

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

**Executive & Presenting Officer: Mr Dave Pickard, Assistant Chief Constable
(Territorial Operations)**

Status: For information

Force Performance Report (April 2010 to March 2011)

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 were currently 18 performance measures within the Priority Indicator Set, each with an associated performance target. Targets were achieved in 10 areas (green) whilst improvements were made in a further 5 (amber).

3.5 Performance Highlights

- **Public confidence** remains high. Performance against the headline Public Confidence measure currently stands at 59.9%¹. This figure represents an improvement in performance putting Cleveland Police as the highest performing force in the country. Furthermore, the Local Public Confidence (LPC) Survey results suggest a higher level of confidence, the latest figure being 73.0%².
- **Victim** or '**user**' **satisfaction** remains high. The latest figures show that 84.8%³ of people surveyed were satisfied with the service received from Cleveland Police. This figure is above the annual target of 84.2% and it is an improvement on the previous year.
- **Recorded crime** has fallen significantly. The annual target for 2010/11 was a reduction of 5.1%. End of year figures show a decrease of 9.0% (4234 less crimes) when compared to last year. Reductions were been achieved in the target crime categories of most serious violence, assault with less serious injury, assault without injury, house burglary, vehicle crime and criminal damage⁴.
- The overall **sanction detection rate** remains stable. The annual target for 2010/11 was to maintain a level of at least 37%. End of year figures show the detection rate currently stands at 39.3%.

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

² Based on Local Public Confidence Survey telephone interviews conducted between April 2010 and March 2011.

³ Based on User Satisfaction Survey telephone interviews conducted during the 12 months ending March 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 2010 and March 2011 there has a decrease of 9.3% (5860 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 15.2% of local residents perceive ASB to be a problem. This compares to a figure of 19.1% from last year. The current level is inline with the annual target for 2010/11 (15.2%). The LPC results suggest a lower level of perceived ASB, the latest figure being 8.3⁶%.

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 27.4%). This is a slight change when compared to the same period last year (27.1%). 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 18.7%⁷.
- There has been a slight decrease in the percentage of people who **perceive drug use or dealing** to be a problem (currently 34.5%). Levels are slightly more than the same period last year (33.4%) and 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 19.8%⁸.
- **Other theft** offences have increased slightly. End of year figures show an increase of 2.0%, an additional 236 crimes when compared to last year. The annual target for 2010/11 was to reduce the number of crimes by 7.3% (841 fewer offences).
- **Robbery** has increased. End of year figures show an increase of 3.1%, an additional 9 crimes when compared to last year. Whilst a directional improvement target was sought in this area, a specific numerical reduction was not set.

3.7 'Call Back' Quality Sampling

Members will be aware that a key part of the outsourcing partnership with Steria concerns their contractual responsibility to re-contact members of the community who have recently received a service from Cleveland Police.

⁵ Based on the latest BCS data release which reports on interviews conducted in the 12 months ending December 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.

- 3.8 Between October 2010 and the end of March 2011 some 17,423 members of the community (service recipients) were re-contacted by Steria personnel and surveyed over the telephone concerning their views on the overall quality of service that they received either from the control room or responding officers (or both).
- 3.9 Appendix 3 to this report provides an overview of the quality of service (call-backs) and the views of the service recipients. The scale of 1 – 5 used within the telephone survey represents a continuum of service from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).
- 3.10 It can be seen that the overall level of satisfaction with Cleveland Police is high and 'buoyant' with over 82% of recipients expressing satisfaction level that was either very good or excellent concerning the response of officers attending to their call or incident and almost 94% of recipients receiving a control room service indicating similar satisfaction. Importantly, less than 6% of those surveyed overall indicated that they had received a poor service from Cleveland Police.
- 3.11 The Police Authority, Force and Steria should take confidence and satisfaction from positive results achieved during the first six months of the new strategic alliance. Further refinements will be made to the call back process including provision to provide an improved update on the outcome of the event or incident involving the member of the community.
- 3.12 Further reports will be made available to the Police Authority in due course.

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.

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 significant improvements in relation to performance and 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 maintaining a high rate of detection.
- 5.2 It is recognised that further improvements could be made in relation to the occurrence of other theft, 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 have and will continue to 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 Governance




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)	59.90%	59.90%	54.62%	52.30%	62.00%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Deliver citizen focused policing to all our neighbourhoods							
SPI 2.1	Understanding Local Concerns (agencies)	48.50%	48.50%	50.70%	46.90%	49.70%	
SPI 2.3	Confidence in Local Police	59.40%	59.40%	55.70%	55.70%	55.00%	
SPI 1.1	Satisfaction with Overall Service (Police)	83.60%	83.60%	81.60%	86.40%	84.20%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Reduce crime and antisocial behaviour and protect our neighbourhoods							
Anti Social Behaviour							
SPI 4.1	Perception of Anti Social Behaviour	15.20%	15.20%	18.55%	17.10%	15.20%	
LPI 1	Anti Social Behaviour Rate	8.81	102.24	8.07	88.71	106.68	
Crime and Detections							
LPI 2	Total Recorded crime per 1000 population	6.96	76.82	7.26	75.44	79.82	
SPI 5.1	Serious violent crime per 1000 population	0.05	0.57	0.03	0.83	0.58	
SPI 5.3	Assault with less serious injury per 1000 population	0.61	7.54	0.66	6.34	7.38	
LPI 6	Assault without injury per 1000 population	0.29	3.90	0.39	2.37	3.80	
LPI 4	Other theft per 1000 population	2.02	20.98	1.80	18.10	18.99	
LPI 5	Criminal damage per 1000 population	1.49	16.42	1.65	15.11	18.02	
SPI 5.2	Serious Acquisitive Crime per 1000 Population	0.95	10.06	1.02	13.80	No Target	
LPI 3	Overall Sanction Detection Rate	37.31%	39.32%	38.51%	32.80%	37.00%	
DELIVERY MECHANISM: Reduce the harm caused by drugs and alcohol							
SPI 4.2	Perception of drunk/rowdy behaviour	27.40%	27.40%	25.04%	26.60%	20.00%	
SPI 4.3	Perception of local drug use / drug dealing	34.50%	34.50%	31.88%	31.30%	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	2.72%	2.58%	2.74%	3.40%	2.67%	
SPI 13.2	Percentage of Police staff working hours lost due to sickness	3.46%	3.28%	4.15%	4.00%	3.79%	

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.