

---

## 5 Police services

This chapter reports on the performance of police services. These services comprise the operations of the police agencies of each State and Territory government and the ACT community policing function performed by the Australian Federal Police (AFP) under the *Arrangement between the Minister for Justice and Customs of the Commonwealth and the Australian Capital Territory for the provision of police services to the Australian Capital Territory*. The national policing function of the AFP and other national non-police law enforcement bodies (such as the Australian Crime Commission) are not included in the Report.

A profile of the police sector appears in section 5.1. The general approach to performance measurement for police services is outlined in section 5.2. The overarching indicators of police performance are contained in section 5.3, and the specific performance measurement frameworks and data for each service delivery area are discussed in sections 5.4–5.8. Section 5.9 contains information on capital costs in police services and section 5.10 covers future directions in performance reporting. The chapter concludes with jurisdictions' comments (section 5.11), information on sample data (section 5.12) and lists of definitions (section 5.13), supporting tables (section 5.14) and references (section 5.15).

A new performance indicator framework was implemented for the 2005 Report and is continued in the 2006 Report. The new framework emphasises the Review's focus on government service 'outcomes', consistent with the demand by governments for outcome orientated performance information.

It should be noted that the use of the term 'offender' in this chapter refers to a person who is alleged to have committed an offence and is not the same as the definition used in chapter 7 ('Corrective services'), where the term 'offender' refers to a person who is undertaking a community corrections sentence.

---

## 5.1 Profile of police services

### Service overview

Police services are the principal means through which State and Territory governments pursue the achievement of a safe and secure environment for the community, through response to incidents, the investigation of offences, the provision of services to the judicial process and the provision of road safety and traffic management. Police are involved in a diverse range of activities aimed at reducing the incidence and effects of criminal activity. They also respond to more general needs in the community — for example, assisting emergency services, mediating family and neighbourhood disputes, delivering messages regarding death or serious illness, and advising on general policing and crime issues (CJC 1996).

### Roles and responsibilities


Policing services are predominantly the responsibility of State and Territory government agencies. The AFP provides a community policing service in the ACT through a strategic partnership with the ACT Government, underpinned by a detailed purchaser/provider agreement. The Australian Government is responsible for the AFP.

While each jurisdiction's police service is autonomous, there is significant cooperation across jurisdictions under the auspices of the Australasian Police Ministers' Council. There are also bilateral arrangements and common national police services, such as the National Institute of Forensic Sciences and the Australasian Centre for Policing Research (ACPR).

### Expenditure

Funding for police services comes almost exclusively from State and Territory government budgets, with some limited specific purpose Australian Government grants. Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services across Australia was approximately \$5.5 billion (or \$280 per person) in 2004-05 (table 5A.11). Most jurisdictions, except NSW, Qld and the ACT increased their real expenditure over the past 12 months (figure 5.1).

Figure 5.1 **Real recurrent expenditure per person (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services (2004-05 dollars)<sup>a, b, c</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> Revenue from own sources includes user charges and other types of revenue (for example, revenue from sale of stores and plant). It excludes fine revenue, money received as a result of warrant execution, and revenue from the issuing of firearm licences. <sup>b</sup> Excludes the user cost of capital. <sup>c</sup> Real expenditure based on the ABS gross domestic product price deflator (2004-05 = 100).

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.11.

Variations in policies, socioeconomic factors and geographic/demographic characteristics have an impact on expenditure per person for police services in each jurisdiction. The scope of activities undertaken by police services also varies across jurisdictions. Care must be used in interpreting such data (box 5.10).

#### *Expenditure breakdown, by key service delivery area*

In this chapter, police outputs/programs are disaggregated into four service delivery areas (SDAs). These include ‘community safety and support’, ‘crime investigation’, ‘road safety and traffic management’ and ‘services to the judicial process’. A fifth area (‘other services’) has been identified to account for expenditure on unique functions that are not included in the SDAs. For this Report, all jurisdictions except Tasmania were able to provide expenditure by SDA.

Care needs to be taken when comparing results across jurisdictions, because expenditure data on each SDA are not fully comparable. (Further information is included in section 5.2, and the outputs/programs undertaken within each SDA are listed in table 5A.10 by jurisdiction). Differences in counting rules exist across jurisdictions, as well as a different mix of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs. As well, the activity survey data that provide the relative breakdown of expenditure rely on snapshot data for most jurisdictions, and may not accurately reflect the peaks and troughs in expenditure throughout the year.

Community safety and support accounted for the largest component (44.9 per cent) of expenditure on police services in 2004-05, for those jurisdictions that provided data. Expenditure on crime investigation accounted for the second largest component (28.9 per cent) of expenditure in 2004-05 (figure 5.2).

More detail on expenditure by SDA is provided in tables 5A.12–5A.15.

**Figure 5.2 Recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services, by service delivery area, 2004-05<sup>a, b, c, d</sup>**



Ave = the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data. <sup>a</sup> Data have not been subject to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as well as a different mix of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs. <sup>b</sup> Overheads (for example, infrastructure costs such as rent on buildings and vehicle and equipment costs) have been apportioned to these SDAs on a pro rata basis. <sup>c</sup> For Queensland, expenditure data for services to the judicial process are unavailable. <sup>d</sup> Expenditure data for Tasmania could not be disaggregated by SDA.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.15.

## Size and scope of sector

### Client groups


Broadly, the whole community is a ‘client’ of the police. Police services aim to provide individuals with protection, help and reassurance, and everyone is required to comply with the law. Some members of the community have more direct dealings with the police and can be considered a specific client group, for example:

- victims of crime
- those suspected of committing offences
- those reporting criminal incidents

- those involved in traffic-related incidents
- third parties (such as witnesses to crime and people reporting accidents)
- those requiring police services for non-crime-related matters.

The ACPR *National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing* (NSCSP) indicated that 46 per cent of respondents nationally in 2004-05 had experienced some form of contact with police in the previous 12 months (Figure 5.3).

**Figure 5.3 Police contact in the past 12 months, 2004-05**



Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.20.

### *Victims of crime in Australia*

Information on the level of selected crimes against the person and crimes against property is sourced from the Crime and Safety Survey, last conducted in 2002, and the ABS Recorded Crime Victims series, last published in 2004.

### *Crime and Safety Survey*

The Crime and Safety Survey is a regular national survey that was run in 1983, 1993, 1998, 2002 and is expected to be conducted every three years in the future. Information is collected from individuals and households, and focuses on those categories of more serious crime that affect the largest number of people. The ABS is reviewing the current range of Australian crime and safety surveys with a view to better meeting the requirements of data users. Alternative models to the current surveys will be proposed.

---

The survey provides information on the levels of both reported and unreported victimisation in the Australian community for personal and household crimes:

- Personal crime includes robbery.
- Household crimes include break-in, attempted break-in and motor vehicle theft.

### *Recorded Crime in Australia*

The Recorded Crime Victims collection provides details of selected crimes reported to, or detected by, police, whose details are subsequently recorded on police administrative systems. Data are reported on recorded crimes against people and property:

- Crimes against people include murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, kidnapping/abduction, robbery and blackmail/extortion.
- Crimes against property include unlawful entry with intent, motor vehicle theft and other theft.

Crime and Safety Survey data are considered to be more comparable across jurisdictions than the Recorded Crime collection, given differences in the way in which recorded crime data are compiled (box 5.1). However, both victimisation survey data and police recorded crime data contribute to informing users about the nature and extent of crime victimisation. While neither administrative statistics nor victimisation surveys alone can provide comprehensive information about crime, each is useful for addressing specific issues (which are discussed in more detail in ABS (2005)).

This chapter reports the *level of crime* using the more comparable Crime and Safety Survey data, and the *annual trends* using the more timely Recorded Crime Victims data.

#### **Box 5.1 ABS crime victimisation statistics**

The ABS maintains national collections on crime victimisation sourced from two different areas: administrative records obtained from State and Territory police agencies; and victimisation data obtained through surveys of individuals in the Australian community. In some instances, the results may provide different pictures of crime in the community, with administrative data indicating a trend in one direction and personal experience indicating the opposite.

Continued on next page

---

**Box 5.1 (Continued)**

The full extent of crime is unlikely ever to be captured — Recorded Crime Victims data understate the true level of crime in Australia as a result of the behaviour of victims and the limitations of the data. Data relate to recorded crimes, but not all offences are reported to, or become known by, police. The victim's confidence in the judicial process, the nature of the offence, and the relationship between the victim and perpetrator are among the key factors that influence the propensity to report an offence. Similarly, with survey data, it may be difficult to obtain information about some crimes such as sexual assault and assaults that have been committed by members of the same household.

*Comparing recorded crime statistics across jurisdictions*

Recorded crime statistics are based on national standards and classifications, but care needs to be taken when comparing these statistics across states and territories, given the different practices of agencies supplying the data. Information recorded by police agencies may vary across states and territories as a result of legislation, recording systems and recording practices. In June 2005, the National Crime Statistics Unit (NCSU) from the ABS completed the *Differences in Recorded Crime Statistics (DiRCS)* project to investigate the differences in recorded crime statistics across State and Territory police agencies.


*Comparing recorded crime statistics with jurisdiction-specific data*

Care needs to be taken if attempting to compare ABS Recorded Crime Statistics with data reported by some jurisdictions. The former are *victim based* (that is, based on the number of victims per selected offence category), whereas some State and Territory data are commonly *offence or incident based* (that is, based on the total number of offences or incidents recorded). To illustrate the difference, multiple offences of the same national offence category committed against the same victim are included as only one count in the Recorded Crime Statistics, but the information systems in each jurisdiction may count separately each offence committed against the same victim.

*Rate of crime victimisation in Australia*

Expressed as a rate, there were 5300 victims of personal crime per 100 000 people in Australia in 2002, up from 4800 in 1998 (when the last survey was undertaken). The rate in 2002 varied across jurisdictions. When compared with the results in the previous survey, the rate increased in most jurisdictions (figure 5.4).

Figure 5.4 Estimated victims of personal crime<sup>a, b</sup>




<sup>a</sup> Data report only the prevalence of crime, not the incidence. A victim is defined as a person reporting at least one of the offences surveyed. Victims were counted once only for each type of offence, regardless of the number of incidents of that type. <sup>b</sup> Includes robbery, assault and sexual assault.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4509.0; table 5A.44.

There were 8900 household victims of crime per 100 000 households in Australia in 2002, little changed from 9000 in 1998 (the difference is not statistically significant), when the previous survey was held (table 5A.45). There was no consistent trend across jurisdictions over the three surveys (in 1993, 1998 and 2002) (figure 5.5).

Figure 5.5 Estimated household victims of crime<sup>a, b</sup>



<sup>a</sup> Data report only the prevalence of crime, not the incidence. A victim is defined as a person reporting at least one of the offences surveyed. Victims were counted once only for each type of offence, regardless of the number of incidents of that type. <sup>b</sup> Includes break-in, attempted break-in and motor vehicle theft.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4509.0; table 5A.45.

---


## Staffing

Most people directly involved in delivering police services are sworn police officers. These officers exercise police powers, including the power to arrest, summons, caution, detain, fingerprint and search. A trend has developed in recent years to increase the participation of unsworn officers (or contracted external providers) in some activities. ‘Civilianisation’ of police services has three key objectives:

- to reduce costs
- to manage more effectively the increasing need for specialist skills
- to reduce the involvement of sworn staff in duties that do not require police powers (for example, administrative work, investigation support and intelligence analysis).

Total police staffing in Australia was 58 167 (or 289 staff per 100 000 people) in 2004-05 (table 5A.16). Nationally, staffing comprised 224 sworn police officers and 64 unsworn employees per 100 000 people in 2004-05. Between 2000-01 and 2004-05, the number of police staff increased overall in all jurisdictions. Over the five year period, the national level of sworn police staff rose by 8 staff members per 100 000 people, and the number of unsworn staff rose by 6 staff members per 100 000 people, taking into account that Queensland data are unavailable for 2000-01 (table 5A.16). In 2004-05, the proportion of total sworn staff was 77.7 per cent nationally (figure 5.6).

Figure 5.6 Police staff, by sworn/unsworn status, 2004-05<sup>a, b, c</sup>




<sup>a</sup> Comprises all full time equivalent (FTE) staff. <sup>b</sup> NSW data for 2004-05 are based on a head count at 30 June 2005 and are not FTE data. <sup>c</sup> For the NT, sworn police officers include police auxiliaries and Aboriginal community police officers.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.16.

A non-operational staff member is any person who does not satisfy the operational staff criteria, including functional support staff such as finance staff and personnel services staff. Approximately 82.5 per cent of staff were operational in Australia in 2004-05 (figure 5.7).

Figure 5.7 **Police staff, by operational status, 2004-05<sup>a, b, c</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> Comprises FTE staff. <sup>b</sup> NSW data for 2004-05 are based on a head count at 30 June 2005 and are not FTE data. <sup>c</sup> For the NT, sworn police officers include police auxiliaries and Aboriginal community police officers. Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.17.

## 5.2 General approach to performance measurement for police services

Performance can be defined in terms of how well a service meets its objectives, given its operating environment. Performance indicators focus on outcomes and/or outputs aimed at meeting common, agreed objectives. The Steering Committee identified four objectives (and associated SDAs) for the purposes of this Report (box 5.2). The individual outputs/programs that are linked to the SDAs are contained in table 5A.10. For some jurisdictions, one output/program may be relevant for more than one SDA, so those jurisdictions may choose to disaggregate that output/program according to the data relevant to each SDA.

### Box 5.2 Objectives for police services


The key objectives for police services (and associated SDAs) are:

- to allow people to undertake their lawful pursuits confidently and safely (through activities associated with *community safety and support*)
- to bring to justice those people responsible for committing an offence (through activities associated with *crime investigation*)
- to promote safer behaviour on roads (through activities associated with *road safety and traffic management*)
- to support the judicial process to achieve efficient and effective court case management and judicial processing, while providing safe custody for alleged offenders, and ensuring fair and equitable treatment of both victims and alleged offenders (through activities associated with *services to the judicial process*).

These objectives are to be met through the provision of services in an equitable and efficient manner.

A new framework (figure 5.8) was implemented in the 2005 Report consistent with the new general Report framework (chapter 1). The reported results need to be considered in conjunction with the data on demographic and geographic differences (see appendix A) and with other available information on jurisdiction-specific characteristics.

Figure 5.8 General performance framework for the police services sector



---

## National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing

The 2006 Report uses data from the NSCSP, which collects information on community perceptions of police in terms of services provided and personal experiences of contact with the police. It also elicits public perceptions of personal safety and problems in the community and local area.

Care needs to be taken in interpreting any survey data. Minor changes in the survey questionnaire occurred in 2004-05. The statistical reliability of survey data is highly dependent on key elements of the survey method, including the survey instrument, the collection method and the sample size and design. In addition, attitudinal data may be influenced in the short term by rare, but significantly adverse or highly publicised events (such as a mass murder or a police corruption incident). Point-in-time responses may thus vary from people's true underlying (or longer term) satisfaction with police and perceptions of safety and crime levels.

### 5.3 Indicators relevant to all service delivery areas

The four SDAs in the performance indicator framework identify the core areas of police work. Within this context, certain indicators of police performance are not specific to any one particular SDA, but are relevant for all. These indicators include 'satisfaction with police services', 'perceptions of police integrity', 'complaints', 'Indigenous staffing' and 'police staff by gender' and access and equity considerations. This section provides information from the NSCSP and the State and Territory governments on these overarching indicators of police performance.

#### *Satisfaction with police services*

Client satisfaction is a widely accepted measure of service quality (box 5.3).

#### **Box 5.3 Satisfaction with police services**

'Satisfaction with police services' is an outcome indicator of governments' objective for police to perform their duties in a professional manner.


The indicator is defined as the proportion of people who were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with police services.

A higher proportion of people who were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' is more desirable.

Public perceptions may not reflect actual levels of police performance, however, because many factors — including individual experiences, hearsay and media reporting — may influence people's satisfaction with police services.

Nationally, the majority of people surveyed (68.9 per cent) were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with the services provided by police in 2004-05 (down from 71.8 per cent in 2003-04 and 72.7 per cent in 2002-03). At the national level, this is a statistically significant movement (figure 5.9).

**Figure 5.9 People who were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with police services**



Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.18.

The Likert Summation Index (LSI) — which provides a statistical measure of centrality for assessing the general (or ‘average’) level of community perceptions — is also useful for comparative purposes. The method and limitations of the LSI are discussed in box 5.4. An LSI of 5.00 would indicate that all respondents were ‘very satisfied’, while an LSI of 1.00 would indicate that all respondents were ‘very dissatisfied’. An LSI of 3.86 indicates that respondents were ‘satisfied’ on average.

Across Australia, the LSI for the responses to the question ‘how satisfied are you in general with the services provided by the police?’ was 3.82 in 2004-05 (down from 3.86 in 2003-04 and 3.90 in 2002-03) on a scale of 1.00 to 5.00 (table 5A.18). (figure 5.10).

### Box 5.4 Likert Summation Index

The LSI is a method for aggregating responses to obtain one measure of the general (or 'average') perceptions of respondents to Likert-type survey questions.

#### Example — General satisfaction with police services

On the following scale, how satisfied are you with services provided by the police?

Very satisfied = 5; Satisfied = 4; Neither = 3; Dissatisfied = 2; Very dissatisfied = 1

The responses are summarised below:

Category	Responses		
	Weight (A)	Actual (B)	Weighted (A×B)
Very Satisfied	5	950	4 750
Satisfied	4	2 500	10 000
Neither	3	1 250	3 750
Dissatisfied	2	400	800
Very Dissatisfied	1	250	250
<b>Total</b>		<b>5 350</b>	<b>19 550</b>

Each response category is allocated a weight between 1 and 5 (A). The actual responses (B) are multiplied by this weight to provide weighted responses (A×B). For example, five times 950 equals 4750. The sum of the weighted responses is divided by the sum of the actual responses:


$$L = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i R_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i} = \frac{(5 \times 950) + (4 \times 2500) + (3 \times 1250) + (2 \times 400) + (1 \times 250)}{950 + 2500 + 1250 + 400 + 250} = \frac{19\,550}{5\,350} = 3.65$$

where: L = Likert Summation Index  
 $w_i$  = the score for answer category i  
 $R_i$  = the responses for answer category i  
 n = the number of response categories

Care needs to be taken in interpreting the LSI because, although it provides a useful tool for making inferences about aggregate population attitudes/perceptions, it is based on a number of simplifying assumptions. Likert scale questions such as that used in the above example provide ordinal data. The LSI method assumes that the underlying data are inherently 'interval' in nature. This assumption — which is not universally accepted in the literature — is closely linked to the design and implementation of the survey instrument.

Further, the LSI is a measure of centrality and does not explicitly highlight outliers — for example, those very dissatisfied with police services — who may be an important focus of police policy. For these reasons, the LSI should be interpreted in conjunction with related frequency data.

Figure 5.10 **General satisfaction with police services<sup>a</sup>**




<sup>a</sup> Data are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.18.

Nationally, of those respondents who had contact with police in 2004-05, 74.1 per cent were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with the service they received during their most recent contact (down from 80.4 per cent in 2003-04). At the national level, this is a statistically significant movement. Results across jurisdictions and over time are presented in figure 5.11.

Figure 5.11 **People who were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with police in their most recent contact<sup>a</sup>**




<sup>a</sup> Data are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.21.

The national LSI in 2004-05 for the responses to the question ‘how satisfied were you with the service you received during your most recent contact with police?’ was 3.97 on a scale of 1.00 to 5.00 (down from 4.14 in 2003-04) (table 5A.21). An LSI of 3.97 indicates that respondents were ‘satisfied’ on average. Results across jurisdictions and over time are presented in figure 5.12.

Figure 5.12 **General satisfaction with police in most recent contact<sup>a</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> Data are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.21.

### *Perceptions of police integrity*

Public ‘perceptions of police integrity’ provide a measure of police professionalism (box 5.5).

Nationally in 2004-05, 63.3 per cent of people ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people ‘fairly and equally’ (down from 65.5 per cent in 2003-04) (figure 5.13).

#### **Box 5.5 Perceptions of police integrity**

‘Perceptions of police integrity’ is an outcome indicator of governments’ objective for police to perform their duties with integrity and professionalism.

Three measures are reported:

- the proportion of people who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people fairly and equally

(Continued on next page)


**Box 5.5 (Continued)**

- 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 most police are honest.

A higher proportion of people who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people fairly and equally is more desirable. Similarly, a higher proportion of people who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police perform the job professionally, and a higher proportion of people who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that most police are honest, is more desirable.

Public perceptions may not reflect actual levels of police integrity, however, because many factors — including individual experiences, hearsay and media reporting — may influence people’s perceptions of police integrity.

**Figure 5.13 People who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people fairly and equally<sup>a</sup>**




<sup>a</sup> Data are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.24.

Nationally, 76.8 per cent of people ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ in 2004-05 that police perform the job ‘professionally’ (down from 79.4 per cent in 2003-04 and 81.2 per cent in 2002-03). Compared with both 2003-04 and 2002-03, the proportion fell in most jurisdictions (figure 5.14).

**Figure 5.14 People who 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' that police perform the job professionally<sup>a</sup>**




<sup>a</sup> Data for later years are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.23.

Police integrity is another important element of police services' performance. This can be judged to some extent by the public perception of police honesty. Nationally, 70.9 per cent of people 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' in 2004-05 that most police are 'honest' (down from 75.4 in 2003-04). Compared with 2003-04, the proportion fell in all jurisdictions. At the national level, this is a statistically significant movement (figure 5.15).

**Figure 5.15 People who 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' that most police are honest<sup>a</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> Data are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.25.

---

## Complaints

Police services across Australia encourage and foster a code of customer service that provides for openness and accountability. Complaints made against police increasingly reflect a range of issues relating to service delivery (box 5.6). Complaints of a more serious nature are overseen by relevant external review bodies, such as the ombudsman, the director of public prosecutions or integrity boards in each jurisdiction.

### Box 5.6 Complaints

'Complaints' is an output indicator of governments' objective for police to perform their duties in a professional manner.

This indicator is defined as the number of complaints per 100 000 people.

Definitions of what constitutes a 'complaint against police' differ greatly between jurisdictions. Some jurisdictions include only complaints made by members of the public against members of the police force, whilst others include both internal organisational complaints against police employees and those made by members of the public. The rate of reported complaints is therefore not comparable across jurisdictions. Rates of complaints against police will be influenced by factors such as familiarity with, effectiveness of and confidence in complaint handling procedures, as well as the definition of 'complaint' applicable to that jurisdiction.

It is desirable to monitor changes in the reported rate of complaints against police to identify reasons for such changes and utilise this information to improve the manner in which police services are delivered.


The trend is presented using a base value of 100 and displaying the variation up or down thereafter.

An increase in complaints does not necessarily indicate a lack of confidence in police. Rather, it may indicate greater confidence in complaints resolution.

Complaints data are not comparable across jurisdictions, as a result of different counting rules. For example, Victorian, ACT and NT data include verbal complaints, which are not counted in other jurisdictions. Complaints data are presented in figure 5.16 and provide a picture of trends over time for each jurisdiction.

Although there were fluctuations across the years in some jurisdictions, the number of complaints against the police per 100 000 people was on a general downward trend in NSW, Queensland, Tasmania and the ACT over the period 2000-01 to 2004-05. Victoria and the NT experienced a rise in complaints per 100 000 people over the five years (figure 5.16).

Figure 5.16 Complaints per 100 000 people<sup>a, b, c, d, e, f</sup>



<sup>a</sup> Data are not comparable across jurisdictions. Data can be used only to view trends over time within jurisdictions. <sup>b</sup> Data include verbal complaints in the NT, the ACT and Queensland. <sup>c</sup> For NSW, a new complaints management system (c@ts.i) was implemented in 2001-02; figures for 2001-02 include only matters entered into the former Complaints Information System so are incomplete. <sup>d</sup> For WA, data for 2000-01 to 2003-04 have been revised. The number of complaints recorded can vary due to the back-capture of previously unreported complaints of a minor nature that are resolved at the local level. <sup>e</sup> Queensland 2003-04 figures include 386 complaint matters where the on-duty status of the subject member is unknown. <sup>f</sup> Base three-year average: 2000-01 to 2002-03 = 100.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.27.

### Access and equity — Indigenous staffing

This section focuses on the performance of mainstream police services in relation to Indigenous Australians. One indicator of access and equity is ‘Indigenous staffing’ — that is, the proportion of police staff from Indigenous backgrounds relative to the proportion of the general population who are from Indigenous backgrounds (box 5.7).

---

**Box 5.7 Indigenous staffing**

'Indigenous staffing' is an output indicator of governments' objective to provide police services in an equitable manner. Indigenous people may feel more comfortable in 'accessing' police services when they are able to deal with Indigenous police staff.


The indicator is defined as the proportion of police staff from Indigenous backgrounds compared to the proportion of the general population aged 20–64 years who are from Indigenous backgrounds. These data are used because a significantly larger proportion of the Indigenous population falls within the younger non-working age groupings compared with the non-Indigenous population. Readily available ABS population estimates for people aged 20–64 years in 30 June 2001 provide a proxy for the estimated working population.

A proportion of police staff from Indigenous backgrounds closer to the proportion of the general population aged 20–64 years who are from Indigenous backgrounds represents a more desirable equity outcome.

In some jurisdictions, the process of identifying Indigenous staff members relies on self-identification. Where Indigenous people are required to identify themselves, then the accuracy of the data will partly depend on how they perceive the advantages (or disadvantages) of identification and whether these perceptions change over time. More generally, many factors will influence the willingness of the Indigenous population to access police services, including familiarity with procedures for dealing with police, and confidence in the effectiveness of police services. For the purposes of this chapter, an Indigenous person is one who self-identifies as being Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander.

In most but not all jurisdictions, the proportion of Indigenous police staff was broadly in line with the representation of Indigenous people in the population aged 20–64 years (figure 5.17).

**Figure 5.17 Proportion of Indigenous staff in 2004-05 (sworn and unsworn) and Indigenous population aged 20–64 years<sup>a, b, c</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> Indigenous staff numbers relate to those staff who self-identify as being of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander descent. <sup>b</sup> Information on Indigenous status is collected only at the time of recruitment. <sup>c</sup> Queensland and Victoria was unable to separate Indigenous and non-Indigenous staff.

Source: ABS, Population by Age and Sex, Cat. no. 3201.0, (unpublished); State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.28.

### Access and equity — staffing by gender

Another measure of access and equity is the level of (sworn and unsworn) ‘police staff by gender’ (box 5.8). Nationally, 29.9 per cent of police staff were female in 2004-05 (figure 5.18). Nationally, the proportion of female police staff increased from 2000-01 to 2004-05 (from 27.5 per cent to 29.9 per cent of staff).

The proportion of female police staff in all jurisdictions increased over this period (figure 5.18).


#### Box 5.8 Access — staffing by gender

‘Police staffing by gender’ is included as an output indicator of governments’ objective to provide police services in an equitable manner. Women may feel more comfortable in ‘accessing’ police services in certain situations when they are able to deal with female police staff.

The indicator is defined as the number of female police staff (sworn and unsworn) divided by the total number of police staff.

A proportion of female police staff commensurate with the proportion of females in the general population is generally more desirable.

Figure 5.18 Female police staff (sworn and unsworn)<sup>a, b, c</sup>



<sup>a</sup> Comprises FTE staff. <sup>b</sup> For NSW, data from 2000-01 are based on a head count at 30 June. <sup>c</sup> For WA, data exclude recruits in training.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.29.

## 5.4 Community safety and support


This SDA captures the role of police in preserving public order and promoting a safer community through a range of activities, including:

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

### Framework of performance indicators

Police performance in undertaking these activities is measured using a suite of indicators that incorporates information on recorded crime levels and community perceptions data. The performance indicator framework shows which data are comparable across jurisdictions in the 2006 Report (figure 5.19). For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

Figure 5.19 Performance indicators for community safety and support



## Key community safety and support performance indicator results

### Outputs

#### *Equity — access*

The Steering Committee has identified access to community safety and support as a key area for development in future reports (box 5.9).

#### **Box 5.9 Performance indicator — access**

An output indicator of governments' objective to facilitate equitable access for people with special needs for community safety and support services has yet to be developed.

#### *Efficiency — dollars per person*

'Dollars per person' is an indicator of the efficiency of governments in delivering community safety and support services (box 5.10).

---

**Box 5.10 Dollars per person**

'Dollars per person' is an output indicator of governments' objective to undertake activities associated with community safety and support in an efficient and effective manner.


The indicator is defined as police services' expenditure (adjusted for inflation) on community safety and support per person.

Care needs to be taken in interpreting these data. While high expenditure per person may reflect less desirable efficiency outcomes, it may also reflect aspects of the service or characteristics of the policing environment (such as more effective policing or more challenging crime and safety situations). Similarly, low expenditure per person may reflect more desirable efficiency outcomes or worse quality (less effective policing) or less challenging crime and safety situations. Efficiency indicators thus need to be interpreted within the context of the effectiveness and equity indicators, to derive an holistic view of performance.

Tasmania did not provide expenditure data by SDA for 2004-05. Nationally, on average for the jurisdictions that did provide data, expenditure on community safety and support was \$126 per person (figure 5.20). Expenditure on community safety and support made up about half of all police expenditure nationally (44.9 per cent) (table 5A.15).

Nationally, real expenditure on community safety and support fell by \$2 per person over the past year (from \$128 to \$126) (table 5A.46).

Figure 5.20 Real expenditure per person (less payroll tax) on community safety and support (2004-05 dollars)<sup>a, b, c</sup>



Ave = the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data. <sup>a</sup> Data have not been subjected to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mix of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs. <sup>b</sup> For SA, the decrease in 2003-04 mainly reflects the outcomes of activity surveys conducted in 2004, which resulted in a shift in resources from community safety and support to crime investigation. In 2004-05, total recurrent expenditure has increased mainly as a result of Enterprise Bargaining for Sworn Staff and asset revaluation decrements. <sup>c</sup> For Queensland, a review of the output structure for 2004-05 has resulted in a change in the distribution of funds across outputs and may have contributed to the redistribution of funds in 2004-05 from this SDA.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.46.

## Outcomes

### *Perceptions of safety*

An important objective of police services is to reassure the public by ensuring the community feels safe in public and private (box 5.11).

---

**Box 5.11 Perceptions of safety**

'Perceptions of safety' is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to reassure the public by ensuring the community feels safe (within themselves and regarding their property) in public and private.

Two measures are reported:

- the proportion of people who felt 'safe or very safe' at home
- the proportion of people who felt 'safe or very safe' in public places.

A higher proportion of people who felt 'safe' or 'very safe' for either indicator is a more desirable outcome.

Perceptions of safety may not reflect reported crime, however, for a number of reasons: reported crime may understate actual crime, under-reporting may vary across jurisdictions, and many factors (including media reporting and hearsay) may affect public perceptions of crime levels and safety.


Nationally, 91.7 per cent of people surveyed felt 'safe' or 'very safe' at home alone during the day in 2004-05. Nationally, 80.7 per cent of people felt 'safe' or 'very safe' at home alone after dark in 2004-05 (figure 5.21).

Nationally, 44.5 per cent of people felt 'safe' or 'very safe' when walking or jogging locally after dark in 2004-05 (up from 40.4 per cent in 2003-04) (figure 5.22).

In Australia, 87.6 per cent of respondents felt 'safe' or 'very safe' when walking or jogging locally during the day in 2004-05, and 59.7 per cent of respondents felt 'safe' or 'very safe' on public transport during the day (down from 66.1 per cent in 2003-04).

Nationally, 22.5 per cent of people surveyed felt 'safe' or 'very safe' when travelling on public transport after dark in 2004-05 (down from 24.3 per cent in 2003-04) (figure 5.22). The results are influenced by the mix (that is, trains, buses, ferries and trams) of public transport in each jurisdiction. The ACT and the NT do not operate a suburban train network. A jurisdiction breakdown of these results is presented in tables 5A.30, 5A.31 and 5A.32.


**Figure 5.21 Perceptions of safety at home**




Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.30.

Figure 5.22 Perceptions of safety in public places <sup>a, b, c</sup>

Proportion who felt 'safe' or 'very safe' walking or jogging locally after dark



Proportion who felt 'safe' or 'very safe' travelling on public transport after dark



<sup>a</sup> Data are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over. <sup>b</sup> For this survey question, the response 'not applicable' was very large and varied significantly across jurisdictions in line with the availability of public transport. <sup>c</sup> Unlike other jurisdictions, the ACT and the NT do not operate a suburban train network and rely on buses as the primary means of public transportation.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); tables 5A.31 and 5A.32.

*Perceptions of crime problem*

'Perceptions of crime problem' is another indicator of how safe the members of the community feel in public and private (box 5.12).

---

### Box 5.12 Perceptions of crime problem

'Perceptions of crime problem' is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to reassure the public by ensuring the community feels safe (within themselves and regarding their property) in public and private.

Two measures are reported:

- the proportion of people who considered that various types of crime were a 'major problem' or 'somewhat of a problem' in their State or Territory
- the proportion of people who considered that various types of crime were a 'major problem' or 'somewhat of a problem' in their neighbourhood.

For both indicators, a lower proportion of people who felt the selected types of crime were a 'major problem' or 'somewhat a problem' is a more desirable outcome.

Care needs to be taken in interpreting data on perceptions of crime, however, because reducing people's concerns about crime and reducing the actual level of crime are two separate, but related challenges for police. Comparisons between perceptions of crime problems and the level of crime raise questions about the factors that affect perceptions. More generally, such comparisons highlight the importance of considering the full suite of performance indicators rather than assessing performance on the basis of specific measures in isolation.

Nationally, when people were asked in 2004-05 about crime problems in their State or Territory, the proportion of people who perceived a particular crime as a 'major problem' or 'somewhat of a problem' was: 92.1 per cent for housebreaking; 91.6 per cent for illegal drugs; 89.3 per cent for vehicle theft; 86.4 per cent for physical assault; 85.2 per cent for poor driver behaviour (speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving); 85.2 per cent for graffiti and other vandalism; 85.1 per cent for louts and gangs; 86.4 per cent for sexual assault; 83.8 per cent for drunken and disorderly behaviour and 81.9 per cent for family violence (tables 5A.36–5A.38).


The following major areas of concern were identified by people in relation to crime problems in their neighbourhood:

- *Poor driver behaviour* — nationally, 74.5 per cent of people believed poor driver behaviour to be a 'major problem' or 'somewhat a problem' in their neighbourhood in 2004-05 (down from 75.3 in 2003-04) (figure 5.23a).
- *Housebreaking* — nationally, 65.2 per cent of people believed housebreaking to be a 'major problem' or 'somewhat a problem' in their neighbourhood in 2004-05 (down from 74.0 per cent in 2003-04) (figure 5.23b).
- *Illegal drugs* — nationally, 59.6 per cent of people believed illegal drugs to be a 'major problem' or 'somewhat a problem' in their neighbourhood in 2004-05 (down from 73.1 per cent in 2003-04) (figure 5.23c).

- 
- *Motor vehicle theft* — nationally, 55.0 per cent of people believed motor vehicle theft to be a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat a problem’ in their neighbourhood in 2004-05 (down from 65.9 per cent in 2003-04) (figure 5.23d).
  - *Physical assault (excluding sexual assault)* — nationally, 40.5 per cent of people believed physical assault to be a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat a problem’ in their neighbourhood in 2004-05 (down from 56.5 per cent in 2003-04) (figure 5.23e).
  - *Family violence* — nationally, 38.5 per cent of people believed family violence to be a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat a problem’ in their neighbourhood in 2004-05 (down from 49.2 per cent in 2003-04) (figure 5.23f). (Tables 5A.33–5A.35).

Comparisons between perceptions of crime problems and the level of crime raise questions about the factors that affect perceptions. More generally, such comparisons highlight the importance of considering the full suite of performance indicators rather than assessing performance on the basis of specific measures in isolation. The preceding NSCSP results indicate that perceptions of crime fall as the respondent focuses on their local neighbourhood rather than the State or Territory in which they live.

**Figure 5.23 Proportion of people who consider the identified issues to be either a 'major problem' or 'somewhat of a problem' in their neighbourhood, 2004-05**



Source: ACPR (unpublished); tables 5A.33–5A.35.

---

### *Crime victimisation*

As noted in section 5.1, two ABS collections are used as the source of the majority of crime victimisation data in this Report: the Crime and Safety Survey and the Recorded Crime collection.

The Crime and Safety Survey is used as the source of data on the level of crime victimisation in this Report (that is, the number of victims), because it is considered to provide data that are more comparable across jurisdictions than the Recorded Crime collection. The Recorded Crime collection, however, provides more timely data than the Survey, and thus is used as the source of data on trends in crime victimisation over time. Data on homicides are provided by the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC 2005).

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

The prevalence and trends in personal crime in the community are important measures of the effectiveness of police services (box 5.13).

Nationally, there were 1.5 recorded victims of homicide per 100 000 people in 2003-04 (down from 1.6 in 2002-03) (figure 5.24).

#### **Box 5.13 Crime victimisation — crimes against the person**

'Crime victimisation' is included as an outcome indicator of governments' objective to enforce the law and improve community safety.

Three measures are reported on the level of crime against the person:

- victims of homicide per 100 000 people
- estimated victims of assault per 100 000 people
- estimated victims of robbery per 100 000 people.

For each measure, a lower rate of crime victimisation is a more desirable outcome.

Data on trends in crime victimisation, based on the number of crimes reported to police, are presented in index form. Differences in the way in which crimes are recorded on jurisdictions' police administrative systems (due to legislation, recording systems and recording practices) mean that comparing the level of recorded crime across jurisdictions is problematic.

(Continued on next page)


**Box 5.13 (Continued)**

One measure is reported on trends in crime against the person:

- victims of armed robbery per 100 000 people (index base 3-year average 2000 to 2002 = 100).

For this measure, a fall in the index number is a more desirable outcome. The recorded number of victims may vary from the actual incidence of crimes against people for a number of reasons, however, including confidence in the judicial system as a whole.

**Figure 5.24 Recorded victims of homicide<sup>a</sup>**




<sup>a</sup> Homicide is defined by the criminal law of each State and Territory. The specific wording of the definition varies between states and territories in terms of degree and culpability.

Source: AIC (2005); table 5A.40.

Based on ABS Crime and Safety Survey data, there were 4700 victims of assault per 100 000 people in Australia in 2002 (up from 4300 per 100 000 people in 1998) (figure 5.25).

Figure 5.25 Estimated victims of assault<sup>a</sup>




<sup>a</sup> A victim is defined as a person reporting at least one assault. Victims were counted once only, regardless of the number of incidents of assault. Assault is defined as an incident, other than a robbery where the respondent was threatened with force or violence or physically attacked.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4509.0; table 5A.44.

Based on ABS Crime and Safety Survey data, there were 600 victims of robbery per 100 000 people in Australia in 2002 (up from 500 victims per 100 000 people in 1998). Available data for all jurisdictions are presented in figure 5.26.

Based on the ABS Recorded Crime collection, the rate of victims of armed robbery per 100 000 people fell by 10.7 per cent in Australia between 2003 and 2004. Although there were fluctuations across the years in some jurisdictions, there has been a general downward trend in the rate of victims of armed robbery per 100 000 people in most jurisdictions since the base period of 2000–02 (figure 5.27).


Figure 5.26 Estimated victims of robbery<sup>a</sup>



<sup>a</sup> A victim is defined as a person reporting at least one robbery. Victims were counted once only, regardless of the number of incidents of robbery. Robbery is defined as an incident, where someone has stolen (or tried to steal) property from a respondent by physically attacking them or threatening them with violence.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4509.0; table 5A.44.

Figure 5.27 Trends in recorded crime — victims of armed robbery per 100 000 people converted to index<sup>a, b, c</sup>



<sup>a</sup> Index base three-year average 2000 to 2002 = 100. <sup>b</sup> Data are based on crimes recorded by police. <sup>c</sup> Data are reported in index form because the variations in the rate of recorded victims across jurisdictions are influenced by different legislation, reporting systems and practices and reporting rates in jurisdictions.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4510.0; table 5A.41.

---

### *Crime victimisation — crimes against property*

The prevalence and trends in crimes against property in the community are important measures of the effectiveness of police services (box 5.14).

Based on ABS Crime and Safety Survey data, there were 7400 break-ins or attempted break-ins per 100 000 households in Australia in 2002 (down from 7600 victims per 100 000 households in 1998). Jurisdictions rates are shown in figure 5.28.

#### **Box 5.14 Crime victimisation — crimes against property**

'Crime victimisation' is included as an outcome indicator of governments' objective to enforce the law and improve community safety.

Two measures are reported on the level of crime against property:

- estimated household victims of break-in/attempted break-in per 100 000 households
- estimated household victims of motor vehicle theft per 100 000 households.

For each of the indicators, a lower rate of crime victimisation is a more desirable outcome.


Data on trends in crime victimisation, based on the number of crimes reported to police, are presented in index form. Differences in the way in which crimes are recorded on jurisdictions' police administrative systems (due to legislation, recording systems and recording practices) mean that comparing the level of recorded crime across jurisdictions is problematic.

Two measures are reported on trends in property crime in the community:

- victims of unlawful entry with intent per 100 000 people (index 2000 to 2002 = 100)
- victims of motor vehicle theft per 100 000 people (index 2000 to 2002 = 100).

For both measures, a fall in the index number is a more desirable outcome. The recorded number of victims may vary from the actual incidence of crimes against property for a number of reasons, however, including confidence in the judicial system as a whole.

Figure 5.28 Estimated victims of break-in/attempted break-in<sup>a</sup>




<sup>a</sup> A victim is defined as a household reporting at least one break-in/attempted break-in. Victims were counted once only, regardless of the number of incidents of break-in/attempted break-in. Break-in is defined as an incident where the respondent's home had been broken into. Break-in offences relating to respondents' cars or gardens are excluded.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4509.0; table 5A.45.

Based on the ABS Recorded Crime collection, the number of victims of unlawful entry with intent per 100 000 people fell by 11.4 per cent in Australia between 2003 and 2004. Although the victimisation rate fluctuated across the years in some jurisdictions, there has been a general downward trend in the rate in all jurisdictions since the base period of 2000–02. At the national level, this is a statistically significant movement (figure 5.29).

Figure 5.29 Trends in recorded crime — victims of unlawful entry with intent per 100 000 people converted to index<sup>a, b, c</sup>




<sup>a</sup> Index base three-year average 2000 to 2002 = 100. <sup>b</sup> Data are based on crimes recorded by police. <sup>c</sup> Data are reported in index form because the variations in the rate of recorded victims across jurisdictions are influenced by different legislation, reporting systems and practices and reporting rates in jurisdictions.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4510.0; See also table 5A.42 for numbers per 100 000 persons.

Based on ABS Crime and Safety Survey data, 1800 motor vehicles were stolen per 100 000 households in 2002 in Australia (up from 1700 per 100 000 households in 1998). Rates for all jurisdictions are presented in figure 5.30.

Figure 5.30 Estimated victims of motor vehicle theft<sup>a, b</sup>




<sup>a</sup> A victim is defined as a household reporting at least one motor vehicle theft. Victims were counted once only, regardless of the number of incidents of motor vehicle theft. Motor vehicle theft is defined as an incident where a motor vehicle was stolen from any member of the respondent's household. It includes privately owned vehicles, as well as business/company vehicles used exclusively by members of the household. <sup>b</sup> The estimate for the NT has a relative standard error greater than 50 per cent and is considered too unreliable for general use.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4509.0; table 5A.45.

Based on the ABS Recorded Crime collection, the number of victims of motor vehicle theft per 100 000 people fell by 11.6 per cent in Australia between 2003 and 2004. Although there were rate fluctuations across the years in some jurisdictions, there has been a general downward trend in the rate in all jurisdictions since 2000 (figure 5.31).

Figure 5.31 Trends in recorded crime — victims of motor vehicle theft per 100 000 people converted to index<sup>a, b, c</sup>



<sup>a</sup> Index base three-year average 2000 to 2002 = 100. <sup>b</sup> Data are based on crimes recorded by police. <sup>c</sup> Data are reported in index form because the variations in the rate of recorded victims across jurisdictions are influenced by different legislation, reporting systems and practices and reporting rates in jurisdictions.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4510.0; See also table 5A.42 for numbers per 100 000 persons.

### Reporting rates

The ABS defines a reporting rate as the total number of the most recent incidents of an offence that were reported to police, expressed as a percentage of the total victims of that offence (box 5.15). Reporting rates vary across different crime types (table 5A.43).

### Box 5.15 Reporting rates

'Reporting rates' is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to enforce the law and improve community safety by engendering public confidence in the police and judicial system.

The indicator is defined as the total number of the most recent incidents of a particular offence (break and enter, attempted break and enter, motor vehicle theft, robbery, assault, sexual assault and total victims of crimes against the person and property) that were reported to police, as a percentage of the total victims of that offence. A higher proportion is more desirable.

This indicator does not, however, provide information on why some people choose not to report particular offences to the police.


#### *Reporting rate — break and enter*

Nationally, the reporting rate for break and enter offences was 75.1 per cent in 2002 (compared with 77.5 per cent in 1998) (figure 5.32).

#### *Reporting rate — attempted break and enter*

Nationally, the reporting rate for attempted break and enter offences was 31.1 per cent in 2002 (similar to that in 1998). Reporting rates are presented in table 5A.43.

Figure 5.32 Reporting rate for break and enter<sup>a</sup>



<sup>a</sup> Break and enter estimates for 2002 for the ACT and the NT have a relative standard error between 25 and 50 per cent and need to be used with caution.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4509.0; table 5A.43.

---

### *Reporting rate — motor vehicle theft*

Nationally, the reporting rate for motor vehicle theft was 95.0 per cent in 2002 (similar to the 1998 rate of 95.1 per cent). Reporting rates for each jurisdiction are presented in table 5A.43.

### *Reporting rate — robbery*

Nationally, the reporting rate for robbery was up slightly to 50.2 per cent in 2002 (compared with 49.8 per cent in 1998). Reporting rates for each jurisdiction are presented in table 5A.43.

## **5.5 Crime investigation**

This SDA captures the role of police in investigating crime and identifying and apprehending suspects. Activities include:


- gathering intelligence on suspects and locations to assist with investigations
- collecting and securing evidence in relation to both the offence and the suspect.

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

### **Framework of performance indicators**

Police performance in undertaking these activities is measured using a suite of indicators that includes outcomes of investigations. The performance indicator framework shows which data are comparable across jurisdictions in the 2006 Report (figure 5.33). For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

Figure 5.33 Performance indicators for crime investigation



## Key performance indicator results

### Outputs

#### *Equity — access*

The Steering Committee has identified equity and access for crime investigation as an area for development in future reports (box 5.16).

#### **Box 5.16 Performance indicator — access**

An output indicator of governments' objective to facilitate equitable access for people with special needs for crime investigation services has yet to be developed.

#### *Efficiency — dollars per person*

'Dollars per person' is included as an indicator of the efficiency of governments in delivering crime investigation services (box 5.17).

### Box 5.17 Dollars per person


'Dollars per person' is an output indicator of governments' objective to undertake activities associated with crime investigation in an efficient manner.

The indicator is defined as expenditure on crime investigation per person.

Care needs to be exercised in interpreting these data. While high expenditure per person may reflect worse efficiency outcomes, it may also reflect aspects of the service or characteristics of the policing environment (such as greater effectiveness or more challenging crime and safety situations). Similarly, low expenditure per person may reflect more desirable efficiency outcomes or worse quality (less effective policing) or less challenging crime and safety situations. Efficiency data thus needs to be interpreted within the context of the effectiveness and equity indicators, to derive an holistic view of performance.

Nationally, of the jurisdictions that could provide data for 2004-05, expenditure on crime investigations was \$81 per person (figure 5.34).

Figure 5.34 Real expenditure per person (less payroll tax) on crime investigation (2004-05 dollars)<sup>a</sup>



Ave = the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data. <sup>a</sup> Data have not been subjected to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mix of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.49.

---

Expenditure on crime investigations as a proportion of total police expenditure was 28.3 per cent nationally in 2004-05. This varied across jurisdictions (table 5A.15).

*Outcomes of investigations — personal crimes*

‘Outcomes of investigations — personal crimes’ is an output indicator of governments’ objective to bring to justice those people responsible for committing crimes (box 5.18).

**Box 5.18 Outcomes of investigations — personal crimes**

‘Outcomes of investigations — personal crimes’ is an output indicator of governments’ objective to bring to justice those people responsible for committing an offence.

Two measures are reported:

- the proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police
- the proportion of finalised investigations which decided to proceed against the alleged offender within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police.



Outcomes of investigations indicators are reported for a range of offences against the person including murder, assault, armed robbery, and sexual assault. A higher proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police is a more desirable outcome. Similarly, a higher proportion of finalised investigations where proceedings had started against the alleged offender within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police, is a more desirable outcome.

‘Outcomes of investigations — personal crimes’ are not directly comparable because of differences in the way data are compiled by jurisdictions. Data for assault and sexual assault were not available for 2004.

Figure 5.35 presents for each jurisdiction in 2004, the proportion of recorded murder investigations and armed robbery investigations that were finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police.

For these finalised investigations, it also presents the proportion of proceedings that had commenced against an alleged offender within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police.

**Figure 5.35 Victims of crimes against the person: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2004**




Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4510.0; table 5A.47.

Figure 5.36 reports for each jurisdiction in 2004 the proportion of recorded unarmed robbery investigations, kidnapping/abduction investigations and blackmail/extortion investigations that were finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police.

For these finalised investigations, it also presents the proportion of proceedings that had started against an alleged offender within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police.

**Figure 5.36 Victims of crimes against the person: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2004**



Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4510.0; table 5A.47.

---

*Outcomes of investigations — property crimes*

‘Outcomes of investigations — property crimes’ is an output indicator of governments’ objective to bring to justice those people responsible for committing crimes (box 5.19).

**Box 5.19 Outcomes of investigations — property crimes**

‘Outcomes of investigations — property crimes’ is an output indicator of governments’ objective to bring to justice those people responsible for committing an offence.

Two measures are reported:

- the proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police
- the proportion of finalised investigations for which proceedings had started against the alleged offender within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police.



Outcomes of investigations indicators are reported for three property offences: unlawful entry with intent, motor vehicle theft and other theft. A higher proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police is a more desirable outcome. Similarly, a higher proportion of finalised investigations where proceedings had started against the alleged offender within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police, is a more desirable outcome.

‘Outcomes of investigations — property crimes’ are not directly comparable because of differences in the way data are compiled by jurisdictions.

Figure 5.37 reports for each jurisdiction in 2004 the proportion of recorded unlawful entry with intent investigations, motor vehicle theft investigations and other theft investigations that were finalised within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police.

For these finalised investigations, it also presents the proportion of proceedings that had started against an alleged offender within 30 days of the offence becoming known to police.

**Figure 5.37 Victims of property crime: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 2004**



Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4510.0; table 5A.48.

---

## *Outcomes*

Outcome indicators for crime investigation services are yet to be developed. The effectiveness with which police undertake criminal investigation services, however, will be somewhat reflected in the general performance indicators for police services, such as the indicator ‘satisfaction with police services’ reported in section 5.3.

## **5.6 Road safety and traffic management**

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


Activities typically include:

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

### **Framework of performance indicators**

Police performance in undertaking road safety and traffic management activities is measured using a suite of indicators that includes people’s behaviour on the roads and the number of land transport hospitalisations and road fatalities. The performance indicator framework shows which data are comparable in the 2006 Report (figure 5.38). For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

Figure 5.38 Performance indicators for road safety and traffic management



## Key performance indicator results

### *Outputs*

#### *Equity — access*

The Steering Committee has identified equity and access for road safety and traffic management as an area for development in future reports (box 5.20).

#### **Box 5.20 Performance indicator — access**

An output indicator of governments' objective to facilitate equitable access for people with special needs for road safety and traffic management services has yet to be developed.

#### *Efficiency — dollars per person and dollars per registered vehicle*

'Dollars per person' and 'dollars per registered vehicle' are included as indicators of the efficiency of governments in delivering road safety and traffic management services (box 5.21).

---

**Box 5.21 Dollars per person and dollars per registered vehicle**

'Dollars per person', and 'dollars per registered vehicle', are output indicators of governments' objective to undertake activities associated with road safety and traffic management in an efficient manner.

The indicator 'dollars per person' is defined as expenditure on road safety and traffic management per person.

The indicator 'dollars per registered vehicle' is defined as expenditure on road safety and traffic management per registered vehicle.

Lower expenditure on road safety and traffic management per person is more desirable. Similarly, lower expenditure on road safety and traffic management per registered vehicle is more desirable.


Efficiency data are difficult to interpret, however. While high expenditure values for either indicator may reflect poor efficiency, it may also reflect aspects of the service or the characteristics of the policing environment (such as highly effective services or challenging road safety and traffic management situations). Similarly, low expenditure values for either indicator may reflect efficient police services. Alternatively, it may reflect lower quality (less effective policing) or less challenging road safety and traffic management situations. Efficiency data thus needs to be interpreted within the context of the effectiveness and equity indicators, to derive an holistic view of performance.

For jurisdictions that could provide data in 2004-05, expenditure on road safety and traffic management was \$32 per person nationally. Expenditure on road safety and traffic management per registered vehicle was \$47 nationally. Both rates varied across jurisdictions in 2004-05 (figure 5.39).

Nationally in 2004-05, expenditure on road safety and traffic management as a proportion of total police expenditure per person was 11.6 per cent. This proportion varied across jurisdictions (table 5A.15).

Nationally, real expenditure on road safety and traffic management rose by \$3 per person (from \$29 to \$32) over the past year (table 5A.56).

Figure 5.39 Real expenditure (less payroll tax) on road safety and traffic management (2004-05 dollars)<sup>a, b</sup>



Ave = the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data. <sup>a</sup> Data have not been subjected to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mix of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs. <sup>b</sup> For SA, total recurrent expenditure on road safety and traffic management increased slightly in 2003-04. However, net recurrent expenditure has reduced as a result of \$14.9 million, that was previously part of appropriation, now reflected as additional revenue from own sources (Community Road Safety Fund). This represents a change in funding arrangements. Total recurrent expenditure on road safety and traffic management also increased in 2004-05. However, net recurrent expenditure reduced as a result of additional revenue from own sources (\$4.6 million) Community Road Safety Fund).

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.56.

---

*Efficiency — dollars per fatal or serious injury or collision*

Another indicator of the efficiency of governments in delivering road safety and traffic management services is ‘dollars per fatal or serious injury or collision’ (box 5.22).

**Box 5.22 Dollars per fatal or serious injury or collision**


‘Dollars per fatal or serious injury or collision’ is an output indicator of governments’ objective to undertake activities associated with road safety and traffic management in an efficient manner.

The indicator is defined as the cost of road safety and traffic management per fatal or serious injury or collision. The number of fatal or serious injuries or collisions is defined as the number of road deaths plus the number of land transport hospitalisations.

Efficiency data are difficult to interpret, however. While high costs per fatal or serious injury or collision may reflect poor efficiency, it may also reflect aspects of the service or the characteristics of the policing environment (such as highly effective services or challenging road safety and traffic management situations). Similarly, low expenditure per person may reflect efficient police services; alternatively, it may reflect lower quality (less effective policing) or less challenging road safety and traffic management situations. Efficiency data thus needs to be interpreted within the context of the effectiveness and equity indicators, to derive an holistic view of performance.

Nationally in 2003-04, the cost of road safety and traffic management per fatal or serious injury or collision was \$14 147. (figure 5.40).

Figure 5.40 **Cost of SDA/number of fatal or serious injuries or collisions (2003-04 dollars) <sup>a</sup>**



Ave = the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data. <sup>a</sup> For SA, total recurrent expenditure on Road Safety and Traffic Management increased slightly in 2003-04. However, between 2002-03 and 2003-04 net recurrent expenditure declined as a result of \$14.9 million in additional revenue from own sources (previously part of appropriation) thereby causing a reduction in 'dollars per fatal or serious injury or collision'. Source: AIHW (unpublished); ATSB (2004); State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.55.

### Outcomes

An aim of police road safety programs is to influence road user behaviour so as to reduce the incidence of road crashes and the severity of road trauma. These programs target the non-wearing of seat belts, excessive speed and drink driving.

This section reports data from the NSCSP about respondents' road use habits.

For contextual purposes, 87.4 per cent of NSCSP respondents in 2004-05 stated that they had driven a motor vehicle in the past 12 months, compared with 88.4 per cent in 2003-04 (table 5A.50).

### Use of seat belts

'Use of seatbelts' is one indicator of the effectiveness of police programs that aim to influence road user behaviour (box 5.23).

### Box 5.23 Use of seatbelts

'Use of seatbelts' is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to promote safer behaviour on the road.


The indicator is defined as the proportion of people who had driven in the past 12 months and 'sometimes' or more often ('half the time', 'most of the time' or 'always') travelled in a car without wearing a seatbelt.

A lower proportion of people who had 'sometimes', or more often, travelled in the car without wearing a seatbelt, is more desirable.

The use of seatbelts in the population is affected by a number of factors in addition to activities undertaken by police services, such as driver education and advertising campaigns.

Nationally in 2004-05, 8.6 per cent of people surveyed who had driven in the previous 12 months said they 'sometimes' or more often ('half the time', 'most of the time' or 'always') travelled in a car without wearing a seat belt (down from 11.2 per cent in 2003-04). Compared with 2003-04, the use of seatbelts was higher in all jurisdictions (figure 5.41).

Figure 5.41 **People who had driven in the previous 12 months and 'sometimes' or more often ('half the time', 'most of the time' or 'always') travelled in a car without wearing a seat belt<sup>a</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> Data are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.51.

---

### Degree of speeding

'Degree of speeding' is another indicator of the effectiveness of police programs that aim to influence road-user behaviour (box 5.24).

#### Box 5.24 Degree of speeding


Degree of speeding is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to promote safer behaviour on the road.

This indicator is defined as the proportion of people who drive and who indicated that they had 'sometimes' or more often ('half the time', 'most of the time' or 'always') driven more than 10 kilometres per hour above the speed limit in the previous 12 months.

A lower proportion of people indicating that they had 'sometimes' or more often driven more than 10 kilometres per hour above the speed limit in the past 12 months, is more desirable.

Nationally in 2004-05, 59.3 per cent of people surveyed who had driven in the previous 12 months reported travelling more than 10 kilometres per hour above the speed limit 'sometimes' or more often ('half the time', 'most of the time' or 'always'). This compares with 62.1 per cent in 2003-04. All jurisdictions experienced decreases in the proportion of people who indicated that they were speeding from the 2003-04 to 2004-05 period (figure 5.42).

Figure 5.42 **People who indicated that they had driven in the previous 12 months more than 10 kilometres per hour above the speed limit 'sometimes' or more often ('half the time', 'most of the time' or 'always')<sup>a</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> Data years are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.52.

---

## Driving under the influence

'Driving under the influence' is another indicator of the effectiveness of police programs that aim to influence road user behaviour (box 5.25).

### Box 5.25 Driving under the influence


'Driving under the influence' is included as an outcome indicator of governments' objective to promote safer behaviour on the road.

The indicator is defined as the proportion of people who drive and who indicated that they had 'sometimes' or more often ('half the time', 'most of the time' or 'always') driven when possibly over the 0.05 alcohol limit in the previous 12 months.

A lower proportion of people who indicated that they had 'sometimes' or more often driven when possibly over the 0.05 alcohol limit in the past 12 months, is more desirable. The prevalence of driving under the influence in the population is affected by a number of factors in addition to activities undertaken by police services, such as driver education and advertising campaigns.

Nationally in 2004-05, 8.7 per cent of people surveyed who had driven in the previous 12 months indicated that they had 'sometimes' or more often ('half the time', 'most of the time' or 'always') driven when possibly over the 0.05 blood alcohol limit (compared with 10.6 per cent in 2003-04). Compared with 2003-04, all jurisdictions recorded a decrease in the proportion of respondents who self-reported drink driving. (figure 5.43).

Figure 5.43 **People who indicated they had driven in the previous 12 months when possibly over the 0.05 alcohol limit 'sometimes' or more often ('half the time', 'most of the time' or 'always')<sup>a</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> Data are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.53.

---

## Road deaths

'Road deaths' is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to promote safer behaviour on the road (box 5.26).

Nationally, there were 1588 road deaths in 2004-05. Road fatalities, for all jurisdictions from 2000-01 to 2004-05 are reported in table 5A.54.

### Box 5.26 Road deaths


'Road deaths' is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to promote safer behaviour on the road. One aim of policing is to contribute to a reduction in road crashes and related road deaths and hospitalisations.

The indicator is defined as the number of road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles.

A lower rate of road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles is a more desirable outcome. The rate of road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles is affected by a number of factors in addition to activities undertaken by police services, such as the condition of roads, driver education and advertising campaigns.

There were 12 road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles in Australia in 2004-05, which is unchanged from 2003-04. From 2000-01 to 2004-05, the number of deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles fell in most jurisdictions. Data from the ACT should be interpreted with caution, especially for 2004-05 (figure 5.44).

Figure 5.44 Road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles



Source: ATSB, *Fatal Road Crash Database*; ABS (various years), Cat. no. 9309.0 (unpublished); table 5A.54.

---

### *Land transport hospitalisations per registered vehicle*

'Land transport hospitalisations per registered vehicle' is another outcome indicator of governments' objective to promote safer behaviour on the road (box 5.27).

#### **Box 5.27 Land transport hospitalisations per registered vehicle**


'Land transport hospitalisations per registered vehicle' is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to promote safer behaviour on the road.

The indicator is defined as the number of hospitalisations from traffic accidents per 100 000 registered vehicles.

A lower number of hospitalisations from traffic accidents per 100 000 registered vehicles is a more desirable outcome. Hospitalisations from traffic accidents per 100 000 registered vehicles is affected by a number of factors in addition to activities undertaken by police services, such as the condition of roads, driver education and advertising campaigns.

There were 314 land transport hospitalisations per 100 000 registered vehicles in 2003-04 in jurisdictions where data were available (figure 5.45). There was no clear trend across jurisdictions between 2001-02 and 2003-04.

**Figure 5.45 Land transport hospitalisations per 100 000 registered vehicles**



Source: ABS (unpublished), Cat. no. 9309.0; AIHW (unpublished); table 5A.55.

### *Perceptions of road safety problems*

An objective of police services is to reassure the public by ensuring the community feels safe in driving and using the roads (box 5.28).

---

**Box 5.28 Perceptions of road safety problems**


'Perceptions of road safety problems' is an outcome indicator of police services' objective to promote safer behaviour on the road.

The indicator is defined as the proportion of people who felt that speeding cars or dangerous, noisy driving was a 'major problem' or 'somewhat of a problem' in their local area.

A smaller proportion of people who felt that speeding cars or dangerous, noisy driving was a 'major problem' or 'somewhat of a problem' in their local area, is a more desirable outcome. Perceptions of road safety may not reflect actual levels of road safety, however, many factors (including individual experiences and media reporting) may influence people's perceptions of road safety.

Nationally in 2004-05, 74.5 per cent of people surveyed believed speeding cars or dangerous, noisy driving to be a 'major problem' or 'somewhat of a problem' in their neighbourhood (similar to 75.3 per cent in 2003-04 and 2002-03) (figure 5.46).

**Figure 5.46 Proportion of people who felt that speeding cars or dangerous, noisy driving was a 'major problem' or 'somewhat of a problem' in their neighbourhood<sup>a</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> Data are based on responses from people aged 15 years or over.

Source: ACPR (unpublished); table 5A.35.

---

## 5.7 Services to the judicial process

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

Activities typically include:

- preparing briefs
- presenting evidence at court
- conducting court and prisoner security.


The role of police services in conducting court and prisoner security differs across jurisdictions.

### Framework of performance indicators

Police performance in undertaking these activities is measured using a suite of indicators that include the proportion of court cases resulting in guilty pleas or guilty findings, and the effectiveness of police in diverting offenders from the criminal justice system.

The performance indicator framework shows which data are comparable in the 2006 Report (figure 5.47). For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

Figure 5.47 Performance indicators for services to the judicial process



## Key performance indicator results

### Outputs

#### Equity — access

The Steering Committee has identified equity and access for services to the judicial process as an area for development in future reports (box 5.29).

#### Box 5.29 Performance indicator — access

An output indicator of governments' objective to facilitate equitable access for people with special needs for services to the judicial process has yet to be developed.

#### Effectiveness — proportion of juvenile diversions

'Proportion of juvenile diversions' is an output indicator of governments' objective to achieve efficient and effective court case management for judicial processing (box 5.30).

---

**Box 5.30 Proportion of juvenile diversions**

'Proportion of juvenile diversions' is an output indicator of governments' objective to support the judicial process to achieve efficient and effective court case management.

The indicator is defined as the number of juveniles who would otherwise be proceeded against (that is, taken to court) but who are diverted by police, as a proportion of all juvenile offenders formally dealt with by police. A higher proportion of juvenile diversions represents a more desirable outcome.

When police apprehend offenders, they have a variety of options available. They can charge the offender, in which case criminal proceedings occur through the traditional court processes, or they can use their discretion to divert the offender away from this potentially costly, time consuming and stressful situation (for both the offender and victim). Diversionary mechanisms include cautions and attendances at community and family conferences. These options can be beneficial because they allow the offender to be admonished, without the necessity of traditional court processes. They are particularly useful mechanisms for dealing with juvenile offenders.

The term 'diverted' includes diversions of offenders away from the courts by way of community conference, diversionary conference, formal cautioning by police, family conferences, and other diversionary programs (for example, drug assessment/treatment). Excluded are offenders who would not normally be sent to court for the offence detected and who are treated by police in a less formal manner (for example, those issued with warnings or infringement notices).

This indicator does not provide information on the relative success or failure of these diversionary mechanisms.

Table 5.1 **Juvenile diversions as a proportion of juvenile offenders (per cent)<sup>a</sup>**

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Qld<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>WA<sup>d</sup></i>	<i>SA<sup>e</sup></i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT<sup>f</sup></i>
2000-01	51	na	44	45	53	59	45	80
2001-02	57	30	44	44	49	68	48	57
2002-03	56	31	45	44	54	57	44	49
2003-04	54	30	45	39	55	56	42	na
2004-05	53	41	44	36	55	66	41	47

<sup>a</sup> 'Juvenile diversion' is defined in box 5.30. <sup>b</sup> For Victoria, results in 2004-05 reflect improved data capture. Results reflect only those instances where a juvenile is taken into police custody and subsequently issued with a formal caution. Instances where a juvenile is released into non-police care or involving a safe-custody application are not included. <sup>c</sup> For Queensland, data also include cautions and community conferences.

<sup>d</sup> Data for WA are for calendar years, not financial years. Juvenile diversions include juvenile cautions and referrals to Juvenile Justice Teams. The proportion of juvenile diversions has been calculated on total recorded police contacts with juvenile offenders, comprising juvenile cautions, referrals to Juvenile Justice Teams and charges pertaining to juveniles. A charge is counted as a separate 'arrest' even though the actual event of arrest may have involved more than one charge being laid. Hence, the number of 'arrests' will over estimate the number of actual events of arrest. The proportion of juvenile diversions, therefore, may be understated. <sup>e</sup> For SA, 2002-03 data include figures from the first full year of operation of the SA Drug Diversion Initiative. Diversions include diversion by way of formal cautioning by police, and family conferences. <sup>f</sup> For the NT, data also include verbal warnings. **na** Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.59.

The proportion of juvenile offenders undergoing diversionary programs varied across jurisdictions (table 5A.59). Across all jurisdictions, the proportion of juvenile diversions in 2004-05 was similar to that in 2003-04 (see table 5.1 above).

#### *Efficiency — dollars per person for judicial services*

'Dollars per person for judicial services' is an indicator of the efficiency of governments in delivering services to the judicial process (box 5.31).

**Box 5.31 Dollars per person for judicial services**

‘Dollars per person for judicial services’ is an output indicator of governments’ objective to undertake activities associated with police services to the judicial process in an efficient and effective manner.

The indicator is defined as expenditure per person on police services to the judicial process.


Lower expenditure per person for police judicial services is generally more desirable.

Efficiency data are difficult to interpret. While high expenditure per person may reflect poor efficiency, it may also reflect aspects of the service or characteristics of the policing environment (such as highly effective services or challenging judicial situations). Similarly, low expenditure per person may reflect efficient police services, alternatively it may reflect lower quality or less challenging judicial situations. Efficiency data thus need to be interpreted within the context of the effectiveness and equity indicators, to derive an holistic view of performance.

Nationally, of the jurisdictions able to provide data in 2004-05, estimated expenditure on services to the judicial process was \$33 per person (figure 5.48). Nationally, expenditure on judicial processes as a proportion of total police expenditure per person was 12 per cent (table 5A.15).

Nationally, real expenditure on services to the judicial process increased by \$1 per person, between 2003-04 and 2004-05 (from \$32 to \$33) (table 5A.60).

**Figure 5.48 Real expenditure per person (less payroll tax) on services to the judicial process (2004-05 dollars)<sup>a</sup>**



Ave = the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data. <sup>a</sup>Data have not been subjected to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mix of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.60.

*Efficiency — costs awarded against police in criminal actions*

Another indicator of the efficiency with which police undertake activities associated with the judicial process is ‘costs awarded against police in criminal actions’ (box 5.32.)

**Box 5.32 Costs awarded against police in criminal actions**

‘Costs awarded against police in criminal actions’ is an output indicator of governments’ objective to undertake activities associated with police services to the judicial process in an efficient manner.

This indicator is defined as the costs awarded against police in criminal actions, reported both as total dollars and per person in the jurisdiction

Lower costs awarded against police in criminal actions are more desirable. Court costs are generally awarded when a criminal action against an offender has failed; in this respect, it represents at least some of the resources expended when a prosecution fails.

Real costs awarded against police, for those jurisdictions providing data in 2004-05 are presented in table 5.2. Data are presented for total dollar amounts and costs per person in the relevant jurisdiction.

**Table 5.2 Real costs awarded against the police in criminal actions (2004-05 dollars)<sup>a</sup>**

	<i>Unit</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA(b)</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>
Total costs									
2000-01	\$'000	542	na	170	1 075	328	4	106	na
2001-02	\$'000	573	1 326	227	1 079	553	10	126	na
2002-03	\$'000	715	1 064	180	1 362	494	na	184	na
2003-04	\$'000	613	1 693	109	1 098	497	na	223	na
2004-05	\$'000	487	1 958	98	1 405	689	na	224	na
Total costs per person									
2000-01	\$	0.08	na	0.05	0.57	0.22	0.01	0.33	na
2001-02	\$	0.09	0.28	0.06	0.57	0.37	0.02	0.39	na
2002-03	\$	0.11	0.22	0.05	0.71	0.32	na	0.57	na
2003-04	\$	0.09	0.34	0.03	0.56	0.33	na	0.69	na
2004-05	\$	0.07	0.39	0.03	0.71	0.45	na	0.69	na

<sup>a</sup> Total costs awarded against the police resulting from summary offences and indictable offences tried summarily before a court of law. <sup>b</sup> For WA, the data for 2000-01 to 2003-04 have been revised significantly due to a change in the source and to reflect costs awarded against the police in Children’s Courts and Magistrates’ Courts throughout WA. **na** Not available.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.61.

---

## Outcomes

### *Deaths in police custody and custody-related operations, and Indigenous deaths in custody-related operations*

‘Deaths in custody and custody-related operations’, and ‘Indigenous deaths in custody’ are outcome indicators of governments’ objective to provide safe custody for alleged offenders, and ensure fair and equitable treatment for both victims and alleged offenders (box 5.33).

**Box 5.33 Deaths in custody and custody-related operations, and Indigenous deaths in custody**

‘Deaths in custody and custody-related operations, and ‘Indigenous deaths in custody’, are outcome indicators of governments’ objective to provide safe custody for alleged offenders, and ensure fair and equitable treatment for both victims and alleged offenders.

The indicators are defined as the number of non-Indigenous and Indigenous deaths in police custody and custody-related operations, reported both as numbers and as a rate per 100 000 of the relevant population.

For both indicators, a lower number of deaths in custody and custody-related operations is a better outcome.

Nationally, there were 27 deaths in police custody and custody-related operations in 2004 (down from 32 in 2003). This total comprised 21 non-Indigenous deaths and six Indigenous deaths. Across jurisdictions, there is a wide variation in the number of deaths, and caution needs to be taken when comparing jurisdictions’ rates due to small absolute numbers. Nationally, the death rate per 100 000 people over the period 2000–2004 was 0.79 (table 5.3).

Table 5.3 **Deaths in police custody and custody-related operations<sup>a</sup>**

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust<sup>b</sup></i>
Non-Indigenous deaths									
2000	12	2	2	1	4	–	–	–	21
2001	15	8	4	1	3	–	–	–	31
2002	12	7	4	2	–	1	–	–	26
2003	8	4	7	3	2	–	1	–	25
2004	7	4	5	2	2	–	1	–	21
Indigenous deaths									
2000	2	–	1	1	1	–	–	–	5
2001	–	–	–	2	2	–	–	–	4
2002	4	–	–	1	–	–	–	5	10
2003	1	–	1	4	–	–	–	1	7
2004	1	–	2	1	–	–	–	2	6
Total deaths									
2000	14	2	3	2	5	–	–	–	26
2001	15	8	4	3	5	–	–	–	35
2002	16	7	4	3	–	1	–	5	36
2003	9	4	8	7	2	–	1	1	32
2004	8	4	7	3	2	–	1	2	27
<b>Total 2000–2004</b>	62	25	26	18	14	1	2	8	156
Rate per 100 000 people (2000–2004) <sup>b</sup>	0.93	0.51	0.69	0.92	0.92	0.21	0.62	4.02	0.79

<sup>a</sup> Deaths in police custody include: deaths in institutional settings (for example, police stations/lockups and police vehicles, or during transfer to or from such an institution, or in hospitals following transfer from an institution); and other deaths in police operations where officers were in close contact with the deceased (for example, most raids and shootings by police). Deaths in custody-related operations cover situations where officers did not have such close contact with the person as to be able to significantly influence or control the person's behaviour (for example, most sieges and most cases where officers are attempting to detain a person, such as pursuits). <sup>b</sup> Rate calculated by using the average population during 2000–2004. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: AIC (various years), *Deaths in Custody, Australia*; table 5A.57.

### *Outcomes of court cases*

The police assist the judicial process in a variety of ways, including collecting evidence and providing testimony in court. Police work in this area can be measured to some extent by the success of the police in achieving a guilty plea or conviction.

Two sources are used to provide data on the outcomes of court cases for the 2006 Report:

- *ABS Criminal Courts collection* — higher court data for all jurisdictions.
- *Jurisdiction data* — lower court cases data based on Magistrates' criminal court data provided by each jurisdiction.

---

It is anticipated that future reports will include comparable ABS data for both higher and lower courts.

*Proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea*

The 'proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea' is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to support the judicial process (box 5.34).

**Box 5.34 Proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea**

'Proportion of lower court cases' resulting in a guilty plea is an outcome indicator of governments' objective to support the judicial process to achieve efficient and effective court case management for judicial processing.


The indicator is defined as the number of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea, as a proportion of the total number of lower court cases.

A higher proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea is a more desirable outcome.

This indicator does not provide information on the number of cases where police have identified a likely offender but choose not to bring the case to trial due to a number of factors. It also does not provide information on the number of minor offences where defendants opt for a guilty plea due to a variety of factors.

Four jurisdictions provided data on the proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea in 2004-05 (figure 5.49). Data should be treated with caution, however, as data are not directly comparable across jurisdictions.

Figure 5.49 Proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea<sup>a, b, c, d, e, f, g</sup>



<sup>a</sup> Data are not comparable across jurisdictions. <sup>b</sup> Lower court cases data are based on magistrates' criminal court data provided by each jurisdiction. <sup>c</sup> Data for NSW relate to calendar years. Exclude cases heard ex-parte, ie where defendant is not present and therefore has not made a formal statement admitting culpability. <sup>d</sup> For Queensland, the Queensland Wide Interlinked Courts database is unable to provide information consistent with the data dictionary — for example, 'no plea' includes ex-parte cases that are not recorded as a finding of guilty in this Report. <sup>e</sup> For WA, the proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea is based on the number of guilty pleas expressed as a percentage of the sum of guilty pleas and matters listed for trial. Data include cases that have been placed before the Children's Court and Magistrates' Courts throughout the State by the police and may also include a small number of cases placed before the Christmas Island Court by the Australian Federal Police. Criminal cases placed before the District and Supreme courts are not included. <sup>f</sup> For SA, data for 2003-04 refer to prosecutions finalised. The figure relates to a percentage of the total number of defendants appearing before a court. The court jurisdiction includes the Magistrates and the Youth Court. The percentage figure is a combination of both a guilty plea and a result of a guilty verdict, that is, the defendant was convicted, a charge was found proved without conviction or a charge was found proved with some other penalty/outcome. <sup>g</sup> Lower court data were not available for Tasmania, the ACT or the NT.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.58.

### *Proportion of higher court cases resulting in a guilty plea or finding*

The 'proportion of higher court cases resulting in a guilty plea or finding' is another outcome indicator of governments' objective to support the judicial process (box 5.35).

---

**Box 5.35 Proportion of higher court cases resulting in a guilty plea or finding**


'Proportion of higher court cases resulting in a guilty plea or finding' is included as an outcome indicator of governments' objective to support the judicial process to achieve efficient and effective court case management for judicial processing.

The indicator is defined as the number of higher courts finalised defendants who either submitted a guilty plea or were found guilty, as a proportion of the total number of higher courts finalised defendants.

A higher proportion of higher courts finalised defendants submitting a guilty plea or being the subject of a guilty finding represents a better outcome. This indicator does not provide information on the number of cases where police have identified a likely offender, but choose not bring the case to trial due to a variety of factors.

In 2003-04, the proportion of higher courts finalised defendants who either submitted a guilty plea or were found guilty varied slightly across jurisdictions (figure 5.50).

**Figure 5.50 Proportion of higher courts finalised defendants who either submitted a guilty plea or were found guilty<sup>a, b</sup>**



<sup>a</sup> All jurisdictions' data include guilty findings and guilty pleas. <sup>b</sup> A defendant can be either a person or organisation against whom one or more criminal charges have been laid.

Source: ABS (various years), Cat. no. 4513.0; table 5A.58.

---

## 5.8 Other services provided by police

Where possible, all jurisdictions have provided data on police activities within the four SDAs identified within the chapter (community safety and support; crime investigation; road safety and traffic management; and services to the judicial process). In some instances, jurisdictions cannot allocate particular activities or costs to the four SDAs already reported in this chapter, so a fifth SDA has been developed, called 'other services.' This SDA can include (but is not limited to) such things as information and licensing services, regulatory services and ministerial support services (see table 5A.10).

For this Report, only Queensland and WA have included expenditure under this SDA (table 5.4). As a proportion of each jurisdiction's total police expenditure in 2004-05, 'other services' represented 14.6 per cent of Queensland expenditure and 2.2 per cent of expenditure in WA (table 5A.15).

Table 5.4 **Real expenditure per person (less payroll tax) on 'other services' (2004-05 dollars)<sup>a, b</sup>**

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Ave
2001-02	–	–	na	5.96	–	na	2.32	na	0.78
2002-03	–	–	na	7.13	–	na	2.50	–	2.52
2003-04	–	4.56	7.01	7.70	–	na	–	–	3.31
2004-05	–	–	36.77	6.94	–	na	–	–	7.98

Ave = the weighted average of those jurisdictions that provided data. <sup>a</sup> Data have not been subjected to extensive tests to determine comparability. Further, some differences in counting rules may exist across jurisdictions as a result of the differing mix of activities undertaken within each of the common SDAs. <sup>b</sup> The Queensland Police Services (QPS) output activities for 2004-05 changed from six outputs in 2003-04 to four in 2004-05. Hence 'Other services' information is now aligned to new QPS output 'Professional Standards and Ethical Practice' which includes significant training expenditure which was previously distributed across other Outputs. The 2004-05 training component includes net direct training costs of \$51.307 million as well as indirect training costs. **na** Not available. – Nil or rounded to zero.

Source: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 5A.62.

## 5.9 Capital costs in the costing of police services

Capital costs (including depreciation and the user cost of capital) for each jurisdiction are contained in tables 5A.1–5A.8. Costs associated with non-current physical assets (such as depreciation and the user cost of capital) are potentially important components of the total costs of many services delivered by government agencies. Differences in the techniques for measuring non-current physical assets (such as valuation methods) may thus reduce the comparability of cost estimates across jurisdictions. In response to concerns regarding data comparability, the Steering Committee initiated a study, *Asset Measurement in the Costing of*

---

*Government Services* (SCRCSSP 2001). The aim of the study was to examine the extent to which differences in asset measurement techniques applied by participating agencies affect the comparability of reported unit costs.

In police services, the results reported in the study indicate that different methods of asset measurement could lead to quite large variations in reported capital costs. Considered in the context of total unit costs, however, the differences created by these asset measurement effects are relatively small, because capital costs represent a relatively small proportion of total cost. A key message from the study is that the adoption of nationally uniform accounting standards across all service areas would be a desirable outcome from the perspective of the Review. (The study results are discussed in more detail in chapter 2.)

## **5.10 Future directions in performance reporting**

While the Report provides information on the costs of services for each SDA, it has proved difficult to develop efficiency indicators for each SDA and for policing in general. At present, the only efficiency indicators shown are the total cost of service per person for each SDA. These are considered to be only partial efficiency measures, given the absence of agreed output measures.

Policing services are often delivered contemporaneously, covering a single SDA or even extending over several SDAs. Police response to a call for service, for example, will not only deal with the incident at hand, but may also increase police visibility and, therefore, provide public reassurance. Likewise, police road safety operations and crime investigations may also have crime prevention components.

The Review is therefore examining alternative methods for developing efficiency indicators. The approach is to identify issues of prime importance and the activities required to address them. Measures can then be made of the time and cost of activities, and of the actions resulting from those activities. Efficiency indicators would be defined in terms of the cost per unit of output, where output is defined as the sum of actions taken, weighted to reflect the importance of redressing the problem.

---

## **5.11 Jurisdictions' comments**

This section provides comments from each jurisdiction on the services covered in this chapter. Appendix A contains data that may assist in interpreting the performance indicators presented in this chapter. These data cover a range of demographic and geographic characteristics, including age profile, geographic distribution of the population, income levels, education levels, tenure of dwellings and cultural heritage (such as Indigenous and ethnic status).

---

## **New South Wales Government comments**

“

The mission of NSW Police is ‘police and community working together to establish a safer environment by reducing violence, crime and fear.’ The primary focus is on reducing crime and the community’s fear of crime-related problems. The development of local solutions to local problems, to ensure all people can freely enjoy their lawful pursuits, is undertaken in partnership with the community and government and non-government agencies.

Local Area Commands (LACs) are at the heart of service delivery. Performance at the State level is an accumulation of LACs and reflects the actions taken locally. However, the achievement of results, including reducing crime and improved community satisfaction, is influenced by many other factors other than NSW Police activity.

LACs are encouraged to engage in internal benchmarking, against past trends and in comparison to other LACs. At the State level, however, comparison with other States/Territories is considered less useful, as the information is neither timely nor sufficiently consistent to be used operationally.

This Report comprises, in the main, outcome or result indicators. In the pursuit of broadly common goals, each State/Territory may adopt a different approach and operational focus to achieve results. It is therefore difficult to derive meaningful and comparable output indicators, and efficiency measures are indeterminate. The different focuses may also confound the interpretation of some outcome indicators. For example, ‘Investigations finalised within 30 days’ is used as measure for Criminal Investigation. Some States, however, may have decided to focus attention on more-prolific offenders and to identify opportunities to restrict their criminality; in effect pursuing joint outcomes from investigations and crime prevention. The simple measure of finalised investigations is unable to reflect that offenders are detected for other matters and incapacitated as a result.

The challenge then is to provide a context for consideration of the results. In NSW, it is believed that intelligence-led policing, concentrating on identified hot-spots and more prolific offenders, is contributing to the reduction in reported crime (and hopefully the true level of crime incidence) and also to the lessening in concern for local problems.

”

---

## Victorian Government comments



Victoria Police achievements in 2004-05 have been significant. In delivering policing services to the community, Victoria Police has continued to focus on those things known to be of most importance to Victorians — preventing and reducing the overall incidence of crime, making the roads safer for all users and ensuring that people can feel safe in their homes and going about their normal daily activities.

The State's overall crime rate, measured per 100 000 population, has continued to fall. A 7.3 per cent reduction achieved in 2004-05 marks the fourth consecutive year in which the crime rate has been reduced and reflects a 21.5 per cent reduction since 2000-01. Over the same four-year period, theft of motor vehicles has been reduced by more than 50 per cent and residential burglaries have been reduced by a total 36.8 per cent. Robbery offences have also fallen dramatically, down some 50 per cent over the last four years.

Victoria Police has now completed the development of a new major crime management model. The new model establishes a dynamic and flexible investigative capacity and will enable it to deal more effectively with major and organised crime. The model builds on existing strengths and other new approaches to organised crime and intelligence management and will be progressively implemented across 2005-06.

The 2003-04 year saw the lowest ever incidence of death and serious injury on Victoria's roads. Unfortunately, there was a small increase in the number of road fatalities this year, with 338 people being killed on Victorian roads across 2004-05, compared with 333 at the same time last year. Victoria Police is committed to reducing the impact of road trauma on the community and to reducing the number of avoidable deaths on the State's roads. Our road policing operations will continue to target the identified causes of those deaths — particularly excessive speed and alcohol and drug — impaired driving.

Victoria Police will always aim to improve on the ways in which it delivers policing services to the community. It is anticipated that the review and re-development of the police Service Delivery Model, which is presently underway, will contribute to ensuring that Victoria Police delivers the best possible policing services to all Victorians.



---

## Queensland Government comments

“

In 2004, the Queensland Government published its Charter of Social and Fiscal Responsibility 2004. This document outlines the Government's commitment to delivering improved outcomes to the people of Queensland.

The Queensland Police Service contributes to the Government priorities: Protecting our children and enhancing community safety and Delivering responsive government. In support of these Government outcomes, the Queensland Police Service introduced its new Strategic Plan 2004–2008.

The Strategic Plan 2004–2008 established four primary 'Outputs', being Community Safety and Engagement; Crime Management; Traffic Management; and Professional Standards and Ethical Practice. Corporate Resource Management is included as an additional component of the Plan and covers areas undertaken to support the other four 'Outputs'.

Engaging the community through constructive partnerships with key groups and individuals has provided the foundation for Our Commitment to Service Delivery throughout 2004-05. The positive results achieved throughout the year, and the effectiveness of policing strategies applied to address areas of community concern, have been monitored, assessed and guided through the use of an effective performance management framework. This demonstrates and supports our commitment to providing high quality policing services to all members of the community.

In March 2005, the Service hosted the Conference of Commissioners of Police of Australasia and the South East Pacific Region. Police Commissioners or their delegates attended from all Australian jurisdictions, New Zealand and many of our neighbours in the Asia-Pacific region. The conference theme of "Performance Management" reinforced and supported the Service's strong commitment in this area.

During 2004-05, the Service has continued to progress the implementation of key government policy directions, including a strong focus on increasing police numbers and addressing key infrastructure requirements and the application of emerging technology to assist operational police in the optimum use of resources and to ensure continuous improvement in service delivery.

The Service's partnership-based approach to child protection has been a priority initiative in 2004-05. Through the Juvenile Aid Bureau, dedicated investigative resources are applied to manage juvenile justice and child protection issues throughout the State. The introduction of a new Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect model has been a key outcome of the implementation of the Government's Child Protection Blueprint.

”

---

## Western Australian Government comments



Since the findings of the Kennedy Royal Commission, the Western Australia Police (WAPOL) has committed to a wide ranging Reform program. With the service delivery philosophy *Frontline First* underscoring the changes, the WAPOL has focused on back-to-basics policing: reducing volume crime, antisocial behaviour and improving road-user behaviour. Through renewed enforcement efforts, this has resulted in the formation of dedicated highly-mobile units such as the Regional Operations Group and the Traffic Enforcement Group. Now fully operational, these groups provide a rapid response to public disorder incidents, and a strong police presence on freeways, highways and major arterial roads. In response to global trends, the agency's deterrent and response capacity has also been enhanced by the creation of a Counter Terrorism and State Security Portfolio, headed by an Assistant Commissioner.

The State Government has committed to an additional 350 police officers over the next four years and to the funding of an additional 160 civilianised positions. This civilianisation is part of a range of initiatives that have been undertaken to move police officers to frontline positions. Other strategies include reviewing the management of sick leave, the operational / non-operational status of police officer positions, deployment practises, revising transfer and tenure policies and reducing the imbalance in experience levels between Regional and Metropolitan WA. Of major significance has been the development of the \$20 million Police Assistance Centre (PAC). Operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, the PAC provides the capacity to answer 38 000 non-emergency calls per month, improving call taking capacity and further freeing up officers for frontline duties.

The *Frontline First* philosophy also captures the agency's focus on corruption resistance and the move towards a stronger performance and accountability-based management culture. The scope of change on WAPOL is evident from sixty of the seventy most senior positions within the organisation being filled by new appointments, since the introduction of the new Executive Team a year ago.

The changes brought about under *Frontline First* and the dedicated work of WA Police employees has resulted in a significant reduction in crime in Western Australia in 2004-05 compared with 2003-04. Burglary offences decreased by 21 per cent; steal motor vehicle offences decreased by 19.5 per cent; robbery decreased by nearly 14 per cent; and theft decreased by 10.5 per cent. Clearance rates for most offence categories also improved.



---

## South Australian Government comments

“

In 2004-05, South Australia Police (SAPOL) continued to contribute to the achievement of the crime reduction and road safety targets in South Australia's Strategic Plan – Creating Opportunity. The Plan recognises that successful economies are based on strong, inclusive communities within a safe and secure environment.

SAPOL continued to place great significance on working with the community to achieve improved community safety outcomes during 2004-05. A 6.6 per cent continued reduction in total crime reported by victims, contributed to a central component of the Plan ('Safe and Secure Communities') of a safer South Australia as the foundation for all community wellbeing and prosperity.

State security is now a community priority in light of terrorist threats. Response to State security issues is a key SAPOL issue, incorporating an ongoing participation in joint national initiatives and exercises. The Police Security Services Branch is also being restructured to enhance physical security to key community assets in the State.

SAPOL was also actively involved in several serious bushfires in 2004-05, as part of our core function of assisting the public in emergency situations and managing response to emergencies. Specialist personnel were also deployed to the South East Asia tsunami, as part of an international response to that emergency situation.

Change is a constant feature of policing. SAPOL has had a dynamic period of organisational reform since 1997, culminating in the second *Future Directions Strategy* 2003–2006, incorporating the South Australia Policing Model.

An important feature of the South Australia Policing Model is the localised problem solving response to community safety issues through fourteen Local Service Areas, supported by a range of centralised specialist services. By working with the community in this way, as in previous years, reaction to the delivery of policing services was very positive. During 2004-05, SAPOL achieved an 81.9 per cent rating for community confidence in their police.

While being guided by the organisational framework of the *Future Directions Strategy* 2003–2006, SAPOL has again recognised the need for continuous improvement through ongoing reform of policing service delivery, in order to remain responsive to community needs and expectations in a changing world. Through the launch of Project Compass in 2004-05, SAPOL will examine new and innovative methods of performance management, to support an enhanced achievement culture throughout the organisation.

”

---

## Tasmanian Government comments



During 2004-05, delivery of effective and efficient policing and emergency services to meet the needs of Tasmanians was underpinned by the Department of Police and Public Safety's Strategic Directions Framework and Business Plan. With service delivery orientated around a commitment to reassurance, readiness, responsiveness, and accountability, substantial progress was made towards achieving the longer-term benchmarks set out in Tasmania Together and implementing key government policy directions, particularly Safe at Home to reduce family violence.

The Department's efforts to constantly strive to develop and enhance an already strong performance management culture were assisted by robust accountability processes to review performance against agreed objectives that also provide for flexibility in responding to emerging trends.

The results have been generally pleasing with national crime statistics showing that Tasmania was below the national rate in all major offence categories. Total recorded offences decreased by 4 per cent which further consolidated the 15 per cent decrease achieved in 2003-04. Offences against the property decreased by a further 9 per cent, following a decrease of 17 per cent the previous year. The clearance rate also improved by a further 1.6 per cent to 31.3 per cent.

Although offences against the person increased, the increased willingness by partners and ex-partners to report family violence incidents to police, following successful introduction of the Tasmanian Government's Safe at Home initiative, contributed to this rise. Significantly, the clearance rate for offences against the person improved by a further two percentage points over the 2004-05 period to reach 93 per cent.

Even though Tasmania is one of the safest places in the world, in response to global trends and to further enhance our deterrent and response capacity, the Government has established a State Security Unit within Tasmania Police. This year a number of structural changes and equipment purchases were made to improve security arrangements, operational capabilities and to review critical infrastructure.

Importantly, the community continued to indicate it has a high regard for the police officers serving Tasmanians. Independent surveying by AC Nielsen showed that compared to the national average, more Tasmanians were satisfied with the services provided by police; felt that police treated people fairly and equally, that police were honest and that police performed their job professionally.



---

### **Australian Capital Territory Government comments**

“

ACT Policing has been a key stakeholder in the multi-agency ACT Crime Prevention Working Group, established by the ACT Government to identify crime priorities for the ACT. The Working Group identified burglary and motor vehicle theft as a first priority, culminating in the development of the ACT Property Crime Reduction Strategy 2004–07 “Building a Safer Community”.

The Strategy, launched by the ACT Chief Minister in August 2004, sets a reduction target of 10 per cent for burglaries and 25 per cent for motor vehicle theft by 31 December 2007. Actions have been developed under five key objectives, namely: Prevention Programs for High Risk Potential and Known Offenders; Law Enforcement; Designing Out Crime; Affordable Safety and Security; and Schools as Property Crime Victims.

Building a Safer Community recognises that ACT Policing has made major inroads into the management of property crime in the ACT but equally recognises that crime management is not just a matter for police. It encourages a whole-of-government approach — working together with police to sustain recent benchmarks by the combined weight of other government agencies, elements of the business community and other community groups to force crime to lower levels than the community has experienced for several years.

2004-05 also saw the expansion of restorative justice in the ACT capturing not only police diversion but diversion along the entire criminal justice continuum including post court and parole options. ACT Policing supports the program by providing dedicated resources including the secondment of personnel to the Restorative Justice Unit to deal with all police referrals to the unit. Phase 1 commenced on 31 January 2005 and applies to offences committed by young offenders. Phase 2, applying to all ages, will commence in January 2006.

”

---

## Northern Territory Government comments

“ During 2004-05, the Northern Territory Police continued to grow and develop following major restructures in the previous reporting period.

For the third consecutive year, reported crime has reduced significantly in the NT. This is as a result of the implementation of a Crime Reduction Strategy which concentrated on intelligence and forensic led policing in conjunction with crime reduction strategies focused on active repeat offenders, crime hot spots, crime scenes, and preventive patrolling.

Other crime reduction initiatives included the Violent Crime Reduction Strategy which was launched in November 2004, and which strengthens police response to incidents of personal and domestic violence. The Remote Community Drug Strategy was also implemented and has been successful in tackling the flow of illicit drugs into remote communities.

In line with emerging national priorities, the Counter Terrorism Security Unit further developed its capability to respond to terrorist activity. In April 2005, Northern Territory Police coordinated the largest ever counter terrorism exercise in the Northern Territory involving 800 people from a range of government and non-government agencies. There was also further training, exercising, planning and equipment procurement across the twelve recognised specialist counter terrorism areas.

Operational Performance Reviews (OPRs) were introduced in October 2004 with the aim ‘to effectively measure, evaluate and continually improve operational performance’. The development of the OPR process, which has been carefully integrated with the Business Performance Framework, is part of an accelerated evolution of changes leading to a performance management and continuous improvement culture across the Agency. It also leads to better resource management and increased customer value.

These strategies and initiatives align with the strong commitment of Northern Territory Police towards enhancing community safety and protection through the continued provision of excellent policing services.

”

---

## 5.12 Information on sample data

Some of the results reported are estimates obtained by conducting surveys with samples of the group or population in question. Results, therefore, are subject to sampling error. The data obtained from a sample may be different from the 'value' that would have been obtained from the entire group or population. Consequently, care needs to be taken when using survey results (see appendix A).

The standard error is a measure of sampling error. It indicates the extent to which the estimate may differ from the 'true value' because only a sample was taken. If the survey is performed repeatedly, then the difference between the sample estimate and the true value will be less than one standard error approximately 68 per cent of the time. The difference will be less than two standard errors 95 per cent of the time. It will be less than three standard errors 99 per cent of the time. Another way of expressing this is to say that in 68 (95, 99) of every 100 samples, the estimate obtained from a single survey will be within one (two, three) standard errors of the 'true' value.

The chance that an estimate falls within a certain range of the true value is known as 'the confidence interval of the estimate'. For any particular survey, there is a tradeoff between the confidence interval of the estimate (68 per cent, 95 per cent or 99 per cent) and the size of the survey. The appropriate level of confidence chosen depends on the purpose of obtaining the estimate.

The relative standard error is the standard error, expressed as a percentage of the estimate. It indicates the margin of error that should be attached to the estimate. The smaller the estimate, the higher is the relative standard error.

Table 5.5 indicates the confidence interval for sample estimates reported in this chapter. For example a point estimate of 50 per cent for NSW has a 95 per cent confidence interval of 48.5 per cent to 51.5 per cent. When comparing jurisdictions, estimates are statistically different only when confidence intervals do not overlap. A similar situation applies when comparing estimates between years.

**Table 5.5 95% Confidence bound to be applied to estimates from National Community Satisfaction with Policing Survey<sup>a</sup>**

<i>Estimate %</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
1 to 3	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.1
4 to 5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.5	± 0.5
6 to 8	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.0	± 1.5	± 0.5
9 to 14	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 2.0	± 0.5
15 to 25	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.5	± 0.5
26 to 30	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 3.0	± 0.5
31 to 46	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 3.0	± 0.5
47 to 53	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 2.5	± 2.5	± 2.5	± 2.0	± 3.0	± 1.0
54 to 69	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 3.0	± 0.5
70 to 74	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 3.0	± 0.5
75 to 85	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.0	± 2.5	± 0.5
86 to 91	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 2.0	± 0.5
92 to 94	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.0	± 1.5	± 0.5
95 to 96	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.0	± 1.5	± 0.5
97 to 99	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.5	± 0.1
<b>Comparing years</b>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Aust</i>
	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 1.5	± 2.5	± 2.5	± 2.5	± 2.0	± 3.0	± 1.0

<sup>a</sup> The ABS considers that only estimates with relative standard errors of 25 per cent or less are sufficiently reliable for most purposes. Estimates greater than 25 per cent are subject to sampling variability too high for most practical purposes and need to be treated with caution and viewed as merely indicative of the magnitude involved.

Source: ACPR (unpublished).

---

## 5.13 Definitions of key terms and indicators

<b>Armed robbery</b>	<p>Robbery conducted with the use (actual or implied) of a weapon, where a weapon can include, but is not restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• firearms — pistol, revolver, rifle, automatic/semi-automatic rifle, shotgun, military firearm, airgun, nail gun, cannon, imitation firearm and implied firearm</li><li>• other weapons — knife, sharp instrument, blunt instrument, hammer, axe, club, iron bar, piece of wood, syringe/hypodermic needle, bow and arrow, crossbow, spear gun, blowgun, rope, wire, chemical, acid, explosive, vehicle, other dangerous article and imitation weapons.</li></ul>
<b>Assault</b>	<p>The direct (and immediate/confrontational) infliction of force, injury or violence on a person(s) or the direct (and immediate/confrontational) threat of force, injury or violence where there is an apprehension that the threat could be enacted.</p>
<b>Available full time equivalent staff</b>	<p>Any full time equivalent category where the individual is on duty performing a function. To be measured using average staffing level for the whole reporting period.</p>
<b>Average non-police staff salaries</b>	<p>Salaries and payments in the nature of salary paid to civilian and other employees, divided by the total number of such employees.</p>
<b>Average police salaries</b>	<p>Salaries and payments in the nature of salary paid to sworn police officers, divided by the number of sworn officers.</p>
<b>Blackmail and extortion</b>	<p>Unlawful demanding with intent to gain money, property or any other benefit from, or with intent to cause detriment to, another person, accompanied by the use of coercive measures, to be carried out at some point in the future if the demand is not met. This may also include the use and/or threatened use of face-to-face force or violence, provided there is a threat of continued violence if the demand is not met.</p>
<b>Cautioning</b>	<p>A formal method of dealing with young offenders without taking court proceedings. Police officers may caution young offenders instead of charging them if the offence or the circumstance of the offence is not serious.</p>
<b>Civilian staff</b>	<p>Unsworn staff, including specialists (civilian training and teaching medical and other specialists) and civilian administrative and management staff.</p>
<b>Complaints</b>	<p>Number of statements of complaint by members of the public regarding police conduct.</p>
<b>Crimes against the person</b>	<p>Total recorded crimes against person, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• murder</li><li>• attempted murder</li><li>• manslaughter</li><li>• assault</li><li>• kidnapping/abduction</li><li>• armed robbery</li><li>• unarmed robbery</li><li>• sexual assault</li><li>• blackmail/extortion.</li></ul>

---

<b>Death in police custody and custody-related incident</b>	Death of a person who was in police custody; death caused or contributed to by traumatic injuries while in custody; death of a person who was fatally injured when police officers attempted to detain that person; or death of a person who was fatally injured when escaping or attempting to escape from police custody.
<b>Depreciation</b>	Where possible, based on current asset valuation.
<b>Driving causing death</b>	The unlawful killing of another person, without intent to kill, as a result of culpable, dangerous, reckless or negligent driving.
<b>Executive full time equivalent staff</b>	Number of executive full time equivalent staff, including civilian senior executive service and sworn (chief superintendent to assistant commissioner) staff.
<b>Full time equivalent (FTE)</b>	The equivalent number of full time staff required to provide the same hours of work as performed by staff actually employed. A full time staff member is equivalent to a full time equivalent of one, while a part time staff member is greater than zero but less than one.
<b>Indigenous full time equivalent staff</b>	Number of full time equivalent staff who are identified as being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent.
<b>Land transport hospitalisations</b>	Hospitalisations due to traffic accidents that are likely to have required police attendance; these may include accidents involving trains, bicycles and so on.
<b>Management full time equivalent staff</b>	Number of management full time equivalent staff, including civilian (managers) and sworn (inspector to superintendent) staff.
<b>Motor vehicle theft</b>	The taking of another person's motor vehicle illegally and without permission.
<b>Murder</b>	The wilful killing of a person either intentionally or with reckless indifference to life.
<b>Non-Indigenous full time equivalent staff</b>	Number of full time equivalent staff who do not satisfy the Indigenous staff criteria.
<b>Non-operational full time equivalent staff</b>	Any person who does not satisfy the operational staff criteria, including functional support staff only. Functional support full time equivalent staff include any person (sworn or unsworn) not satisfying the operational or operational support staff criteria (for example, finance, policy, research, personnel services, building and property services, transport services, and management above the level of station and shift supervisors).
<b>Other recurrent expenditure</b>	Maintenance and working expenses; expenditure incurred by other departments on behalf of police; expenditure on contracted police services; and other recurrent costs not elsewhere classified. Expenditure is disaggregated by service delivery area.
<b>Other staff</b>	All unsworn, non-civilian staff, including all auxiliary police personnel who are neither sworn officers nor strictly civilians because they are authorised to exercise statutory powers normally restricted to sworn officers. This category includes police cadets, police aides and special constables.
<b>Other theft</b>	The taking of another person's property with the intention of depriving the owner of the property illegally and without permission, but without force, threat of force, use of coercive measures, deceit or having gained unlawful entry to any structure, even if the intent was to commit theft.

<b>Outcome of investigations</b>	The stage reached by a police investigation after a period of 30 days has elapsed since the recording of the incident.
<b>Practitioner full time equivalent staff</b>	Number of practitioner full time equivalent staff, including civilian (administration) and sworn (constable to senior constable) staff.
<b>Property crimes</b>	Total recorded crimes against property, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• unlawful entry with intent</li> <li>• motor vehicle theft</li> <li>• other theft.</li> </ul>
<b>Proportion of higher court cases resulting in guilty finding</b>	Total number of higher courts finalised defendants resulting in a guilty plea or finding, as a proportion of the total number of higher courts finalised defendants. A defendant can be either a person or organisation against whom one or more criminal charges have been laid. <p>A higher court is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an intermediate court (known either as the district court or county court) that has legal powers between those of a court of summary jurisdiction (lower level courts) and a supreme court, and that deals with the majority of cases involving serious criminal charges</li> <li>• a supreme court (a higher court level which deals with the most serious criminal charges and has the greatest legal powers of all the State and Territory court levels) (ABS 2003c).</li> </ul> <p>Guilty finding is an outcome of a trial in which a court determines that the criminal charge against a defendant has been proven (ABS 2003c).</p>
<b>Proportion of juvenile diversions</b>	Total number of juvenile offenders who are diverted by police (for example, through the use of cautions, official warnings or other diversionary programs) away from the criminal justice system, as a proportion of the total number of juvenile offenders either diverted from or dealt with by the criminal justice system (that is, those who are either diverted or prosecuted).
<b>Proportion of lower court cases resulting in guilty plea</b>	Total number of cases (excluding committal hearings) heard before lower courts of law only, for which there was a plea of guilty, as a proportion of the total number of cases (excluding committal hearings) heard before lower courts of law only. <p>A lower court is a court of summary jurisdiction (commonly referred to as magistrates' court, local court or court of petty sessions) that deals with relatively less serious charges and has the most limited legal powers of all State and Territory court levels. Such courts are presided over by a magistrate and have jurisdiction to hear trial and sentence matters relating to summary offences. Under some circumstances, this court level may also deal with the less serious indictable offences known as 'minor indictable' or 'triable either way' offences (ABS 2003c).</p> <p>A guilty plea is the formal statement by a defendant admitting culpability in relation to a criminal charge. A not guilty plea is the formal statement by a defendant denying culpability in relation to a charge (ABS 2003c). For this data collection, a plea of 'not guilty' should also include 'no plea', 'plea reserved' and 'other defended plea'.</p> <p>Further, these definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• exclude preliminary (committal) hearings for indictable offences dealt</li> </ul>

---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>with by a lower court</li> <li>count cases that involve multiple charges as a 'lower court case resulting in a plea of guilty' if a plea of guilty has resulted for at least one of those charges.</li> </ul>
<b>Real expenditure</b>	Actual expenditure adjusted for changes in prices, using the GDP(E) price deflator, and expressed in terms of final year prices.
<b>Recorded crime</b>	Crimes reported to (or detected) and recorded by police.
<b>Registered vehicles</b>	Total registered motor vehicles, including motorcycles.
<b>Reporting rate</b>	The proportion of crime victims who told police about the last crime incident of which they were the victim, as measured a crime victimisation survey.
<b>Revenue from own sources</b>	Revenue from activities undertaken by police, including revenue from the sale of stores, plant and vehicles; donations and industry contributions; user charges; and other revenue (excluding fine revenue and revenue from the issuing of firearm licenses). Revenue is disaggregated by service delivery area.
<b>Road deaths</b>	Fatal road injury accidents as defined by the Australian Transport Safety Bureau.
<b>Robbery</b>	The unlawful taking of property from the immediate possession, control, custody or care of a person, with the intent to permanently deprive the owner of the property accompanied by the use, and/or threatened use of immediate force or violence.
<b>Salaries and payments in the nature of salary</b>	<p>Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>base salary package</li> <li>motor vehicle expenses that are part of employer fringe benefits</li> <li>superannuation, early retirement schemes and payments to pension schemes (employer contributions)</li> <li>workers compensation (full cost) including premiums, levies, bills, legal fees</li> <li>higher duty allowances (actual amounts paid)</li> <li>overtime (actual amounts paid)</li> <li>actual termination and long service leave</li> <li>actual annual leave</li> <li>actual sick leave</li> <li>actual maternity/paternity leave</li> <li>fringe benefits tax paid</li> <li>fringe benefits provided (for example, school fee salary sacrifice at cost to the government, car parking, duress alarms, telephone account reimbursements, 'gold passes', other salary sacrifice benefits</li> <li>fringe benefits provided (for example, school fee salary sacrifice at cost to the government, car parking, duress alarms, telephone account reimbursements, 'gold passes', other salary sacrifice benefits, frequent flier benefits, overtime meals provided, and any other components that are not part of a salary package)</li> <li>payroll tax.</li> </ul> <p>These are disaggregated by service delivery area.</p>
<b>Senior executive full time equivalent staff</b>	Number of senior executive full time equivalent staff, including civilian (top senior executive service) and sworn (commissioner, deputy commissioner and equivalent civilian executives) staff.

---

<b>Service delivery areas</b>	<p>The core areas of police work. Four service delivery areas are identified for the purposes of this Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• community safety and support</li> <li>• crime investigation</li> <li>• road safety and traffic management</li> <li>• services to the judicial process.</li> </ul> <p>A fifth service delivery area ('other' or 'other services') was identified to account for those unique functions of jurisdictions that were not directly associated with the aforementioned areas.</p> <p>While this is an attempt to identify common areas of core service delivery, their exact formats do not neatly fit with any jurisdiction or with how the jurisdictions measure or plan for performance.</p>
<b>Sexual assault</b>	<p>Physical contact of a sexual nature directed towards another person where that person does not give consent, that person gives consent as a result of intimidation or fraud, or consent is proscribed (that is, the person is legally deemed incapable of giving consent as a result of youth, temporary/permanent (mental) incapacity or a familial relationship). Includes rape, attempted rape, indecent assault and assault with intent to commit sexual assault. Excludes sexual harassment not leading to assault.</p>
<b>Supervisory full time equivalent staff</b>	<p>Number of supervisory full time equivalent staff, including civilian (team leaders) and sworn (sergeant to senior sergeant) staff.</p>
<b>Sworn staff</b>	<p>Sworn police staff recognised under each jurisdiction's Police Act.</p>
<b>Total capital expenditure</b>	<p>Total expenditure on the purchase of new or second hand capital assets, and expenditure on significant repairs or additions to assets that add to the assets' service potential or service life.</p>
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<p>Total capital expenditure plus total recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources).</p>
<b>Total FTE staff</b>	<p>Operational staff and non-operational staff, including full time equivalent staff on paid leave or absence from duty (including secondment and training), as measured using absolute numbers for the whole reporting period.</p>
<b>Total number of staff</b>	<p>Full time equivalent staff directly employed on an annual basis (excluding labour contracted out).</p>
<b>Total recurrent expenditure</b>	<p>Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• salaries and payments in the nature of salary</li> <li>• other recurrent expenditure</li> <li>• depreciation</li> <li>• less revenue from own sources.</li> </ul>
<b>Unarmed robbery</b>	<p>Robbery conducted without the use (actual or implied) of a weapon.</p>
<b>Unavailable full time equivalent staff</b>	<p>Any full time equivalent category where the individual is on paid leave or absent from duty (including secondment and training), as measured using the average staffing level for the whole reporting period.</p>
<b>Unlawful entry with intent — involving the taking of property</b>	<p>The unlawful entry of a structure (whether forced or unforced) with intent to commit an offence, resulting in the taking of property from the structure. Includes burglary and break and enter offences. Excludes trespass or lawful entry with intent.</p>
<b>Unlawful entry with intent — other</b>	<p>The unlawful entry of a structure (whether forced or unforced) with intent to commit an offence, but which does not result in the taking of</p>

---

	property from the structure. Excludes trespass or lawful entry with intent.
<b>Value of physical assets — buildings and fittings</b>	The value of buildings and fittings under the direct control of police.
<b>Value of physical assets — land</b>	The value of land under the direct control of police.
<b>Value of physical assets — other</b>	The value of motor vehicles, computer equipment, and general plant and equipment under the direct control of police.

---

## 5.14 Supporting tables

Supporting tables for chapter 5 are provided on the CD-ROM enclosed with the Report. The files are provided in Microsoft Excel format as \Publications\Reports\2006\Attach5A.xls and in Adobe PDF format as \Publications\Reports\2006\Attach5A.pdf.

Supporting tables are identified in references throughout this chapter by an 'A' suffix (for example, table 5A.3 is table 3 in the electronic files). These files can be found on the Review web page ([www.pc.gov.au/gsp](http://www.pc.gov.au/gsp)). Users without Internet access can contact the Secretariat to obtain these tables (see details on the inside front cover of the Report).

### Descriptors

<b>Table 5A.1</b>	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NSW
<b>Table 5A.2</b>	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Victoria
<b>Table 5A.3</b>	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Queensland
<b>Table 5A.4</b>	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, WA
<b>Table 5A.5</b>	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, SA
<b>Table 5A.6</b>	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, Tasmania
<b>Table 5A.7</b>	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, ACT
<b>Table 5A.8</b>	Police service expenditure, staff and asset descriptors, NT
<b>Table 5A.9</b>	Treatment of assets by police agencies, 2004-05
<b>Table 5A.10</b>	Concordance of individual police agency outputs with nationally agreed service delivery areas
<b>Table 5A.11</b>	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) on police services per person (2004-05 dollars)
<b>Table 5A.12</b>	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2001-02 (2004-05 dollars)
<b>Table 5A.13</b>	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2002-03 (2004-05 dollars)
<b>Table 5A.14</b>	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2003-04 (2004-05 dollars)
<b>Table 5A.15</b>	Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) per person on police services, by service delivery area, 2004-05
<b>Table 5A.16</b>	Police staff, by sworn/unsworn status
<b>Table 5A.17</b>	Police staff, by operational status (per cent)

---

### **Performance Indicators for All Service Delivery Areas**

<b>Table 5A.18</b>	General satisfaction with services provided by the police
<b>Table 5A.19</b>	Satisfaction with the police — dealing with public order problems and supporting community programs
<b>Table 5A.20</b>	Contact with police in the past 12 months
<b>Table 5A.21</b>	People who had contact with police in the past 12 months: satisfaction with police in most recent contact
<b>Table 5A.22</b>	People who had contact with police in the past 12 months: main reason for satisfaction and dissatisfaction with police service in most recent contact
<b>Table 5A.23</b>	Opinions on statement 'police perform job professionally'
<b>Table 5A.24</b>	Opinions on statement 'police treat people fairly and equally'
<b>Table 5A.25</b>	Opinions on statement 'most police are honest'
<b>Table 5A.26</b>	Opinions on statement 'have confidence in the police'
<b>Table 5A.27</b>	Trends in complaints
<b>Table 5A.28</b>	Indigenous, sworn and unsworn police staff
<b>Table 5A.29</b>	Police staff, sworn and unsworn, by gender (per cent)

### **Performance Indicators for Community Safety and Support**

<b>Table 5A.30</b>	Feelings of safety at home alone
<b>Table 5A.31</b>	Feelings of safety walking or jogging locally
<b>Table 5A.32</b>	Feelings of safety on public transport
<b>Table 5A.33</b>	Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in the neighbourhood
<b>Table 5A.34</b>	Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in the neighbourhood
<b>Table 5A.35</b>	Opinions on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in the neighbourhood
<b>Table 5A.36</b>	Opinion on whether family violence, sexual assault and other physical assault are problems in your State or Territory
<b>Table 5A.37</b>	Opinion on whether illegal drugs, housebreaking and motor vehicle theft are problems in your State or Territory
<b>Table 5A.38</b>	Opinion on whether speeding cars, dangerous or noisy driving, graffiti or other vandalism, louts or gangs and drunken or disorderly behaviour are problems in your State or Territory
<b>Table 5A.39</b>	Whether worried about being a victim by type of crime
<b>Table 5A.40</b>	Victims of homicide — crimes against the person (per 100 000 people)
<b>Table 5A.41</b>	Victims of recorded crimes — crimes against people (per 100 000 persons)

- 
- Table 5A.42** Victims of recorded crime — property crime (per 100 000 persons)
- Table 5A.43** Reporting rates for selected major offences (per cent)
- Table 5A.44** Estimated total victims of crime (unreported and reported) — crimes against the person (per 100 000 people)
- Table 5A.45** Estimated total household victims of crime, reported and unreported — crimes against property (per 100 000 households)
- Table 5A.46** Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on community safety and support (2004-05 dollars)

#### **Performance Indicators for Criminal Investigation**

- Table 5A.47** Outcomes of investigations of crimes against the person: 30 day status, 1 January to 31 December 2004
- Table 5A.48** Victims of property crime: outcomes of investigations, 30 day status, 1 January to 31 December 2004
- Table 5A.49** Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on crime investigation (2004-05 dollars)

#### **Performance Indicators for Road Safety and Traffic Management**

- Table 5A.50** People who have driven a motor vehicle in the past 12 months
- Table 5A.51** People who drive and who have travelled in a car not wearing a seat belt
- Table 5A.52** People who drive and have driven 10 kilometres per hour or more over speed limit
- Table 5A.53** People who drive and have driven while over alcohol limit
- Table 5A.54** Road fatalities
- Table 5A.55** Land transport hospitalisations
- Table 5A.56** Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on road safety and traffic management (2004-05 dollars)

#### **Performance Indicators for Services to the Judicial Process**

- Table 5A.57** Number of deaths in police custody and custody-related operations, 2000 to 2004
- Table 5A.58** Outcomes of court cases
- Table 5A.59** Juvenile diversions as a proportion of offenders (per cent)
- Table 5A.60** Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on services to the judicial process (2004-05 dollars)
- Table 5A.61** Real costs awarded against the police through criminal actions (2004-05 dollars)

#### **Performance Indicators for Other Services**

- Table 5A.62** Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources and payroll tax) per person on other services (2004-05 dollars)

---

## 5.15 References

- ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) 2005, *Recorded Crime – Victims, Australia 2004*, Cat. no. 4510.1, Canberra (and various years).
- 2004a, *Information Paper: Measuring Crime Victimisation, Australia: The Impact of Different Collection Methodologies*, Cat. no. 5522.0.55.001
- 2003b, *Crime and Safety, Australia 2002*, Cat. no. 4509.0, Canberra.
- 2004c, *Criminal Courts 2003-04, Australia*, Cat. no. 4513.0, Canberra.
- 2003d, *Motor Vehicle Census 2002, Australia*, Cat. no. 9309.0, Canberra.
- AIC (Australian Institute of Criminology) 2002, *Deaths in Custody, Australia* (and various years), Canberra.
- 2005, *Homicide in Australia: 2003–2004 National Homicide Monitoring Program (NHMP) Annual Report*, Canberra.
- ATSB (Australian Transport Safety Bureau) 2004, *Fatal Road Crash Database*, [www.atsb.gov.au](http://www.atsb.gov.au) (accessed 30 September 2004).
- CJC (Criminal Justice Commission) 1996, *The Nature of General Police Work*, Research Paper Series, vol. 3, no. 2, Brisbane.
- SCRCSSP 2001, *Asset Measurement in the Costing of Government Services*, Canberra.

