Justice and Policing in Australia

Measurement of Police Performance

Mag. Dirk Steller (BCom., Ass. Dip.)
A. Univ. Prof. Mag. Dr. Kurt Promberger
# Table of Contents

PART 1 - Justice and Policing in Australia ................................................................................. 6

1. The Australian Political System ......................................................................................... 6
   1.1 Overview .................................................................................................................. 6
   1.2 Ministerial Responsibility for Police Services ......................................................... 7

2. The Justice System in Australia – A general overview .................................................. 7

3. Government Expenditure on Justice ................................................................................. 9

4. Police Services in Australia .............................................................................................. 11
   4.1 Expenditure on Policing ............................................................................................ 11
      4.1.1 Expenditure by key service delivery area ............................................................. 12
      4.1.2 Staffing .............................................................................................................. 13

5. National Performance Indicators for Police Services ..................................................... 15
   5.1 General Framework for Performance Measurement .................................................. 15
   5.2 Indicators Relevant to all SDAs ................................................................................ 16
      5.2.1 Satisfaction with police services ................................................................. 17
      5.2.2 Perceptions of police integrity ........................................................................ 17
      5.2.3 Complaints ....................................................................................................... 17
      5.2.4 Access and Equity ............................................................................................ 18
   5.3 Indicators for Community Safety and Support .......................................................... 18
      5.3.1 Perceptions of Safety ....................................................................................... 19
      5.3.2 Perceptions of Crime Problem ......................................................................... 20
      5.3.3 Recorded Crimes and Crime Victimisation – Recorded crimes against the person 20
      5.3.4 Recorded Crimes and Crime Victimisation – Recorded property crimes ...... 21
   5.4 Indicators for Crime Investigation .............................................................................. 21
      5.4.1 Outcomes of investigations – crimes against the person .................................... 22
      5.4.2 Outcomes of investigations – property crime .................................................... 22
   5.5 Indicators for Road Safety and Traffic Management .................................................. 23
      5.5.1 Use of Seat Belts ............................................................................................... 23
      5.5.2 Driving Under the Influence ............................................................................ 23
      5.5.3 Degree of Speeding .......................................................................................... 24
      5.5.4 Road Deaths ..................................................................................................... 24
      5.5.5 Land Transport Hospitalisations ...................................................................... 25
      5.5.6 Perceptions of Road Safety Problems ............................................................ 25
      5.5.7 Efficiency ......................................................................................................... 25
   5.6 Indicators for Services to the Judicial Process ............................................................. 25
      5.6.1 Deaths in Custody ............................................................................................. 27
      5.6.2 Outcomes of Court Cases ............................................................................... 27
      5.6.3 Juvenile Diversions ........................................................................................... 27
   5.7 Indicators for Other Services ...................................................................................... 27

Conclusion ............................................................................................................................. 28
PART 1 - Justice and Policing in Australia

1. The Australian Political System

1.1 Overview

Australia is a federation comprising six states and two federal territories. The parliamentary and governmental systems of the federal government, and each of the State and Territory governments, are based on the British Westminster model.

In 1901 the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act (Australian Constitution) provided for the conversion of the then six self-governing British colonies into the states of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania and established the Commonwealth Parliament of Australia as the overarching legislative body.

The legislative power of the federal Parliament is, under the Australian Constitution, confined to matters of overseas and interstate trade and commerce, taxation, broadcasting, telephonic and postal services, defence, trading and financial corporations and external affairs.

Although the areas in which the federal Parliament can legislate are significantly limited by the Constitution, its power in relation to taxation matters means that it collects approximately 70 per cent of total revenue. In addition, the Constitution allows the federal government to grant money it has raised to the states (and to other bodies and individuals) and to impose specific conditions on how these grants may be used. This has provided the federal government with the ability to exercise influence in areas not covered by its constitutional mandate.

The federal Parliament consists of two houses, the House of Representatives (or lower house) and the Senate (or upper house). A government is usually formed by the party or coalition that holds the most seats in the House of Representatives. The leader of this party or coalition will then, in the normal course of events, be appointed as the Prime Minister and take on the formal role of the leader of government. In addition to the Prime Minister, Portfolio Ministers are also appointed and together they make up the Cabinet.

The responsibilities of the Commonwealth Government are divided into groupings called ‘portfolios’. Each portfolio is made up of one or more departments and agencies which are responsible for the delivery of government services.

Normal practice is for the Prime Minister to appoint persons from his/her political party as Portfolio Ministers, who then take on responsibility for implementation of the government’s policies in their portfolio. Most major policy matters are discussed and decided upon in Cabinet meetings.

The political process in State and Territory parliaments operates, in principle, similarly to that in the Commonwealth.
1.2 Ministerial Responsibility for Police Services

The responsibilities for policing services are differently split depending on the administrative arrangements that are in place in each of the State, Territory and Commonwealth Governments.

In general, responsibility for policing services usually falls under the umbrella of either the Justice Portfolio or the Attorney General’s Portfolio. In some cases Police Services represent a separate portfolio. Given that portfolios are able to have more than one responsible minister, there is often a minister who is responsible specifically for police services. The minister for police is also often responsible for emergency services.

2. The Justice System in Australia – A general overview

The Australian criminal justice system is made up of institutions, agencies, departments and personnel at both State/Territory and Commonwealth levels. These organisations are responsible for dealing with the justice aspects of crime, and related issues and processes.

Two systems of criminal justice exist in Australia:

1. the federal criminal justice system, based on offences against Commonwealth laws; and

2. the State criminal justice system, based on offences against State laws.¹

Criminal law in Australia is administered through:

- federal police agencies;
- State and Territory police agencies;
- the National Crime Authority;
- the Courts; and
- State and Territory corrective or penal services (there is no independent federal corrective service).²

Legislative responsibilities in Australia are divided up between the State/Territory and Commonwealth through the Constitution. One of the main principles governing the division of legislative powers in Australia is that all powers not specifically vested in the Commonwealth are the responsibility of State and Territory governments. Given this, it is the statute law and the common law of the States and Territories that primarily govern the day-to-day lives of most Australians.

As described above, the eight States and Territories all have the power to enact criminal law and the Commonwealth has the power to enact laws in relation to its responsibilities under the Constitution. Therefore, in effect, there are nine different systems of criminal law in existence in Australia.

The Australian criminal justice system consists of various agencies that operate within a process in which criminal incidents and offenders move through a number of stages. Figure 1.1 provides an overview of the different stages in the process.

**Figure 1.1 – The Australian Criminal Justice System**

---

[a] Does not account for all variations across jurisdictions. b The flow diagram is indicative and does not seek to include all the complexities of the justice system. c Includes voluntary agreement to attend court in some jurisdictions. d Appeals are referred to higher courts. Lower court sentencing is upheld for unsuccessful appeals. e Juvenile justice is covered in the ‘Community services’ section.

3. Government Expenditure on Justice

The total recurrent expenditure, less revenue from own sources, on the justice system in Australia was almost $7.0 billion in 2001-02 (see table 1.1).

Police services accounted for approximately $4.6 billion in 2001-02, corrective services for around $1.6 billion and criminal courts administration for $412 million. Expenditure on civil justice (including Federal Court, Federal Magistrates Service and family courts) was approximately $375 million.\(^3\)

Table 1.1 – Real recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) on justice by all Australian governments (2001-02 dollars) a, b, c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>4289</td>
<td>4521</td>
<td>4496</td>
<td>4610</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court admin. – criminal(^d)</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court admin. – civil(^e)</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective services</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total justice system</td>
<td>5943</td>
<td>6493</td>
<td>6899</td>
<td>6802</td>
<td>6984</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | %       | %       | %         | %       | %       | %                            |
| Police services      | 66.1    | 66.1    | 65.5      | 66.1    | 66.0    | ..                            |
| Court admin. – criminal | 6.9    | 6.8     | 6.4       | 6.6     | 5.9     | ..                            |
| Court admin. – civil | 7.3     | 7.3     | 7.1       | 5.3     | 5.4     | ..                            |
| Corrective services  | 19.7    | 19.9    | 21.0      | 22.0    | 22.7    | ..                            |
| Total justice system | 100.0   | 100.0   | 100.0     | 100.0   | 100.0   | 100.0                         |

\(^a\) Totals may not sum as a result of rounding. \(^b\) For police and courts, defined as recurrent expenditure plus depreciation less revenue from own sources (excludes capital expenditure and estimates of the user cost of capital). For corrective services, total net expenditure includes recurrent expenditure (not of recurrent receipts), the cost of transport and escort services, and capital costs comprising depreciation on government owned facilities, debt service fees for privately owned facilities, capital asset charges, and other associated capital expenses, but excludes the user cost of capital. \(^c\) Payroll tax has been included for all jurisdictions except WA and the ACT (where government operations are not subject to payroll tax). \(^d\) Includes the cost of magistrates’ (including electronic and children’s), district/country, supreme and coroners’ courts. \(^e\) Includes magistrates’ (including children’s), district/country and supreme courts, Family Court, Federal Court of Australia and Family Court of WA. The Federal Magistrates Service has been included for the first time in 2001-02. The data exclude the cost of probate hearings for all years. \(^f\) Court administration expenditure less income has been used instead of in-house revenue in 2000-01 and 2001-02. This has led to a much larger amount of revenue from own sources, particularly for the civil courts for these two years. Care needs to be taken in comparing the rates of growth of court expenditure prior to these years. \(^g\) The data for court administration (criminal) include a large amount of income from electronic courts not previously reported. .. Not applicable.

Source: Commonwealth, State and Territory governments (unpublished).

Recurrent expenditure, less revenue from own sources, between the period 1997-98 and 2001-02 grew fastest in real terms for corrective services (at an annual average rate of 7.9 per cent). A decrease was experienced in the area of civil courts administration (annual average average

of 3.6 per cent). However, due to changes in the collection of data over this period care should be taken in interpreting this data.

Also of interest, is the recurrent expenditure on a per person basis. Recurrent expenditure, less revenue from own sources, on the Australian justice system in 2001-02 was $361 per person (see table 1.2).

Table 1.2 – Recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) on justice, per person, 2001-02 a, b, c, d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>Vic</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Tas</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>Aust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>$353</td>
<td>$296</td>
<td>$344</td>
<td>$411</td>
<td>$348</td>
<td>$331</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$854</td>
<td>$361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court admin. – criminal</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court admin. – civil</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective services</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total justice system</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a For police and courts, defined as recurrent expenditure plus depreciation less revenue from own sources (excludes capital expenditure and estimates of the user cost of capital). For corrective services, total net expenditure includes recurrent expenditure (not of recurrent receipts), the cost of transport and escort services, and capital costs comprising depreciation on government owned facilities, debt service fees for privately-owned facilities, capital asset charges, and other associated capital expenses, but excludes the user cost of capital. b Payroll tax has been included for all jurisdictions except WA and the ACT (where government operations are not subject to payroll tax). c Totals may not sum as a result of rounding. d For corrective services and court administration the population is estimated at 30 June 2002. e For police services the population is estimated at 31 December 2001. f Australian total includes Commonwealth expenditure on the Family Court of Australia, the Federal Court, and the Federal Magistrates Service which are not attributed to jurisdiction expenditure. The civil expenditure on those Commonwealth courts are $9 per person (based on the Australian population). g WA civil data are not comparable with other jurisdictions, as the WA civil data include the cost of the Family Court of WA. If this cost was removed then the cost per person becomes $15 within WA. h Excludes cost of probate hearings. i Due to the use of two different population bases, the total justice system expenditure per person should be viewed as an approximation.

Source: Commonwealth, State and Territory governments (unpublished); ABSa, ABSb.

Per person expenditure on civil and criminal justice in 2001-02 was highest in the Northern Territory ($854) and lowest in Victoria ($296). Per person expenditure on police services were also highest in the Northern Territory ($541) and lowest in Victoria ($225).
4. Police Services in Australia

The State and Territory police services are the principal means through which the achievement of a safe and secure environment for the community, the investigation of offences and provision of services to the judicial process, and the provision of road safety and traffic management.

Police are involved in a wide range of activities aimed at reducing the incidence and effect of criminal activity. The police forces are also involved in the provision of services such as assisting emergency services, mediating family and neighbourhood disputes, delivering messages regarding death or serious illness and advising on general policing services.⁴

The responsibilities for policing lie with the relevant State and Territory governments, except in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT), where the Australian Federal Police (AFP) provides a community policing service. This community policing service is provided under the means of a purchaser/provider arrangement between the ACT government and the AFP (see Chapter 4 for further details).

The State and Territory police services are autonomous, but there is significant cooperation between the police services, particularly in the areas of forensic sciences and policing research.

4.1 Expenditure on Policing

Policing services in Australia are funded almost solely from State and Territory budgets, plus some limited specific purpose grants from the Commonwealth. As detailed above, real recurrent expenditure, less revenue from own sources, on police services was approximately $4.6 billion (or $240 per person) in the 2001-02 year.

On a per person basis, real recurrent expenditure, less revenue from own sources, is fairly consistent across Australia, except in the Northern Territory where policing expenditure is nearly double the national average. Figure 1.2 details per person policing expenditure for the period 1997-98 to 2001-02.

### 4.1.1 Expenditure by key service delivery area

The Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Delivery, in its Report on Government Services 2003, disaggregated police services into four Service Delivery Areas (SDAs), and a fifth area called ‘other services’ to account for expenditure not included in the SDAs.

The SDAs defined by the Committee are:

- Community safety and support;
- Crime investigation;
- Road safety and traffic management;
- Services to the judicial process; and
Other services.\(^5\)

**Figure 1.3 – Recurrent expenditure (less revenue from own sources) on police services, by service delivery area, 2001-02** \(^{a,b,c}\)

The SDA consuming the largest amount of expenditure in 2001-02 was community safety and support, accounting for 53.6 per cent of expenditure. Crime investigation consumed the second largest portion of expenditure, accounting for 22.9 per cent nationally.

4.1.2 Staffing

The staffing structure in Australian police forces is split into two major categories; (1) Sworn police officers, who have police powers, including the power to arrest, summons, caution, detain, fingerprint and search; and (2) non-sworn officers, who are civilian employees undertaking duties that do not require police powers, for example, administrative work, crime scene analysis and intelligence analysis.

In recent years there has been a trend towards increasing the numbers of non-sworn officers into the police force. There are three main objectives of this ‘civilianisation’ of police services. They are:

- to reduce costs;
- to better manage the increasing need for specialist skills; and
- to reduce the involvement of sworn police officers in duties that do not require police powers.\(^6\)

---


Table 1.3 – Police staff by sworn/unsworn status (staff members per 100 000 people)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>Vic</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Tas</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>Aust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sworn police staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsworn police staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>na</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>265</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>242</td>
<td><strong>na</strong></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comprises all full time equivalent (FTE) staff.  
  b NSW data for 2001-02 are based on a headcount at 30 June 2002 and are not FTE data.  
  c For 2001-02 WA sworn staff data exclude 130 recruits in training. Recruits in training were included in data for previous years.  
  d In the ACT, civilisation of support functions has occurred throughout 2000-01 with the ‘communications centre’ now being substantially staffed by non-sworn staff. In addition, as a result of a comprehensive review of enabling costs applicable to ACT Policing in 2000-01, the formula previously applied to the calculation of staffing and expenditure data has been significantly revised. This methodological shift means that data relating to staffing and expenditure from 2000-01 onwards are not directly comparable to data prior to 2000-01.  
  e For the NT, sworn police officers include police auxiliaries and Aboriginal community police officers.  
  f Not available.

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

In 2001-02 the total police staffing in Australia was 55 108 (or 281 staff per 100 000 people). This comprised 218 sworn police officers and 63 non-sworn employees per 100 000 people. Significant variations can be seen across Australian jurisdictions, for example, in the Northern Territory total staff per 100 000 people was 580 compared to 242 staff per 100 000 people in the ACT. See table 1.3 for further details.

For analysis purposes, it is also useful to look at police staffing levels based on operational status. Police staff have been separated into two categories; (1) operational staff, who are any persons (sworn or unsworn) who deliver or support a police or police related service directly to an external customer (i.e. members of the public, other government departments, courts and the government); and (2) non-operational staff, who are any persons not meeting the criteria for classification as operational staff, including functional support staff, such as finance staff and personnel services staff.7 Table 1.4 provides a breakdown of police staff by operational status.

---

Table 1.4 – Police staff by operational status (per cent) \(^a, b\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational staff</th>
<th>NSW(^c)</th>
<th>Vic</th>
<th>Qld(^d)</th>
<th>WA(^e)</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Tas(^f)</th>
<th>ACT(^g)</th>
<th>NT(^h)</th>
<th>Aust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Non-operational staff | 1998-99 | 11.0 | 17.7 | 3.5 | 7.2 | 9.5 | 8.9 | 20.3 | 11.9 | 12.8 |
|                       | 1999-2000 | 9.1 | 18.0 | na | 7.8 | 9.8 | 14.4 | 7.9 | 16.2 | 11.8 |
|                       | 2000-01 | 17.6 | 18.7 | 34.5 | 8.6 | 9.0 | 16.7 | 13.1 | 16.8 | 19.4 |
|                       | 2001-02 | 16.4 | 17.8 | 17.4 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 16.5 | 13.1 | 18.7 | 16.2 |

\(^a\) Comprises all FTE staff. \(^b\) The definition of operational status is quite broad and may be interpreted differently across jurisdictions and over time. \(^c\) For 2000-01, NSW operational/non-operational staffing figures are not comparable with previous years as information is derived based on location and position description, whereas earlier years it is based on location only. For 2001-02, NSW data are based on a headcount at 30 June 2002 and are not FTE data. \(^d\) For Queensland, the definitions of operational and non-operational status does not align with the national data dictionary. Therefore care needs to be taken when comparing Queensland with other jurisdictions. \(^e\) For WA, 2001-02 data excludes 130 recruits in training. Data for previous years included recruits in training. \(^f\) The 1998-99 figure accidentally included operational marine and emergency staff. \(^g\) These are services unique to Tasmania and should not have been included. \(^h\) In 2000-01, as a result of a comprehensive review of enabling costs applicable to ACT Policing, the formula previously applied to the calculation of staffing and expenditure data has been significantly revised. This methodological shift means that data relating to staffing and expenditure from 2000-01 onwards are not directly comparable to data prior to 2000-01. \(^i\) For the NT, sworn police officers include Police Auxiliaries and Aboriginal Community Police Officers. \(^j\) na not available.

Source: State and Territory governments, (unpublished); table 5A.17.

5. National Performance Indicators for Police Services

The Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Delivery, in its Report on Government Services 2003, developed a general approach for the measurement of performance on a national basis. Each State and Territory police force manages its own set of performance indicators for internal decision making and reporting purposes. The performance measurement framework described below has been developed to allow a direct comparison between the various police forces.

5.1 General Framework for Performance Measurement

The performance measurement framework developed by the Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Delivery, in its Report on Government Services 2003, is built around the four Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) and an additional area ‘other services’ for those activities not directly attributable to one of the SDAs (as identified in Section 4.1.1).

Figure 1.4 provides an overview of the performance measurement framework and particularly, the desire of the Steering Committee to measure both effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery in each of the SDAs. In reality, it has not been possible for the Steering Committee to develop directly comparable or complete indicators for all of the SDAs. The majority of indicators are focused on the effectiveness of police services and are measured through the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing.
5.2 Indicators Relevant to all SDAs

In addition to the performance indicators specific to each of the SDAs, the Steering Committee identified five areas relevant to all SDAs. These are:

1. satisfaction with police services;
2. perceptions of police integrity;
3. complaints;
4. access and equity – indigenous staff; and
5. access and equity – staffing by gender.\(^8\)

Areas 1 and 2 are measured through the use the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing and areas 3, 4 and 5 are measured through data collected and supplied by the individual police forces.

5.2.1 Satisfaction with police services

In order to measure the community’s satisfaction with police services people are asked “how satisfied are you in general with the services provided by the police?” and “how satisfied were you with the service you received during your most recent contact with police?”.

Satisfaction with police services is measured by two indicators. They are:

1. percentage of people aged 18 years and over who were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with police services; and
2. percentage of people aged 18 years and over who were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with police in their most recent contact.9

The results of the 2001-02 survey indicated that 69 per cent of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with police services and 80.2 per cent of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with police in their most recent contact.

5.2.2 Perceptions of police integrity

A further area measured through the use of the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing is perceptions of police integrity.

Public perceptions of police integrity are measured by three indicators. They are:

1. percentage of people aged 18 years and over who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people fairly and equally;
2. percentage of people aged 18 years and over who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police perform the job professionally; and
3. percentage of people aged 18 years and over who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that most police are honest.10

The 2001-02 survey indicated that 65.0 per cent of respondents ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police treat people fairly and equally, 70 per cent of respondents ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that police perform the job professionally and 74.4 per cent of respondents ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that most police are honest.

5.2.3 Complaints

In recent years Australian police forces have encouraged the implementation of customer service codes that encourage openness and accountability. In line with this trend, police forces record all complaints against police officers, which provides useful information in relation to various aspects of police service delivery.

---

Indicators in relation to complaints against police are detailed in two forms. They are:

1. complaints against police officers per 100,000 people; and
2. complaints against police officers per 100 sworn police staff.\(^{11}\)

5.2.4 Access and Equity

A further area that can be used as an indicator of the organisational culture within Australian police forces is the number of indigenous staff members and female staff members. Indigenous staffing is most relevant in central and northern Australia where the indigenous community has the largest density.

Indigenous Staffing

Indigenous staffing has one indicator and represents the number of indigenous staff as a proportion of working age indigenous Australians.

1. indigenous staff (sworn and unsworn) as a proportion of the indigenous population aged between 20-64 years of age.\(^{12}\)

Staffing by Gender

Staffing by gender has two indicators. They are:

1. female staff (sworn and unsworn) as a proportion of total staff; and
2. female staff (sworn and unsworn) per 100 staff.\(^{13}\)

5.3 Indicators for Community Safety and Support

The service delivery area of ‘community safety and support’ is focused on 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; and
- undertaking crime prevention activities and community support programs.

As described in section 5.1, the Steering Committee has established performance indicators for both effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the SDA ‘community safety and support’. Figure 1.5 provides an overview of the performance indicator structure.

The effectiveness indicators have been split into two groups, (1) indicators of outcomes; and (2) indicators of access and equity. However, the access and equity indicators are yet to be developed.

The indicators in relation to outcomes have two main information sources. The information for indicator groups (1) perceptions of safety and (2) perceptions of crime problem is sourced

---


through the Nations Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing (NSCSP). The information for the indicator groups (3) reported crimes and (4) crime victimisation is sourced through data collected and supplied by the police forces. A fifth indicator group ‘reporting rates’ is intended to provide data on the level of crime reporting (i.e. an indication of the amount of crimes, in selected offence categories, that are not reported to police). This information is collected and supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS).

In relation to efficiency indicators, the Steering Committee has chosen to report the efficiency of the community safety and support SDA on a dollars per person basis.

**Figure 1.5 – Performance Indicators for Community Safety and Support**
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**Key to indicators**

- Provided on a comparable basis for this Report
- Information not complete or not strictly comparable
- Yet to be developed or not collected for this Report


### 5.3.1 Perceptions of Safety

The indicator group ‘perceptions of safety’ has been reported through four indicators derived from responses to questions in the NSCSP. The indicators are:

- the proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home alone during the day;
- the proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ at home after dark;
- the proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ walking of jogging locally after dark; and
- the proportion of people who felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ on public transport after dark.\(^{14}\)

---

5.3.2 Perceptions of Crime Problem

The indicator group ‘perceptions of crime problem’ has also been derived from responses to questions in the NSCSP. In order to identify community perceptions to various types of criminal activity, the NSCSP identified ten crime areas, they are:

1. housebreaking;
2. drugs;
3. vehicle theft;
4. driver behaviour;
5. physical assault;
6. graffiti/vandalism;
7. louts/gangs;
8. sexual assault;
9. family violence; and
10. drunken behaviour.\(^{15}\)

There are two indicators reported on, in relation to these types of criminal activity. They are:

- the proportion of people aged 18 and over who consider the identified issues to be either a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem’ in the State or Territory; and
- the proportion of people aged 18 and over who consider the identified issues to be either a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem’ in the neighbourhood and general community.\(^{16}\)

5.3.3 Recorded Crimes and Crime Victimisation – Recorded crimes against the person

The indicator group ‘record crimes and crime victimisation – recorded crimes against the person’ has three indicators, which are reported on a victims per 100 000 people basis.

The indicators are:

- recorded victims of murder (per 100 000 people);
- recorded victims of assault (per 100 000 people); and
- recorded victims of armed robbery (per 100 000 people).\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\) Productivity Commission, Report on Government Services 2003, Commonwealth of Australia, ch 5, p 33,34.
5.3.4 Recorded Crimes and Crime Victimisation – Recorded property crimes

The indicator group ‘record crimes and crime victimisation – recorded property crimes’ has two indicators, which are reported on a victims per 100 000 people basis.

The indicators are:

- recorded victims of unlawful entry with intent (per 100 000 people); and
- recorded victims of motor vehicle theft (per 100 000 people).18

5.4 Indicators for Crime Investigation

The service delivery area of crime investigation is focused on the activities of police in investigating crime and identifying and apprehending suspects, including:

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

As with the performance indicators for other SDAs, the indicators for ‘crime investigation’ have bee split into those relating to effectiveness and those relating to efficiency. Figure 1.6 provides an overview of the performance indicator structure for the SDA crime investigation.

There are three effectiveness indicators, in relation to outcomes, for ‘crime investigation’, (1) outcomes of investigations - personal crimes; (2) outcomes of investigations - property crimes; and (3) stolen vehicle recovery. However, indicator (3) has not yet been reported.

The fourth effectiveness indicator, which is in relation to access and equity, is also yet to be developed.

There is one efficiency indicator for the SDA ‘crime investigation’ and details the cost of providing crime investigation on a dollars per person basis.

5.4.1 Outcomes of investigations – crimes against the person

The performance indicator group ‘outcomes of investigations – crimes against the person’ there have been two indicators developed. The crimes of murder, assault and armed robbery are separately identified.

The two indicators are:

- the proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days; and
- the proportion of finalised investigations leading to the offender being proceeded against.\(^{19}\)

5.4.2 Outcomes of investigations – property crime

The performance indicator group ‘outcomes of investigations – property crime’ there have been two indicators developed. The crimes of unlawful entry with intent, motor vehicle theft and other theft are separately identified.

The indicators are:

- the proportion of investigations finalised within 30 days; and
- the proportion of finalised investigations leading to the offender being proceeded against.\(^{20}\)

### 5.5 Indicators for Road Safety and Traffic Management

The SDA ‘road safety and traffic management’ focuses on maximising road safety through operations in the areas of reducing the incidence of traffic offences and through attendance at, and investigation of, road traffic accidents and incidents. Typical duties 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; and
- improving public education and awareness of traffic and road safety issues.

Performance indicators for the SDA ‘road safety and traffic management’ have been split into those relating to effectiveness and those relating to efficiency. Figure1.7 provides an overview of the performance indicator structure for the SDA ‘road safety and traffic management.

There are six effectiveness indicators, in relation to outcomes, (1) use of seat belts; (2) driving under the influence; (3) degree of speeding; (4) road deaths; (5) land transport hospitalisations; and (6) perceptions of road safety problems. Indicators (1), (2), (3) and (6) are based on responses from the NSCSP and indicators (4) and (5) are based on actual data supplied by the various police forces.

The seventh effectiveness indicator, which is in relation to access and equity, is yet to be developed.

In relation to indicators of efficiency, three measures have been identified, (1) dollars per person; (2) dollars per registered vehicle; and (3) dollars per fatal or serious injury collision.

#### 5.5.1 Use of Seat Belts

The performance indicator ‘use of seatbelts’ is measured through responses to the NSCSP.

The indicator used is: ‘people who had driven in the last 12 months and ‘never’ travel in a car without wearing a seat belt, drivers aged 18 years and over’. Reported as per cent of respondents.

#### 5.5.2 Driving Under the Influence

The performance indicator ‘driving under the influence’ is measured through responses to the NSCSP.

---

The indicator used is: ‘people who had driven in the last 12 months who indicated that they had ‘never’ driven while possibly over 0.05 blood alcohol level, drivers aged 18 years and over’.  

Figure 1.7 – Performance Indicators for Road Safety and Traffic Management

5.5.3 Degree of Speeding

The performance indicator ‘degree of speeding’ is measured through responses to the NSCSP. The indicator used is: ‘people who indicated that they had driven in the last 12 months more than 10km/h above the speed limit ‘sometimes’ or more often, drivers aged 18 years and over’.  

5.5.4 Road Deaths

The performance indicator group ‘road deaths’ is measured through the supply of actual data from the various police forces.

---

The indicators reported are:

- total deaths on Australian roads; and
- road deaths per 100 000 registered vehicles.23

5.5.5 Land Transport Hospitalisations

The performance indicator group ‘road transport hospitalisations’ is measured through the supply of actual data from the various police forces.

The indicators reported are:

- total road transport hospitalisations; and
- road transport hospitalisations per 100 000 registered vehicles.24

5.5.6 Perceptions of Road Safety Problems

The performance indicator group ‘perceptions of road safety problems’ is based on data collected through the NSCSP.

The indicator reported is: ‘the proportion of people aged 18 years and over who felt the speeding cars or dangerous, noisy driving was a ‘major problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem’ in their neighbourhood’.25

5.5.7 Efficiency

The efficiency of services provided in relation to the SDA ‘road safety and traffic management’ is measured through the use of three specific indicators. They are:

- dollars per person;
- dollars per registered vehicle; and
- cost per fatal or serious injury or collision.26

The indicator ‘cost per fatal or serious injury or collision’ is calculated by taking the cost of the SDA ‘road safety and traffic management’ and dividing this by the number of fatal or serious injuries or collisions, where the number of fatal or serious injuries or collisions is defined as the number of road deaths plus the number of road transport hospitalisations.

5.6 Indicators for Services to the Judicial Process

The SDA ‘services to the judicial process’ centres around the role of police in providing 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. The activities involved in the provision of this SDA include:

---

- preparing briefs;
- presenting evidence in court; and
- conducting court and prisoner security.

The performance indicators in relation to the SDA ‘services to the judicial process’ have been split between those relating to effectiveness and those relating to efficiency. Figure 1.8 provides an overview of the performance indicator structure for the SDA ‘services to the judicial process’.

**Figure 1.8 – Performance Indicators for Services to the Judicial Process**
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**Source:** Productivity Commission, Report on Government Services 2003, Commonwealth of Australia, ch 5, p 51.

The effectiveness indicators have been divided into two groups those relating to outcomes and those relating to access and equity. There are four outcome indicators, (1) deaths in custody; (2) proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea; (3) proportion of higher court cases resulting in a guilty finding; and (4) proportion of diversions (juvenile cases). In relation to access and equity, the number of indigenous deaths in custody is used as the indicator.

In terms of efficiency, there are three indicators, (1) dollars per person for judicial services; (2) dollars per person for custodial care; and (3) costs awarded against the police criminal actions. However, indicator (2) ‘dollars per person for custodial care’ has not yet been reported.
5.6.1 Deaths in Custody

The performance indicator group ‘deaths in custody’ is based on information collected directly from the Australian Institute of Criminology. It provides information for both the outcome indicator ‘deaths in custody’ and the access and equity indicator ‘indigenous deaths in custody’.27

5.6.2 Outcomes of Court Cases

Given the police’s role in the judicial process, a guilty plea or conviction can be used to some degree as a measure of success. There have been two indicators developed in relation to outcomes of court cases, (1) proportion of lower court cases resulting in a guilty plea and (2) proportion of higher court cases resulting in a guilty finding.28 However, a number of state authorities are not yet able to provide complete or comparable data for these indicators.

5.6.3 Juvenile Diversions

When offenders are apprehended by police, there are a number of options available. For example, police may charge the offender, and the case will proceed to the courts, or they may use their discretion and divert the offender to another, more rehabilitative process.

The term ‘diverted’ is used when offenders are forwarded to programs such as community conference, diversionary conference, formal cautioning by police, family conferences and other diversionary programs (i.e. drug assessment/treatment). Offenders who would not have normally been forwarded to the courts are not included in the figures.

The indicator reported is: ‘juvenile diversions as a proportion of juvenile offenders’.29

5.7 Indicators for Other Services

As described earlier in this report, there are certain police functions that can not be directly accredited to one of the four operational SDAs, these costs are picked up under the SDA ‘other services’. Performance of the ‘other services’ SDA is measured on a real expenditure per person basis (see Table 1.4).

---

Table 1.4 – Real Expenditure per person on ‘other services’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>Vic</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Tas</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>Aus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        |        |        |        |        |
| Payroll tax |        |        |        |        |
| 1999-2000 | –   | –   | na  | ..  | –  | na  | ..  | na | –   |
| 2000-01  | –   | –   | na  | ..  | –  | na  | ..  | na | –   |
| 2001-02  | –   | –   | na  | ..  | –  | na  | ..  | na | –   |
| Total    | 1999-2000 | –   | –   | na  | 7.52 | –  | na  | –   | na | 0.79 |
|          | 2000-01  | –   | –   | na  | 6.48 | –  | na  | 5.06 | na | 0.89 |
|          | 2001-02  | –   | –   | na  | 5.59 | –  | na  | 2.14 | na | 0.74 |

---

**Conclusion**

The criminal justice system in Australia is made up of organisations at the State/Territory and Commonwealth levels. Each of the States and Territories have their own criminal justice systems, in addition to that at the federal level. Australia’s Constitution defines the division of powers between the States/Territories and the Commonwealth. The Constitution has been drafted in such a manner as to allocate limited powers to the Federal or Commonwealth Parliament, leaving the majority of power to legislate with the States and Territories. For this reason, it is the laws of the States and Territories that primarily govern the day to day lives of most Australians.

Each State and Territory has its own police force, except for the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) which purchases policing services from the Australian Federal Police (AFP). The AFP is responsible for issues such as transnational crime, protection of VIPs and other cross jurisdictional operations.

Each of the various police forces have individual performance measurement and performance management frameworks. However, performance indicators for police services, on a nationally comparable basis, have been developed by the Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Delivery. The 2003 Report on Government Services splits police services into five Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). Each of the SDAs have been allocated various performance indicators that relate to both effectiveness and efficiency. The indicators are derived from information collected directly from the State and Territory Governments and from the National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Police Services. The use of community satisfaction surveys to gauge police performance is aimed at assessing if the police programs and policies are having the desired effect in the community.