proceedings in the criminal justice system and not a coronial inquest, only limited information can be cross‑checked through the NCIS. In the majority of cases, sufficient information will be available through the NCIS to cross‑check information provided by the custodial authority about the deceased ‑ such as name, date of birth/death, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status, location, and the cause and circumstances of the death. The AIC does not validate its deaths in custody data against court findings and, therefore, it is often difficult to determine responsibility in such cases – however undertaking validation against court findings is being considered by AIC.  The number of deaths in custody falling under the category ‘unlawful homicides’ each year is very small (usually less than five). Over the thirty years for which data is available, it is estimated that such deaths represent less than four per cent of the total number of deaths in custody cases recorded by the NDICP since 1980, however they are often the most controversial deaths and therefore AIC is considering undertaking validation against court findings.  Denominator/s  All denominators used by the AIC in the NDICP are taken from ABS published reports. The quality of this data is ultimately a matter for the ABS and we suggest the Commission refer to ABS submissions regarding the quality of their data. | | | |
| Relevance | Numerator/s  Collecting timely information about deaths occurring in custodial settings and custody‑related operations is highly relevant to assessing equity and effectiveness in the criminal justice system, most particularly for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. The ongoing monitoring of deaths in custody in Australia serves as an accountability and performance measure for custodial authorities, as well as providing the community with a better understanding of the trends and issues. As the former NSW State Coroner, Kevin Waller, observed:  'The rationale is that by making mandatory a full and public inquiry into deaths in prison and police cells the government provides a positive incentive to custodians to treat their prisoners in a humane fashion, and satisfies the community that deaths in such places are properly investigated' (Waller, K. (AM), Coronial Law and Practice in NSW, 3rd Edition, p. 28).  Among the concerns expressed by the RCIADIC was that statistics on both deaths in prison custody and juvenile detention and the related issue of the numbers of persons dying in police custody were at best poor, if not simply unavailable. It is the role of the NDICP to fill this data gap, as well as to identify emerging trends and issues relating to deaths in custody, particularly with regards to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. The data collected in the NDICP has become one of the only Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander‑specific indicators for equity and effectiveness in the criminal justice system.  Various information about the location of the death is recorded, and more refined geographic information on place of death and last place of private residence is proposed to be collected from 2012.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Timeliness | Numerator/s  The most recent NDICP annual report released by the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC).  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Accuracy | Numerator/s  The accuracy of the data collected by the NDICP is largely contingent on the following three factors:   * the accuracy of information provided by custodial authorities * the accuracy of information in the NCIS database * the regularity with which information is cross‑checked between these two sources.   The AIC recently undertook a special validation exercise of all deaths in custody cases in the dataset and will make some corrections as necessary. These corrections will have minimal impact on the high level trends reported to date.  How does the NDICP ensure every case is collected?  The data obtained from custodial authorities is continuously validated against NCIS and also reviewed annually and as needed by corrections, juvenile justice and police agencies. The main risk to accuracy relates to ensuring that only deaths that are within scope for this monitoring program are collected and validated against the NCIS database as explained above.  Currently the NCIS does not have a coding flag to identify which cases have been confirmed as deaths in custody by the Coroner. Consequently, several mechanisms must be used to identify possible missing cases that fall within scope. These include searching for cases where the incident location is recorded as a Correctional Institution, or cases that involved a Legal Intervention. Not all deaths which are coded under these values fit the AIC criteria for a death in custody. In most cases, the AIC also receives direct notification of completed coronial inquiries into deaths in custody from the relevant State Coroner.  For the purposes of greater transparency with regards to the quality of deaths in custody data, included with all future releases of NDICP data will be information about the proportion of cases under each of the following three categories:   * ‘possible death in custody’ – deaths where it is not clear from available information whether the deaths falls within scope or not. These deaths will not be reported or included in analysis until coronial findings allow this to be determined * ‘confirmed death in scope’ and checked against the NCIS to validate basic information about the death, but no coronial findings available to confirm many details of death ie cause of death * ‘validated deaths in custody’ – those deaths that have been fully validated against a coronial finding in the NCIS.   Indicators 1 and 2, see above, will include deaths categorised under b) and c), and the percentage of deaths which are b) or c).  For example: There were X number of deaths in prison custody in 2010; X per cent of these have been validated against coronial findings (across as many variables as possible). As deaths under category a) become resolved those in scope will be retrospectively added to the numbers under category c).  Indicator 3 will only include deaths under c), i.e. validated against coronial findings, in order to avoid findings on sensitive matters that require correction in later years as coronial findings become available.  In this way, the AIC will be able to provide more accurate data to ROGS on all non‑natural cause deaths, broken down by ‘apparent non‑natural cause deaths’ and non‑natural cause deaths confirmed by coronial findings.  AIC undertook a review of the NDICP in 2011, which included revising the User Manual and administrational procedures around the collection of data from custodial authorities and the NCIS. In particular, the review outcomes included revising and modernising the Data Definitions to more accurately reflect significant changes in the justice system over the last twenty years. This process also aims to better align the NDICP with other datasets and standards i.e. that of ABS and also alignment with emerging data definitions for disability, health and mental health.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Coherence | Numerator/s  For information on deaths occurring in prison custody and in police institutional settings (eg. Police cells) since 1980, data is internally consistent as the same definition, data collection process and research methodology has been applied consistently over the last twenty years (data throughout the 1980’s was collected by the RCIADIC).  For information on deaths occurring in police custody‑related operations, accurate and internally consistent information is only available from the year 1990 and onwards. Prior to 1990, only deaths occurring in police institutional settings are recorded.  AIC undertook a review of the program in 2011 and has specifically considered improving coherence with other key datasets and standards e.g. ABS, AIHW, ROGS, and PC. Following conclusion of this review, revised Data Definitions, an improved User Manual and other key program documents will be finalised and fully implemented.  All State/Territory Coroners and custodial authorities (corrections and juvenile justice agencies, police and the AFP) use the same Data Definitions and all relevant stakeholders were invited to comment on and agree to revisions and improvements to key documents underpinning the NDICP.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Accessibility | Numerator/s  The data is reported in regular NDICP Monitoring Reports and also through occasional in‑depth research papers when resources allow. Publications are available on the AIC website and also in hard copy free of charge.  Requests for NDICP data from interested parties such as the media and academics are dealt with on a case‑by‑case basis; data is usually provided if it relates to data already available through published Monitoring Reports. All legitimate requests for data are provided without charge. Only de‑identified data is ever provided, consistent with ethics requirements.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Interpretability | Numerator/s  A range of matters related to ‘interpretability’ were identified in an Issues Paper that supported the review conducted by AIC during 2011. Each of these matters was considered and will be resolved and changes implemented as necessary.  A key matter relevant to interpretability is the lack of data on a range of matters linked to Indicator 3, such as evidence for successful preventative measures for reducing deaths in custody. From 2012 onwards, it is proposed that the Monitoring Reports will include thematic analysis of findings and recommendations made by Coroners to improve the evidence base in this area.  Denominator/s  ABS data | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues: (Insert key points)  If resources were made available to allow validation of aspects of deaths against court findings, such as in cases where there has been a charge laid in respect of the death, this would add value to the program. This is because such deaths, while in the minority, often are of greatest interest in regard to equity and effectiveness. | | | |

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

Data quality information for this indicator has been developed by the Police Services Working Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | | |  |
| Element | Judicial services — Outcomes | | | |
| Indicator | Proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea or finding. | | | |
| Measure (computation) | The indicator is defined as the number of finalised defendants in lower courts who either submitted a guilty plea or were found guilty, as a proportion of the total number of lower courts adjudicated cases.  A higher proportion is a better outcome.  Computation/s  Division (expressed as a percentage). | | | |
| Data source/s | Criminal Courts, Australia, ABS 4513.0. | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  | | |
| Institutional environment | Numerator and denominator  Criminal matters are brought to the courts by a government prosecuting agency, which is generally the Director of Public Prosecutions, but can also be the Attorney‑General, the police, regulatory agencies or local councils. Information on defendants brought before the courts is recorded by the court administration authorities in each state and territory for operational and case management purposes in the adjudication and sentencing process. Criminal Courts statistics are based on data extracted from these administrative records. Data are supplied to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) by the courts administering agency for all states and territories except for Queensland (where they are supplied via the Office of Economic and Statistical Research), and New South Wales (where they are supplied via the Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research).  Criminal Courts statistics are produced by the National Criminal Courts Statistics Unit (NCCSU) of the ABS. The NCCSU functions under an intergovernmental agreement between the ABS, the Australian Government Attorney General's department and state and territory departments responsible for justice issues. One of the major functions of the NCCSU is to compile, analyse, publish and disseminate uniform national criminal courts statistics, subject to the provisions of the Census and Statistics Act 1905(Cth).  For information on the institutional environment of the ABS, including the legislative obligations of the ABS, financing and governance arrangements, and mechanisms for scrutiny of ABS operations, please see ABS Institutional Environment. | | | |
| Relevance | Numerator and denominator  The Criminal Courts collection provides statistics about defendants dealt with by the criminal jurisdiction of the Higher, Magistrates' and Children's Courts of Australia. Defendants include persons as well as organisations (for the Higher and Magistrates' Courts only) charged with criminal offences. Comparable statistics are provided for each of the states and territories and for Australia on the offences and sentence types associated with defendants dealt with by the Criminal Courts. If a person or organisation is a defendant in a number of criminal cases finalised within the courts during the reference period, this person or organisation will be counted more than once within that reference period. | | | |
| Timeliness | Numerator and denominator  Data from the Criminal Courts collection are released annually in Criminal Courts, Australia (cat. no. 4513.0) and accompanying datacubes within 9 months of the reference period. Each release includes data for the current reference year, along with time series for some data items. | | | |
| Accuracy | Numerator and denominator  Criminal Courts data are extracted from each state and territory's court administration system. The data are not subject to sampling error. Non‑sampling errors can arise from inaccuracies in recording by courts agencies, when the data are extracted, processed and disseminated. The ABS has limited influence over any errors associated with data recorded by external sources. The ABS does provide a collection manual which outlines the scope, coverage, counting rules and data item definitions for the Criminal Courts collection to minimise data extraction errors. Efficient processing and editing procedures are in place within the ABS to minimise processing and reporting errors.  Revisions to published data are irregular. Revisions to historical data are made when new information about the comparability of data over time is identified. This may occur when errors or omissions are identified in the administrative data supplied to the ABS in prior years. | | | |
| Coherence | Numerator and denominator  In order to ensure consistency in the data for each state and territory, criminal courts statistics are compiled according to national standards and classifications. However, some differences still occur due to state and territory legislative requirements or to limitations of the various administrative data bases that are used to extract the data.  Due to differing scope and counting rules the data in the Criminal Courts publication may not be comparable to data published in other national and state/territory publications. Given the high degree of conceptual complexity in the operation of the courts systems in Australia, and the variation in the capacity of the states and territories to supply statistical information, a staged approach was adopted in the development of the Criminal Courts collection. The publication presents results from several development stages of the collection. Information relating to criminal cases heard in the Supreme and Intermediate (Higher) Courts has been available since the mid 1990's. National information about defendants finalised in the Magistrates' Courts is available from 2003‑04 onwards, and in the Children's Courts from 2006‑07. | | | |
| Accessibility | Numerator and denominator  In addition to the information provided in the publication, a series of supplementary Data Cubes are also available providing detailed breakdowns by states and territories. | | | |
| Interpretability | Numerator and denominator  The Criminal Courts publication contains detailed Explanatory Notes, Appendices and Glossary that provide information on the data sources, counting rules, terminology, classifications and other technical aspects associated with these statistics.  A data dictionary, the National Criminal Courts Data Dictionary, 2005 (cat. no. 4527.0) has also been developed by the ABS in collaboration with key stakeholders. It is a reference document which defines national data items and outlines methods for the use of 27 data elements and concepts that underpin the ABS and Council of Australian Governments (COAG) criminal courts collections. The data dictionary relates to the Higher and Magistrates' Criminal Courts and it is anticipated that an updated version of the data dictionary will extend the scope of the data dictionary to the Children's Criminal Courts. | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |  | |
| Key data gaps /issues | Data are both comparable and complete for the court cases reported. The indicator does not conceptually identify the link between police effectiveness in preparing briefs and presenting evidence, and the decision of defendants to plead guilty or not. | | | |