

**Report of the Chief Constable to the Chair and Members
of the Operational Policing Panel
22nd January 2010**

**Executive & Presenting Officer: Mr Sean White, Assistant Chief Constable
(Territorial Operations)**

Status: For information

Local Public Confidence Survey (Oct – Nov 2009)

1 Purpose

- 1.1 To present to the Police Authority an update on the findings to date resulting from the Local Public Confidence Survey.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Members note and comment on the findings presented in the report.

3 Reasons

3.1 The Policing Plan Priority 2009-10

The Policing Plan Priority for 2009-10 is '*to enhance public confidence in Cleveland Police*'. In order to deliver this priority Cleveland Police will:

- Deliver citizen focuses policing to all our neighbourhoods.
- Reduce crime, antisocial behaviour and protect neighbourhoods.
- Reduce the harm caused by drugs and alcohol.
- Ensure efficient and effective use of our people and the public's money.

3.2 The Local Public Confidence Survey

The Local Public Confidence (LPC) Survey was introduced in October 2009. This survey is conducted in partnership by the Force and the Authority and replaces the previous Quality of Life and Neighbourhood Surveys. The survey is conducted via telephone interview with sample selection and other

methodology issues designed in accordance with the Home Office minimum technical requirement.

- 3.3 The survey is conducted on a monthly basis by an independent market research company, Maven Research. The aim of the survey is to measure public confidence and to understand the factors associated with it. For comparative purposes, the survey includes a number of British Crime Survey (BCS) questions, including the National confidence indicator (APACS 2.2):

'the percentage of people who agree that the police and local council are dealing with the crime and anti-social behaviour issues that matter in their area'.


- 3.4 Other APACS indicators taken from the BCS which are included in the survey are:
- 2.1: Understanding local concerns
 - 2.3: Perceptions of local police performance
 - 4.1: Perceptions of anti social behaviour
 - 4.2: Perceptions of drunk/rowdy behaviour
 - 4.3: Perceptions of drug use/dealing

3.5 Provisional Results

During October and November 2009 a total of 1,200 interviews were completed across the Cleveland area. The following table provides a summary comparison of the results obtained compared to the most recent data available from the British Crime Survey.

Table 1: Comparison of APACS performance measures using the Local Public Confidence survey and the British Crime Survey

APACS ref:	Performance Measure/Survey Question	LPC	BCS
2.1	Understanding local concerns (agencies)	57.8%	52.2%
2.2	Dealing with local concerns (agencies)	70.4%	56.8%
2.3	Residents perception of police performance	See below	57.2%
4.1	Perceptions of anti social behaviour	8.6%	19.7%
4.2	Perceptions of drunk or rowdy behaviour	17.8%	35.1%
4.3	Perceptions of drug dealing and usage	17.9%	27.3%

 Area where LPC survey indicates a higher level of performance than currently measured via the British Crime Survey

3.6 The National Confidence Measure (APACS 2.2)

The National confidence measure is currently the only top down numerical target set by the Home Office for individual police forces. The National target is to achieve a 60.0% level of confidence by March 2012 (from a baseline of

45.0%). The local target for Cleveland is 66.0% by 2012 (from a baseline of 54.0%). Progress towards these targets is measured via the BCS. According to the BCS, Cleveland currently has a confidence level of 56.8% (+/- 3.2%). However, the LPC survey suggests a comparative figure of 69.5% (+/- 3.7%).

3.7 Residents Perception of Police Performance (APACS 2.3)

APACS 2.3 is sometimes considered to be a more accurate measure of police performance in relation to public confidence. According to the BCS, 57.2% (+/- 4.2%) of people interviewed believe that Cleveland Police are doing a 'good' or 'excellent' job. APACS 2.3 is included in the LPC survey at the beginning of the script and then repeated towards the end. The reason for repeating the question is to establish whether on not other questions or issues raised throughout the interview have a positive or negative impact on perceptions of police performance. As shown in the table below, a more positive result is obtained when the question is asked towards the end of the interview.

Table 2: Perception of Police Performance using the Local Public Confidence survey and the British Crime Survey

APACS ref:	Percentage of residents who believe the local police are doing a 'good' or 'excellent' job.	LPC	BCS
2.3	Question 1: Start of survey	62.1%	57.2%
	Question 22: End of Survey	69.3%	

3.8 A 'True' Measure of Confidence

The APACS performance measures detailed above provide both an informative and comparable insight into the issue of public confidence in the police service and perceptions of police performance. However, the questions posed do not explicitly reference the issue of confidence. The LPC survey includes a more explicit question which directly asks residents for their opinion in relation to the issue of confidence, that is 'How confident are you in Cleveland Police?' 86.3% of people surveyed between October and November 2009 stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' confident.

3.9 Identifying the Drivers of Public Confidence

Public confidence can only be improved through understanding and addressing the issues that directly affect it. Identifying the drivers associated with public confidence is therefore essential. Whilst a significant amount of work has been undertaken across the country in relation to such drivers, local data is yet to be analysed in this way with detailed diagnostic analysis to be completed once the full baseline data set has been collected (February 2010). A provisional review of the data gathered to date has however identified repetitive themes.

- 3.10 A high level of confidence is not necessarily the result of personal experience or direct contact with the police. Rather, it would appear to be linked to the absence of problems in the local area and a subsequent perception of police effectiveness. Confidence also appears to be associated with the positive experienced of others e.g. friend, relatives or other people living in the local area.
- 3.11 Conversely, low levels of confidence would appear to be linked to the existence of neighbourhood problems, poor service delivery and a perceived lack of police action. However, this experience may not necessarily be current, with a lack of confidence repeatedly linked back to specific incidents or services received a number of years previous.

6 Implications

6.1 Finance

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

6.2 Diversity and Equal Opportunities

There are no diversity or equal opportunities arising from this report.

6.3 Human Rights Act

There are no Human Rights Act implications arising from this report.

6.4 Sustainability

There are no sustainability implications arising from this report.

6.5 Risk

There are no risk implications arising from this report.

7 Conclusions

- 7.1 The initial findings of the LPC survey are positive. To date, the responses given would suggest a higher level of public confidence and a more positive perception of police performance than those indicated via the BCS. It is recognised however that public confidence can only be improved through understanding and addressing the issues that directly affect it. Identifying the drivers associated with public confidence is therefore essential.
- 7.2 The baseline dataset will be completed by the beginning of February 2010. This dataset will include responses from a total of 2,400 residents across the Cleveland area, providing a statistically significant and representative sample from each of the four policing districts within the Cleveland area. A detailed diagnostic analysis of the data will therefore be undertaken once the full baseline data set has been collected. The results of this analysis will help us to

7.3 In accordance with National requirements, headline results from the baseline dataset will be made available to the public by the end of February 2010. Data collection for 2010-2011 will re-commence in April 2010.

Sean Price
Chief Constable

Prepared by Corporate Planning and Performance