

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

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

**Status: For information**

**Force Performance Report (April to November 2009)**

**1 Purpose**

- 1.1 To present to the Police Authority an update 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 focused 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 reduced suite of performance measures (i.e. 'a performance dashboard'), which aim to reflect outcome performance in relation to the local policing priority and the Chief Constables 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, 2 are amber and 5 are red. The Force is therefore currently failing to achieve the required target in 7 areas.

3.5 Members have previously requested copies of the Strategic Performance Group minutes. The minutes of the meetings held in November and December 2009 are attached at Appendix 3 and Appendix 4.

## 4 Performance Highlights

4.1 **Public Confidence** has increased. Performance against the National Confidence measure currently stands at 56.8%<sup>1</sup>. This is slightly lower than the annual target of 58%. However, Cleveland Police remain one of the highest performing forces in the country (3rd).

4.2 **Victim** or '**User**' **Satisfaction** remains high. The latest figures show that 83.7% of people surveyed were satisfied with the service received from Cleveland Police. This figure exceeds the annual target of 83.3%

4.3 **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 11.9% (4,437 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).

4.4 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 39.2%, an improvement of 1.7% pts when compared to last year.

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on the latest BCS data release which reports on interviews conducted between July 2008 and June 2009.

- 4.5 ***Sickness levels*** have improved in relation to both Police Officers and Police Staff. The percentage of working hours currently lost due to 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.

## 5 Areas for Improvement

- 5.1 ***Anti Social Behaviour*** (ASB) incidents have increased slightly. Between April and November 2009 there has been an increase of 0.4% (an additional 181 incidents) when compared to last year. The annual target for 2009-10 is to reduce ASB incidents by 2%. Importantly, an increase in recorded ASB between April and August 2009 has now been followed by reductions during September, October and November 2009. This is following a review of ASB performance during the summer. The Force believes that this 2009/10 target of a 2% reduction can still be met.
- 5.2 Results from the British Crime Survey show that overall perceptions of ABS have improved. The latest figures<sup>2</sup> 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%
- 5.3 There have been slight decreases in the percentage of people who perceive drug use or dealing to be a problem (currently 35.1%) and the percentage of people who perceive drunk and rowdy behaviour to be a problem (currently 27.3%). However, perceived levels of such behaviour remain above the annual targets for 2009-10 (27.8% and 23.3% respectively).
- 5.4 ***Most Serious Violence Offences*** (MSV) have increased. Between April and November there has been an increase of 9.5% (an additional 20 crimes) when compared to last year. The annual target for 2009-10 is to reduce MSV by 4.2%

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

---

<sup>2</sup> Based on the latest BCS data release which reports on interviews conducted between July 2008 and June 2009.

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

7.2 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 1 – Performance against the Priority Indicator Set




 <b>CLEVELAND POLICE - FORCE PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD</b> (Overview of performance against the Local Policing Plan & Priority Indicator Set) 						
Performance Indicator	Performance 2009-10	Performance Comparators			Performance Assessment	
		Last year	MSF Average	Annual Target		
<b>LOCAL PRIORITY: To enhance public confidence in Cleveland Police by 'Putting People First'</b>						
SPI 2.2	Dealing with local concerns (agencies)	56.80%	54.00%	49.50%	58.00%	
<b>DELIVERY MECHANISM: Deliver citizen focused policing to all our neighbourhoods</b>						
SPI 2.1	Understanding Local Concerns (agencies)	52.20%	44.70%	44.50%	47.20%	
SPI 2.3	Confidence in Local Police	57.20%	48.40%	52.00%	48.40%	
SPI 1.1	Satisfaction with Overall Service (Police)	83.70%	82.40%	84.60%	83.30%	
<b>DELIVERY MECHANISM: Reduce crime and antisocial behaviour and protect our neighbourhoods</b>						
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	11.90	14.26	14.82	13.86	
SPI 5.3	Assault with less serious injury per 1000 population	8.07	8.23	7.276	7.95	
SPI 5.1	Serious violent crime per 1000 population	0.62	0.57	0.98	0.54	
LPI 1	Anti Social Behaviour Rate	122.59	115.61	89.39	113.30	
LPI 4	Other theft per 1000 population	22.18	24.47	17.44	22.98	
LPI 5	Criminal damage per 1000 population	21.26	24.56	18.43	22.18	
LPI 6	Assault without injury per 1000 population	4.03	5.27	2.46	4.98	
LPI 2	Total Recorded crime per 1000 population	88.32	98.44	82.10	93.52	
LPI 3	Overall Sanction Detection Rate	39.24%	37.64%	33.10%	37.00%	
<b>DELIVERY MECHANISM: Reduce the harm caused by drugs and alcohol</b>						
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%	
<b>DELIVERY MECHANISM: Ensure efficient and effective use of our people and the public's money</b>						
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%	
<b>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.</b>						

## 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.