

**Report of the Chief Constable to the Chair and Members
of the Operational Policing Panel
26th January 2011**

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

Status: For information

Force Performance Report (April to December 2010)

1 Purpose

1.1 To update Members on Force performance against the 2010/11 Policing Plan Priority.

2 Recommendations

2.1 That members note Force performance against targets.

3 Reasons

3.1 Policing Plan Priority 2010/11

The Policing Plan Priority for 2010/11 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 2010/11, there are currently 18 performance measures within the Priority Indicator Set. Of these 10 are green, 1 is amber, 7 are red.

3.5 Performance Highlights

- **Public confidence** remains high. Performance against the headline Public Confidence measure currently stands at 53.7%¹. Whilst this figure is slightly lower than previously reported, Cleveland Police remain one of the highest performing forces in the country (currently in 10th position). However, the Local Public Confidence (LPC) Survey results suggest a higher level of confidence, the latest figure being 73.3%².
- **Victim** or '**user**' **satisfaction** remains high. The latest figures show that 84.3%³ of people surveyed were satisfied with the service received from Cleveland Police. This figure is marginally above the annual target of 84.2%.
- **Recorded crime** has fallen significantly. The annual target for 2010/11 is a reduction of 5.1%. Year to date figures show a decrease of 11% (3,980 less crimes) when compared to last year. Reductions have been achieved in the target crime categories of most serious violence, assault with less serious injury, house burglary, vehicle crime, criminal damage and other theft⁴.
- The overall **sanction detection rate** remains stable. The annual target for 2010/11 is to maintain a level of at least 37%. Year to date figures show the detection rate currently stands at 40%, this is slightly above the detection rate achieved at the same time last year.

¹ Based on the latest BCS data release which reports on interviews conducted in the 12 months ending June 2010

² Based on Local Public Confidence Survey telephone interviews conducted between April and September 2010.

³ Based on User Satisfaction Survey telephone interviews conducted during the 12 months ending June 2010.

⁴ Whilst reductions have been achieved in these categories, these are not necessarily in line with the required annual targets.

- **Anti-social behaviour** (ASB) incidents have fallen. Between April and December 2010 there has a decrease of 11.8% (5939 fewer incidents) when compared to last year. The annual target for 2010/11 is a reduction of 5%, particularly in relation to the incidence of rowdy/nuisance neighbours. Rowdy or inconsiderate behaviour and street drinking.
- Results from the British Crime Survey show that **overall perceptions of ASB** have improved. The latest figures⁵ show that 17.5% of local residents perceive ASB to be a problem. This compares to a figure of 19.0% from last year. The current level remains above the annual target for 2010/11 (15.2%). However, the LPC results suggest a lower level of perceived ASB, the latest figure being 8.6⁶%.

3.6 Areas for Improvement:

- There has been a decrease in the percentage of people who perceive **drunk and rowdy behaviour** to be a problem (currently 25.1%). This is a slight improvement when compared to the same period last year (25.9%). The current level remains significantly above the annual target for 2010/11 (20.0%). Again, the LPC survey results suggest lower levels of concern, the latest figures being 19.3%⁷.
- There has been slight decrease in the percentage of people who **perceive drug use or dealing** to be a problem (currently 33.6%). Levels are slightly less than the same period last year (33.8%) but remain significantly above the annual target level of 2010/11 (23.7%). Again, the LPC survey results suggest lower levels of concern, the latest figures being 19.5%⁸.
- **Assaults without injury** (common assault) have increased. Year to date figures show an increase of 1.7%, an additional 28 crimes when compared to last year. The annual target for 2010/11 is to reduce the number of crimes by 6.3% (144 fewer crimes).

4. Implications

4.1 Finance

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

4.2 Diversity and Equal Opportunities

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

⁵ Based on the latest BCS data release which reports on interviews conducted between April 2009 and March 2010

⁶ Calculation includes 'don't know' responses therefore comparisons should be treated with caution.

⁷ Calculations include 'don't know' responses therefore comparisons should be treated with caution.

⁸ Calculations include 'don't know' responses therefore comparisons should be treated with caution.

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 is making good progress in relation to the delivery of the 2010/11 Policing Plan priority. The Force continues to achieve high levels of public confidence and satisfaction whilst reducing crime significantly and increasing detections.

5.2 It is recognised that further improvements are still required in relation to the occurrence of assaults without injury, robbery and perceptions of anti-social behaviour, specifically with regards to 'drugs dealing and use' and 'drunk and rowdy 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




 CLEVELAND POLICE - FORCE PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD (Overview of performance against the Local Policing Plan & Priority Indicator Set) 							
Performance Indicator	Current Data*	End of year projection	Performance Comparators			Performance Assessment	
			Comparative Month	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)	53.70%	53.70%	56.80%	52.40%	62.00%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Deliver citizen focused policing to all our neighbourhoods							
SPI 2.1	Understanding Local Concerns (agencies)	46.90%	46.90%	52.20%	47.80%	49.70%	
SPI 2.3	Confidence in Local Police	55.20%	55.20%	57.20%	53.70%	55.00%	
SPI 1.1	Satisfaction with Overall Service (Police)	84.40%	84.40%	84.10%	85.70%	84.20%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Reduce crime and antisocial behaviour and protect our neighbourhoods							
Anti Social Behaviour							
SPI 4.1	Perception of Anti Social Behaviour	17.50%	17.50%	19.70%	17.90%	15.20%	
LPI 1	Anti Social Behaviour Rate	6.86	100.81	7.73	89.12	106.68	
Crime and Detections							
LPI 2	Total Recorded crime per 1000 population	4.51	75.70	5.69	77.60	79.82	
SPI 5.1	Serious violent crime per 1000 population	0.04	0.56	0.04	0.87	0.58	
SPI 5.3	Assault with less serious injury per 1000 population	0.56	7.61	0.59	6.59	7.38	
LPI 6	Assault without injury per 1000 population	0.27	4.06	0.33	2.45	3.80	
LPI 4	Other theft per 1000 population	1.07	20.44	1.29	17.87	18.99	
LPI 5	Criminal damage per 1000 population	0.93	16.18	1.34	15.98	18.02	
SPI 5.2	Serious Acquisitive Crime per 1000 Population	0.60	9.57	0.77	14.32	No Target	
LPI 3	Overall Sanction Detection Rate	43.59%	40.35%	41.93%	32.99%	37.00%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Reduce the harm caused by drugs and alcohol							
SPI 4.2	Perception of drunk/rowdy behaviour	25.10%	25.10%	27.30%	25.70%	20.00%	
SPI 4.3	Perception of local drug use / drug dealing	33.60%	33.60%	35.10%	32.10%	23.70%	
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%	-	-	No Target	No Data available
SPI 13.1	Percentage of police officer working hours lost due to sickness	2.91%	2.51%	3.30%	3.70%	2.67%	
SPI 13.2	Percentage of Police staff working hours lost due to sickness	4.33%	3.24%	4.00%	4.30%	3.79%	

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.