

**Report of the Chief Constable to the Chair and Members
of the Operational Policing Panel
18th March 2010**

Executive & Presenting Officer: Mr Sean White, Assistant Chief Constable

Status: For information

Force Performance Report (April 2009 to January 2010)

1 Purpose

- 1.1 To update Members on Force performance against the 2009-10 Policing Plan Priority.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 That members note and comment on Force performance against targets.

3 Reasons

3.1 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 Progress against the Policing Plan Priority is monitored using the Priority Indicator Set. The Priority Indicator Set provides a suite of key performance measures (i.e. 'a performance dashboard'), which aim to reflect outcome performance in relation to the local policing priority and the Chief Constable's vision of Putting People First. The Priority Indicator Set has been developed using the APACS framework, the National Indicator Set and the internal Performance Management Framework, and is the framework upon which specific performance improvement targets have been set. A full breakdown of

performance against the Priority Indicator Set and associated improvement targets is shown in Appendix One.

3.3 Summary of Performance Against the Priority Indicator Set

Performance against the Priority Indicator Set is assessed using a 'traffic light' system whereby:

GREEN shows the Force is on track to achieve the annual target.

AMBER shows the Force requires slight performance improvements in order to achieve the annual target.

RED shows the Force requires significant performance improvements in order to achieve the annual target.

3.4 For 2009-10, there are 18 performance measures within the Priority Indicator Set. Of these 11 are green, 3 are amber and 4 are red. The Force is therefore currently failing to achieve the required target in 7 areas.

3.5 Performance Highlights

- **Public Confidence** remains high. Performance against the National Confidence measure currently stands at 55.3%¹. Whilst this figure is slightly lower than the annual target of 58%, Cleveland Police remain one of the highest performing forces in the country (currently within the top third, in 8th position). However, the Local Public Confidence (LPC) Survey results suggest a higher level of confidence, the latest figure being 71.0%².
- **Victim or 'User' Satisfaction** remains high. The latest figures show that 84.1% of people surveyed were satisfied with the service received from Cleveland Police. This figure exceeds the annual target of 83.3%
- **Recorded Crime** continues to fall significantly. The annual target for 2009-10 is a reduction of 5%. Year to date figures show a current decrease of 13.5% (6212 less crimes) when compared to last year. Significant reductions have been achieved in all headline target crime categories (Overall Violent Crime, Serious Acquisitive Crime, Criminal Damage and Other Theft).
- The overall **Sanction Detection Rate** continues to improve. The annual target for 2009-10 is to maintain a level of at least 37%. Year to date figures show the current detection rate to be 39.8%, an improvement of 2.1% pts when compared to last year.
- **Sickness levels** have improved in relation to both Police Officers and Police Staff. The percentage of working hours currently lost due to

¹ Based on the latest BCS data release which reports on interviews conducted between October 2008 and September 2009.

² Based on the LPC baseline survey using data collected between October 2009 and January 2010

sickness for Police Officers is 2.60% and for Police Staff is 3.43%. Both of these figures represent significant improvements on last year and are within target.

3.6 Areas for Improvement:

- **Anti Social Behaviour** (ASB) incidents have increased slightly. Between April 2009 and December 2010 there has been an increase of 1.5% (an additional 797 incidents) when compared to last year. The annual target for 2009-10 is to reduce ASB incidents by 2%. Analysis reveals that this is almost entirely attributable to the inclement weather and 'snowballing' reports.
- Results from the British Crime Survey show that overall perceptions of ASB have improved. The latest figures³ show that 19.7% of local residents perceive ASB to be a problem. Whilst this is a slight improvement when compared to the previous figure, it remains above the annual target for 2009-10 of 18.6%. However, the LPC results suggest a lower level of perceived ASB, the latest figure being 7.7⁴%.
- There has been slight decreases in the percentage of people who perceive drug use or dealing to be a problem (currently 33.4%) and the percentage of people who perceive drunk and rowdy behaviour to be a problem (currently 27.1%). Whilst perceived levels of such behaviour remains above the annual targets for 2009-10 (27.8% and 23.3% respectively), Again, the LPC survey results suggest lower levels of concern, the latest figures being 18.4% and 18.0% respectively⁵.
- **Most Serious Violence Offences** (MSV) have increased. Between April and November there has been an increase of 10.1%. Although this is a high percentage increase it is based on an additional 26 crimes when compared to last year. However, Cleveland is the lowest in its family of most similar forces for levels of MSV. The annual target for 2009-10 is to reduce MSV by 4.2%. Achieving the 2009/10 target is still possible and an action plan has been put in place to properly record, investigate, finalise and audit MSV offences.

4 Implications

4.1 Finance

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

³ Based on the latest BCS data release which reports on interviews conducted between October 2008 and September 2009

⁴ Calculation includes 'don't know' responses.

⁵ Calculations include 'don't know' responses.

4.2 Diversity and Equal Opportunities

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

4.3 Human Rights Act

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

4.4 Sustainability

There are no sustainability implications arising from this report.

4.5 Risk

There are no risk implications arising from this report.

5. Conclusions

5.1 The Force has made good progress in relation to the delivery of the 2009-10 Policing Plan Priority. The Force continues to achieve high levels of public confidence and satisfaction, reduce crime significantly and increase detections, whilst improving the level of sickness absence amongst officer and staff.

5.2 It is recognised that further improvements are still required in relation to the occurrence of the most serious violent crimes and anti social behaviour. However, the achievements detailed above will assist us to achieve our vision of Putting People First and help us to make our communities and neighbourhoods safer places to live and work.

Sean Price
Chief Constable

Prepared by Corporate Planning and Performance

Appendix One – Performance against the Priority Indicator Set




<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> CLEVELAND POLICE - FORCE PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD (Overview of performance against the Local Policing Plan & Priority Indicator Set) </div> </div>						
Performance Indicator	Performance 2009-10	Performance Comparators			Performance Assessment	
		Last year	MSF Average	Annual Target		
LOCAL PRIORITY: To enhance public confidence in Cleveland Police by 'Putting People First'						
SPI 2.2	Dealing with local concerns (agencies)	55.30%	54.00%	49.50%	58.00%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Deliver citizen focused policing to all our neighbourhoods						
SPI 2.1	Understanding Local Concerns (agencies)	51.50%	44.70%	44.50%	47.20%	
SPI 2.3	Confidence in Local Police	56.40%	48.40%	53.50%	48.40%	
SPI 1.1	Satisfaction with Overall Service (Police)	84.10%	82.40%	84.90%	83.30%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Reduce crime and antisocial behaviour and protect our neighbourhoods						
SPI 4.1	Perception of Anti Social Behaviour	19.70%	21.90%	18.80%	18.60%	
SPI 5.2	Serious Acquisitive Crime per 1000 Population	11.41	14.26	15.10	13.86	
SPI 5.3	Assault with less serious injury per 1000 population	8.00	8.23	6.86	7.95	
SPI 5.1	Serious violent crime per 1000 population	0.60	0.57	0.9	0.54	
LPI 1	Anti Social Behaviour Rate	117.21	115.61	89.39	113.30	
LPI 4	Other theft per 1000 population	20.73	24.47	16.60	22.98	
LPI 5	Criminal damage per 1000 population	20.23	24.56	17.64	22.18	
LPI 6	Assault without injury per 1000 population	3.99	5.27	2.43	4.98	
LPI 2	Total Recorded crime per 1000 population	84.80	98.44	79.88	93.52	
LPI 3	Overall Sanction Detection Rate	39.78%	37.64%	33.07%	37.00%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Reduce the harm caused by drugs and alcohol						
SPI 4.2	Perception of drunk/rowdy behaviour	27.30%	26.60%	27.80%	23.30%	
SPI 4.3	Perception of local drug use / drug dealing	35.10%	31.90%	32.40%	27.80%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Ensure efficient and effective use of our people and the public's money						
SPI 12.1	Delivery of cashable and non cashable efficiency targets	0.00%	0.00%	-	No Target	No Data available
SPI 13.1	Percentage of police officer working hours lost due to sickness	2.60%	3.25%	3.83%	3.00%	
SPI 13.2	Percentage of Police staff working hours lost due to sickness	3.43%	4.43%	4.37%	4.40%	
Note : 'Performance 2009-10' is the projected performance for the end of year. For actual year to date performance figures, please refer to the appropriate performance tab within framework document.						

Appendix 2 - Interpreting the 'performance assessment' symbols

The 'Performance Assessment' symbol provides an illustration of current performance against 3 comparative benchmarks. These are:




1. Historical Performance

Current performance is compared against that of the previous year. This assessment is illustrated one of the following direction symbols:

-  indicates an improved performance
-  indicates no change in performance
-  indicates deteriorated performance

2. MSF Comparison

Current performance is compared to the MSF average. This assessment is illustrated by the position of the direction symbol within the 'ladder' or box.

-  Better than average performance
-  Average Performance
-  Worse than average performance

3. Performance against annual target

The final element of the assessment is the background colour given to the ladder or box. This represents performance against the agreed target:

- GREEN** shows the Force is on track to achieve the annual target.
- AMBER** shows the Force requires slight performance improvements in order to achieve the annual target.
- RED** shows the Force requires significant performance improvements in order to achieve the annual target.