

To: Chair and Members of the Operational Policing Panel

Date: 29th September 2011

Executive & Presenting Officer: Mrs Sarah Wilson, Consultation & Performance Officer

Status : For information

End of Year Police Authority Consultation Report

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 Engaging with the public and seeking the views of our communities remains a key activity for Cleveland Police Authority¹. This report presents the findings of consultation activities undertaken by Cleveland Police Authority, Cleveland Police and partner agencies from September 2010 to August 2011.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 It is recommended that members take cognisance of the consultation findings (see Appendix 1) with a view to using the results, along with the Force strategic assessments, the Home Secretary's national policing priorities and the results of Tier 1 consultation undertaken by Districts, to assist in setting the local policing priorities for 2011 - 2012.

3. Reasons

- 3.1 The Police Act 1996 clearly sets out the statutory duty placed upon police authorities to 'consult with those in that policing area, about the policing of that area.' The Policing and Crime Act 2009 and Community Engagement and Membership Regulations 2010 adds the requirement to 'have regard to the views of people in the authority's area about policing in that area.'

¹ Police Act 1996, Policing and Crime Act 2009, Community Engagement and Membership Regulations 2010

- 3.2 The joint Force and Authority Local Public Confidence Survey was introduced in October 2009, and replaces the previous Neighbourhood Survey. The survey is conducted via telephone interview by an independent research company. Interviews are conducted on a rolling basis, with 2400 undertaken per year.
- 3.3 Demographic data on age, gender and ethnicity is collected, which enables the Force and Authority to determine if certain sectors of the population are under represented in the survey results. If this is the case then additional consultation activities are organised with the under represented groups. If results indicate that a particular issue is a concern in an area then an additional consultation is arranged in this area to explore the issue in greater depth.
- 3.4 In interviews conducted between April 2010 and March 2011 adults aged under thirty five were under represented, so additional qualitative consultations have been conducted with this group. The Police Authority has a three year rolling programme of consultation which aims to cover all sectors of the population, so consultation with other minority groups will be arranged on a rolling basis.
- 3.5 The consultation data collated in Appendix 1 consists of various forms of consultation, both qualitative (for example focus groups) and quantitative (for example IML surveys at Crucial Crew). That data which is not statistically valid on a stand alone basis is rendered valid by means of 'triangulation', whereby the weakness of one consultation method is countered by the strengths of another and becomes relevant when the same results are being reported. For example, if the responses to telephone surveys and focus groups all point to anti-social behaviour as being the most significant concern of citizens, we can reasonably accept that this is representative of public opinion.
- 3.6 The Police Act 1996, as amended by the Police and Justice Act 2006, stipulates that the Force and Authority will produce an annual, rolling three year Policing Plan which will be informed by the consultation activities.

4 Key Findings

- 4.1 Confidence in the police and partners' ability to deal with local concerns varied considerably between different consultations. The latest release of British Crime Survey (BCS) results places Cleveland in first position in the country for public confidence, with a confidence rating of 59%, a rise of 5.1 percentage points on last year. Cleveland also scored highly in other BCS questions used to measure confidence in policing – 61% thought that their local police did a good or excellent job and 72.2% had confidence in the police in their area. These latter two questions are used in Cleveland's priority indicator set to monitor progress against the 'Delivering Putting People First' priority.

- 4.2 Local Public Confidence Survey results relating to confidence in policing were considerably higher. 73% of those interviewed across Cleveland agreed that the police and council were dealing with the issues that matter. 67.4% of respondents felt that their local police did a good or excellent job whilst 85.8% had confidence in the police in their area. Interestingly, this rose to 89.2% when considering Cleveland Police as a whole, suggesting that people have more confidence in the Cleveland Police brand than in their local neighbourhood police teams.
- 4.3 Young people aged 11 to 19 questioned through the youth policing plan summary survey had quite low feelings of confidence (42%), but primary school children questioned through Crucial Crew were more confident than their secondary counterparts (56% in Middlesbrough and 55% in Redcar and Cleveland).
- 4.4 The top crime priorities for adults in Cleveland were speeding and other motoring offences, car crime, house burglary and violent crime. The top policing priorities for young people aged eleven to nineteen were house burglary, criminal damage and drugs, whilst for younger children violence was the top priority.
- 4.5 Anti-social behaviour remained a key concern for residents of Cleveland, with people being more concerned by anti-social behaviour issues than they were by crime. Adults identified teenagers hanging around on the streets, litter, criminal damage, drunk and rowdy behaviour and people using or dealing drugs as their top concerns. Children and young people were concerned by similar issues, identifying teenagers hanging around, litter and vandalism and graffiti as their top concerns. Primary school children also highlighted noisy neighbours as an issue.
- 4.6 Both adults and children questioned stated that they primarily based their views of crime and anti-social behaviour on personal experience, although the media was also seen as a key influence.
- 4.7 Children felt that more activities for young people to do outside school, working with offenders to prevent re-offending and more work between the police and young people would help increase their feelings of safety.
- 4.8 Knowledge of Neighbourhood Policing was relatively high – just over two thirds of those questioned in the Local Public Confidence Survey were aware of their local policing team, and over half stated that they saw their local team patrolling the area at least once a week. Those questioned through Operation Tornado in Stockton were more likely to be satisfied with their local policing than dissatisfied, with many stating that they had no reason to deal with the police due to the lack of problems in their area.

- 4.9 Whilst only just over a third (33.5%) of those questioned in the Local Public Confidence Survey felt well informed about policing in their local area, the majority (65.7%) of respondents stated that they did wish to receive such information anyway.
- 4.10 Those consulted through Operation Tornado were largely unaware of the government's proposals to replace Police Authorities with directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs). Nearly half (45.6%) were against the proposals compared to only 17.6% who were in favour. The main reasons given for being against the proposals were that the current system of Police Authorities works well and that a panel of seventeen people would be more effective than one person. Conversely, the main reason for being in favour of the idea was that one full time person would be more effective than seventeen part time members.
- 4.11 Whilst members of the LGBT community who were consulted felt that the police response to the LGBT community had improved greatly over recent years, many were still reluctant to report incidents either through fear of recrimination from perpetrators or through feeling that incidents were too 'trivial' to report or that nothing could be done.
- 4.12 Mental health service users who were consulted felt that the police did not always take people with mental health issues seriously when they reported incidents. It was also felt that problems were not followed up effectively and that police did not physically attend incidents often enough.
- 4.13 Whilst the results of the user satisfaction surveys carried out with victims of designated crime types² were largely positive, Cleveland was rated below the Most Similar Force average on all but one aspect of the survey.

5 Implications

5.1 Finance

A budget of £35,000 was allocated to undertake consultation work. This is divided as follows:

- £28,000 – Local Confidence Survey
- £4000 – IML system
- £3000 – other consultation

5.2 Diversity/Equal Opportunities

Cleveland Police Authority has built targeting of hard to engage groups into its consultation strategy and plans.

² Burglary, Violent Crime, Road Traffic Collisions, Racist Incidents and Vehicle Crime

5.3 **Human Rights Act Implications**

There are no human rights act implications arising from this report.

5.4 **Sustainability**

Engagement activities detailed in this report were delivered within current budgets. Any reduction to the current budgeting levels as a result of budgetary cutbacks could jeopardise the Force and Authority's ability to delivery similar consultation levels in the future.

5.5 **Risk**

Failure to take account of consultation findings could result in reduced public confidence in the Force and the Authority and therefore lead to a reduction in engagement with communities.

6 **Conclusion**

6.1 It is recommended that members take into account key consultation findings detailed in Appendix 1 when setting and approving the local policing priorities for 2011-2012.

6.2 Consider this report along with:

- Cleveland Police Strategic Assessment and Control Strategy
- Home Secretary's national policing priorities
- Results of Tier 1 consultation undertaken by Districts³
- Local CSP Community Safety Plans

Jeremy Holderness
Acting Chief Executive

³ These will be presented to the Operational Policing Panel on 24th November 2011

End of Year Consultation Report

Appendix 1

The key objectives for Cleveland Police Authority consultation activities are to inform the annual, rolling three year Policing Plan and to assist in identifying policing priorities for the residents of Cleveland.

Cleveland Police Authority adopted a number of different methods to undertake consultation from September 2010 to August 2011. The table below details the various qualitative and quantitative methods used, together with consultation undertaken by partners, which is highlighted in bold.

Who we have consulted with	Numbers/Groups Involved	How we consulted	When we consulted
Adults in the Cleveland area	2400 per year	Joint telephone Survey	Rolling interviews
11 to 19 year olds in the Cleveland area	Distributed 48,000 Respondents 4982	Freepost survey distributed with the Youth Policing Plan Summary	Autumn 2010
People in the Cleveland area	713 participants	Summer consultation roadshows ⁴	July 2011
Victims of crime ⁵ in Cleveland	1812	User satisfaction surveys	Rolling surveys
Stockton District			
Operation Tornado	184 participants	Face to face surveys	January 2011
Crime and disorder audit	5222 participants	Questionnaire	Autumn 2010
Middlesbrough District			
Crucial Crew Yr 6 Primary School	1090 participants	IML Software Survey	July 2011
LGBT community	4 participants	Focus group	November 2010
Mental health service users	16 participants	Focus group	October 2010
Redcar and Cleveland District			
Crucial Crew Yr 6	722 participants	IML Software	June 2011

⁴ Due to the family nature of the events where the roadshows were conducted representation of adults under 35 was high, this group having been under represented in the Local Public Confidence Survey

⁵ Only survey victims of specified crime types

Primary School		Survey	
Rural community - Farmwatch	14 participants	IML Software Survey	May 2011
Hartlepool District			
Visually impaired community	10 participants	Focus group	September 2010

Issues covered by the consultation include:

- Confidence in policing
- Policing Priorities
- Perceptions of Anti Social Behaviour
- Neighbourhood Policing
- Fear of crime
- Police and Crime Commissioner proposals
- User satisfaction
- LGBT community views
- Mental health service users' views
- Visually impaired community views
- Farming/rural community views

Key Consultation Findings

Confidence in Policing

Although the national confidence measure has now been removed by the Home Office, public confidence in policing is still a priority for the Force and Authority.

The confidence measure focused on the percentage of people who agree that the Police and Local Authority are dealing with local concerns, as derived from the British Crime Survey (BCS) question below:

It is the responsibility of the police and local council working together in partnership to deal with anti-social behaviour and crime in your area. Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statement:

The police and local council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in this area:

- *Strongly agree*
- *Tend to agree*
- *Neither agree nor disagree*
- *Tend to disagree*
- *Strongly disagree*
- *Don't know*

In the latest release of BCS, covering interviews from April 2010 to March 2011, Cleveland has risen to number one in the country for this question, with a confidence rating of 59%, compared to 53.9% in last year's BCS release.

The BCS uses a range of questions to measure public confidence in policing, including:

- The percentage of people who think that their local police do a good or excellent job - currently 61%
- The percentage of respondents who, taking everything into account, have confidence in the police in their area – currently 72.2%

These latter two questions are used in Cleveland's priority indicator set to measure progress against the 'Delivering Putting People First' priority.

In the Local Public Confidence survey (LPC) the three confidence questions mentioned above are asked in their BCS format, although the methodologies differ – BCS is a face to face survey whereas LPC is a telephone survey. This makes direct comparison of the results problematic.

For all three questions results obtained through LPC are considerably higher than those obtained through BCS. In LPC interviews conducted between April 2010 and March 2011, 73% of those interviewed across Cleveland agreed that the police and council were dealing with the issues that matter. This ranged from 75.7% in Redcar and Cleveland to 70.5% in Middlesbrough, with Stockton and Hartlepool rating 73.3% and 72.2% respectively. Across Cleveland, 67.4% of respondents felt that their local police did a good or excellent job, with respondents from Redcar and Cleveland again having the highest confidence (69.8%), and those from Middlesbrough the lowest (64.2%). Across Cleveland 85.8% of those questioned had confidence in the police in their area. Interestingly, this rose to 89.2% when considering Cleveland Police as a whole, suggesting that people have more confidence in the Cleveland Police brand than in their local neighbourhood police teams. Confidence in local police was highest in Hartlepool whereas confidence in Cleveland Police was highest in Stockton. The full results are shown in the table below:

	British Crime Survey	Local Public Confidence Survey				
		Force	H'Pool	M'bro	Redcar & Cleveland	Stockton
Dealing with crime and ASB issues	59.0%	73.0%	72.2%	70.5%	75.7%	73.3%
Police doing good or excellent job	61.0%	67.4%	66.8%	64.2%	69.8%	68.2%
Confidence in police in local area	72.2%	85.8%	87.3%	83.7%	85.3%	86.8%
Confidence in Cleveland	N/A	89.2%	89.5%	87.0%	89.8%	90.2%

In depth analysis of LPC data has identified an association between public confidence in policing and the following factors:

- Community engagement and problem solving
- Procedural justice (fair treatment)
- Police effectiveness
- Contact with the police
- Targeted foot patrol
- Dealing with antisocial behaviour

Those people expressing higher levels of confidence based their opinions on the following:

- Perceived reliability to be there when needed
- A perceived lack of problems in the local area
- The skills and attitude of staff
- A good level of visible patrol/police presence in the local area.

Conversely, the unreliability of the police to be there when needed or to respond to requests for assistance, a lack of presence on the streets and a perceived lack of action in relation to local problems were all given as the main reasons for a lack of confidence.

Young people aged between eleven and nineteen who completed the youth policing plan summary survey were asked whether they thought that the police and council were dealing with the crime and anti-social behaviour issues that mattered in their area with simplified options of yes, no and don't know. Overall across the whole of Cleveland 42% of the young people surveyed felt that the police and council dealt with the issues that mattered. This ranged from 48.6% in Hartlepool to 35.4% in Redcar and Cleveland, with Stockton and Middlesbrough rating 48.3% and 38.8% respectively. Although the young people had far lower levels of confidence than adults questioned, this could partly be attributable to the higher proportion of 'don't know' answers received in the young people's consultation.

Children at Crucial Crew (Year 6 pupils, aged 10 and 11) were asked a simplified version of the question - 'Do you think the police and council do a good job in dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour' with options of 'yes', 'no' and 'don't know'. In Redcar and Cleveland, 55% felt that the police and council did a good job, with this rising to 56% for Middlesbrough. Again there was a relatively high percentage of 'don't know' answers at both events (21% don't know for Redcar and Cleveland and 18% for Middlesbrough). The children questioned felt that the police could do a better job by having more visible street patrols, quicker response times, dealing more proactively with incidents as they occur and providing better feedback on actions taken.

Crime Priorities

Those surveyed through the Local Public Confidence Survey identified the top three crime concerns across Cleveland to be speeding and other motoring offences, cars being stolen or

broken into and burglary or things being stolen from the home. These priorities remained the same across all four BCUs. Speeding was also identified as an issue by people consulted through Operation Tornado in Stockton.

Those who took part in Stockton's Crime and Disorder Audit identified alcohol related crime, violent crime and drug related offending as their top crime concerns. Mental health service users from Middlesbrough were particularly concerned by theft, violence and speeding offences.

Young people who completed the youth policing plan summary survey were asked what their main crime concerns were. The top three crime concerns across Cleveland were house burglary, criminal damage and drugs. House burglary was the top concern for Middlesbrough and Stockton, whilst the young people in Redcar and Cleveland were primarily concerned by criminal damage and drugs were seen as a particular issue in Hartlepool.

For children at Crucial Crew the top crime concerns were violence, drug dealing and criminal damage in Redcar and Cleveland and house burglary, violence and drug dealing in Middlesbrough.

Perceptions of Anti Social Behaviour

Those surveyed through the Local Public Confidence Survey identified their top three anti-social behaviour concerns as rubbish or litter lying about, teenagers hanging around on the streets, and vandalism, graffiti or other deliberate damage. These concerns remained broadly similar across the four BCUs, although teenagers was the top concern in Stockton, and people using or dealing drugs was a particular concern in both Stockton and Redcar and Cleveland.

Anti-social behaviour was the theme of this year's Police Authority summer consultation roadshows. Those who took part in the roadshow consultation were much more concerned by anti-social behaviour in their local area than by crime. When considering local policing arrangements the top three anti-social behaviour concerns were teenagers hanging around the streets, people dealing drugs and people using drugs. However, when considering priorities at a Force level people gave far less priority to teenagers hanging around the streets, with the top three priorities being people dealing drugs, people using drugs and people being drunk and rowdy in public places.

By far the most popular suggestion for better dealing with anti-social behaviour in the future was an increase in police presence on the streets, although some respondents did acknowledge that this would be difficult to achieve given the current budgetary pressures. Other popular responses were harsher punishments for offenders and more diversionary facilities for young people.

Those who took part in Stockton's Crime and Disorder Audit were also more concerned by anti-social behaviour than by crime. The top anti-social behaviour concerns identified through the audit were vandalism, alcohol misuse and people being drunk and rowdy. People consulted through Operation Tornado in Stockton also identified alcohol related disorder as an issue, together with youth anti-social behaviour and fire setting.

Members of Hartlepool's visually impaired community who attended a focus group felt that youth anti-social behaviour was less of a problem than in the past and that alcohol confiscation seemed to be having a positive effect. Attendees acknowledged that parents have a key role to play in tackling youth anti-social behaviour, with lack of parental responsibility aggravating anti-social behaviour issues. Drugs was seen as more of a concern than alcohol in the Hartlepool area.

Mental health service users from Middlesbrough identified youth anti-social behaviour as a key concern. This group felt that anti-social behaviour was too often seen as a 'catch all' for many issues which are actually criminal offences and should be dealt with more seriously.

Young people who completed the youth policing plan summary survey were asked to identify their three most important anti-social behaviour concerns. Across the whole Cleveland area the top three concerns were teenagers hanging around the streets, rubbish/litter and vandalism and graffiti. These top three concerns remained broadly similar across all four BCUs, although drugs was a particular issue in Hartlepool and noisy neighbours was mentioned as a key issue in both Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland.

For children at Crucial Crew the top anti-social behaviour concerns were teenagers hanging around, noisy neighbours, vandalism/graffiti/ criminal damage and litter.

Fear of Crime

People surveyed through the Local Public Confidence Survey were more likely to feel that crime and anti-social behaviour had decreased in the last two years than increased. 33.2% felt that there was less crime than two years ago, compared to 10.9% who felt that there was more, and 36.6% felt that there was less anti-social behaviour now than two years ago, compared to 20.8% who felt that there was more. The proportion of respondents who perceived a high level of anti-social behaviour in their local neighbourhood was generally low (8.3%).

Conversely, people consulted through the summer consultation roadshows had less favourable views on crime and anti-social behaviour levels. Roughly equal numbers of those surveyed felt that crime had increased (23%) or decreased (22.4%) over the last two years, but a higher proportion felt that anti-social behaviour had increased (39%) than decreased (16.7%) during the same time period.

Farmers and other members of the rural community who attended the Redcar and Cleveland Farmwatch event were more likely to feel that crime had increased over the last twelve months (35%) than decreased (28%).

Participants in the Local Public Confidence Survey were asked to identify the factors which influenced their perception of crime and anti-social behaviour. The most frequent responses were 'from personal experience' (51.0%) followed by 'from what they have been told by family, friends or people in the local community' (43.1%). A significant number (25.7%) also identified the media as a contributing factor.

Children consulted at Crucial Crew also identified personal experience as the key influence in their perception of crime and anti-social behaviour, either through seeing incidents, knowing a victim or being a victim themselves. 36% of those questioned at Middlesbrough Crucial Crew stated that they had been a victim of crime or anti-social behaviour within the last year.

Children at Middlesbrough Crucial Crew were asked what they thought the police and partners should do to stop crime and anti-social behaviour and make people feel safer. The most popular choices were more activities for young people to do outside school, more work between the police and young people and help for those committing crime to stop them re-offending.

Neighbourhood Policing

The Local Public Confidence Survey has a strong focus on Neighbourhood Policing. 66.2% of participants were aware that their neighbourhood had a team of Police Officers or PCSOs with the specific job of policing their local area and working with the community. However, of these only a small minority stated that they knew their team either by sight (30.0%) by name (14.8%) or in another way (3.0%). Over half (50.2%) of participants stated that they saw their local neighbourhood teams patrolling the area at least once a week. 34.3% stated that they saw patrols once a month or less and 15.6% that they never saw an officer or PCSO on patrol in their area. 60.9% of those questioned were satisfied with the level of patrol in their area, whilst just over a quarter (25.8%) were dissatisfied.

Participants were asked how well informed they were about the way their local area is policed. Whilst a significant number stated that they were either very well (8.9%) or fairly well (24.6%) kept informed, the majority stated that they only get limited information (40.0%) or no information at all (25.7%). However, 65.7% stated that they did not wish to receive such information anyway.

Of those who had had contact with the police during the last year, 76.3% were satisfied and 17.7% were dissatisfied. The most common reasons for being satisfied were the attitude of the officers or staff, the speed of response and the action taken. Conversely the same

reasons were mentioned for being dissatisfied. Lack of subsequent feedback was also a key reason for dissatisfaction.

People questioned through Operation Tornado in Stockton were asked what they thought of the services provided by their local police. 16% of those questioned felt that their local police were good (13.4%) or very good (2.6%), compared to only 5.2% who felt that they delivered a poor service. 22.4% felt that the service was fine/OK. A significant proportion of respondents (18.5%) stated that they had no reason to deal with the police as there were few problems in the area. Views regarding visibility of policing were divided, with 18.5% of those questioned stating that they saw their local police teams on the beat regularly, whilst 14.2% stated that they rarely or never saw them. Just over half the respondents (53.3%) stated that they knew how to contact their local neighbourhood officers. Many mentioned leaflets that they had received containing the Single Point Of Contact numbers.

All of those attendees at the Redcar and Cleveland Farmwatch event who had been in contact with Cleveland Police felt that they had received a 'very good' (33%) or 'good' (67%) service. 86% of attendees felt that the police understood their concerns regarding farms and rural areas.

Members of Hartlepool's visually impaired community who attended a focus group were generally positive regarding local policing and felt that Neighbourhood Policing was having a positive impact in their community. PCSOs were seen⁶ regularly, and when they weren't it was felt that this was because the area had few problems and didn't merit regular patrols.

Mental health service users from Middlesbrough had very mixed views regarding neighbourhood policing, with those who had regular contact with their local police being able to identify the benefits more readily than those who did not. In most areas local police teams were rarely seen on foot, only in cars. It was felt that the police often lacked sufficient resources to deal with problems effectively, and that police teams were not always in the right place at the right time. Most attendees were unaware that local teams held regular beat surgeries, although these are advertised within communities.

Police and Crime Commissioner Proposals

Those who were consulted through Operation Tornado in Stockton were asked for their views regarding the proposals to replace Police Authorities with directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs). Just under two thirds (62.1%) of respondents were not aware of the proposals. 45.6% of respondents were against the idea of PCCs compared to 17.6% who were in favour. 36.8% stated that they were unsure, mostly because they felt that they needed more information to fully understand the proposals.

⁶ Many attendees were visually impaired, so able to identify a PCSO, whilst those who were completely blind relied upon the information which they got from other community members

The main reasons given for being against the proposals were that the current system of Police Authorities works well (23.1%) and that people thought a panel of seventeen people would be more effective than one person (23.1%). There was some concern that the role would be too significant for one person to undertake (8.7%), and some respondents didn't like the idea of one person holding all the power (5.8%) or of politics having a role in policing (3.8%). There was also concern that changing the system would cost a significant amount of money (4.8%).

The main reason for being in favour of the idea was that one full time person would be more effective than seventeen part time members (6.7%). It was felt that a PCC would provide a more high profile figurehead for the police, and some people liked the accountability of an elected person (4.8%).

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Community Views

Members of the LGBT community were specifically consulted through a focus group held in Middlesbrough. There was general agreement that the police response to the LGBT community has greatly improved over recent years, in particular through police involvement in LGBT events, LGBT representation on Police Independent Advisory Groups and the use of specialised Minority Liaison Officers. The placement of police cadets in LGBT organisations was seen as a very effective way of breaking down barriers and there was a feeling that this new generation of police officers were better at dealing with the LGBT community as they lacked the more 'old fashioned' attitudes of some older officers.

Attendees sometimes felt reluctant to report hate crime for a variety of reasons, including fear of recrimination from perpetrators, and feeling that incidents were too 'trivial' to report or that no action could be taken. The transgender community felt particularly vulnerable, being a 'visible' target for hate crime, and the importance of prompt action to prevent any escalations in incidents was emphasised.

Rural Community Views

In May 2011 Cleveland Police Authority ran an interactive IML session with members of the Redcar and Cleveland farming and rural community at a Farmwatch event. 86% of attendees felt that wildlife crime affected them 'a lot' or 'occasionally' and 93% placed 'very high' or 'high' importance on conservation issues. The top rural policing priorities in Redcar and Cleveland were theft, poaching and trespass.

Mental Health Service Users' Views

Mental health service users were specifically consulted through a focus group held in Middlesbrough. There was a general feeling that people with mental health issues were not taken seriously when they reported incidents to the police. It was felt that problems were not followed up effectively and that police did not physically attend incidents often enough. Some attendees had been victims of harassment and it was felt that the police lacked a co-ordinated approach in handling this. There was also a perceived lack of feedback following incidents.

Victims and Witnesses

User satisfaction surveys are carried out by every Force as part of the Home Office performance requirements. The questionnaires are structured around a mandatory framework of core questions, covering:

- User satisfaction with the whole experience, i.e. the overall service provided
- User satisfaction with:
 - First contact – making contact with the police
 - Action taken by the police
 - Follow-up – being kept informed of progress
 - Treatment by staff

Surveys are sent to victims of five different crime/incident types as follows:

- Burglary
- Violent Crime
- Road Traffic Collisions
- Racist Incidents
- Vehicle Crime

Data from surveys covering 2010/2011 shows that 84.8% of those questioned were satisfied with the whole experience, against a Most Similar Force (MSF) average of 86.9%.

When looking at satisfaction with various aspects of the service, with the exception of ease of contact, Cleveland is below the MSF average:

- satisfaction with ease of contact 96.7% - 0.4 percentage points above MSF average
- satisfaction with actions taken 83.7% - 1.3 percentage points below MSF average
- satisfaction with follow up 73.1% - 11.9 percentage points below MSF average
- satisfaction with treatment stands 92.5% - 1.7 percentage points below MSF average