



Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
Cleveland Police Headquarters
Ladgate Lane
Middlesbrough
TS8 9EH

Email: pcc@cleveland.pnn.police.uk
Website: <http://www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk>

Police and Crime Commissioner:
Chief of Staff:
Chief Constable:

Barry Coppinger
Ed Chicken
Jacqui Cheer QPM

Tel: 01642 301653
Tel: 01642 301653
Tel: 01642 301215

Report of the Police & Crime Commissioner to the Chair and Members of the Cleveland Police & Crime Panel

22nd October 2013

Quarterly Performance Report (July – September 2013)

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide an update of performance scrutiny undertaken by the Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland during the period July – September 2013.

2 Priorities of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland

- 2.1 The priorities of the Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Cleveland, as set out in the Police & Crime Plan 2013-17, are:

- Retaining and Developing Neighbourhood Policing
- Ensuring a Better Deal for Victims & Witnesses
- Diverting People from Offending, with a focus on Rehabilitation and the Prevention of Re-offending
- Developing Better Co-ordination, Communication and Partnership between Agencies - to make the Best Use of Resources
- Working for Better Industrial and Community Relations

- 2.2 Cleveland Police has developed Operational Plans for the first year of the Police & Crime Plan that sets out priority areas to support the Police and Crime Commissioner's priorities. In developing these plans, the Force has taken account of public consultation, listened to partners and considered current levels of crime and disorder.

2.3 The table below shows how the priorities of Cleveland Police support the Commissioner's priorities:

PCC Objective	Force Priority	Area of Focus / Measurement
Retaining and Developing Neighbourhood Policing	Reduce Neighbourhood Crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antisocial Behaviour (ASB) & Criminal Damage • House Burglary • Personal Robbery
Ensuring a Better Deal for Victims & Witnesses	Improve Services to Victims And Witnesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Of Service • Repeat Victimization
	Protecting People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual Exploitation of Children • Hate Incidents • Sexual Offending • Domestic Abuse • High Risk Missing People
Diverting People from Offending, with a focus on Rehabilitation and the Prevention of Re-offending	Reduce Offending and Prevent Re-offending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restorative Justice • Integrated Offender Management • Sexual And Violent Offenders
	Tackle Serious and Organised Crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organised Crime Groups • Criminal Use Of The Roads • Proceeds Of Crime
Developing Better Co-ordination, Communication and Partnership between Agencies - to make the Best Use of Resources	Effective Use of Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Force Structure • Develop Our Leaders • Effective Partnerships • Acting Professionally

2.4 This report will outline performance information relating purely to the priorities of the Police & Crime Commissioner. This may include performance data or actions that have been undertaken by the Office of the PCC to hold the Chief Constable to account.

3 How the Commissioner Monitors Performance

3.1 The Performance Management Framework of the PCC ensures analysis and scrutiny of priority performance, as part of overall performance management activities. This is undertaken via a number of means which are described briefly below:

3.2 Weekly Meetings with the Chief Constable

3.3 The PCC and Chief Constable meets weekly to consider current and future issues, including performance management, via a structured agenda. The actions from each meeting are recorded and published on the 'Force Accountability' page of the PCC's website to aid transparency.

3.4 Monthly Crime Performance Updates

3.5 At the start of every month, the Office of the PCC prepares a summary of headlines across a range of crimes and Cleveland's positioning against national and Most Similar Forces (MSFs), informed by the crime statistics.

3.6 Attendance at the Strategic Performance Group

3.7 The Office of the PCC is present at the Force's monthly Strategic Performance Group, a Force led event, chaired by the Force Executive and attended by all relevant senior officers. The content includes monthly and year-to-date analysis of operational policing priorities, crime performance data (including national and MSF positions), Antisocial Behaviour (ASB), public confidence and victim satisfaction surveys, control room call back satisfaction levels, arrest/custody data and crime registrar compliance.

3.8 PCC Quarterly Performance Scrutiny Meetings

3.9 Every month, the PCC holds themed Scrutiny Meetings with the Force and/or partners.

3.10 The first month involves scrutiny of the crime data performance. Month two involves looking at corporate performance issues such as Financial and Human Resource indicators. In the third month, the focus shifts to involve commissioning and partnerships, and then the cycle repeats.

3.11 At Performance Scrutiny Meetings, focussed questions are posed of the Deputy Chief Constable regarding quarterly crime data, ASB statistics and public satisfaction levels which, in turn, are published on the Force Accountability page of the PCC's website.

3.12 At the scrutiny meeting in September, relating to first quarter performance (April – June 2013), the PCC posed seven questions relating to: ASB Levels, the Impact of Restorative Justice, Property Theft, District Crime Levels, Domestic Abuse Detection Rates, and Victim Satisfaction. The responses to these questions are listed in Appendix 1.

3.13 The Performance Scrutiny Meeting for the period July – September takes place on 28 November 2013 and an update of questions, posed to the Chief Constable, will be provided to the Police & Crime Panel at the following meeting.

4 Performance Against the PCC's Key Priorities

4.1 Performance measures for the PCC's priorities are set out in the Police & Crime Plan 2013-17. Each priority is listed below with relevant update information.

4.2 PCC Priority 1: Retain and Develop Neighbourhood Policing

- 4.3 In 2012-13, Cleveland Police experienced its lowest year on record for levels of Publicly Reported Crime (where there is a victim of crime) with a decrease of 9.4% (3,648 less offences) compared to 2011-12. For the same period, however, in comparison with its Most Similar Forces, Cleveland remained in last place (rate per 1,000 of population) and 41st of 43 Forces¹ nationally for levels of Publicly Reported Crime and Total Crime.
- 4.4 For July - September 2013, levels of Publicly Reported Crime have increased by 5.4% (470 offences) whilst Total Crime increased by 3.5% (344 offences) against the same period in 2012-13. For the year to date (April – September 2013), Publicly Reported Crime has increased by 3% (529 offences) whilst Total Crime experienced a rise of 1.7% (344 offences) against the same period in 2012-13. A breakdown of Publicly Reported Crime and Total Crime levels are shown in Appendix 2.
- 4.5 For the period April – September 2013, overall Antisocial Behaviour (ASB) levels rose by 11.6% (2407 more incidents) across Cleveland, measured against the same period in 2012-13. This breaks down as Personal ASB (-22.3%, 1640 less incidents), Nuisance ASB (+30.1%, 3830 more incidents) and Environmental ASB (+33.5%, 217 more incidents).
- 4.6 Local Public Confidence levels for the period October 2012 - September 2013 state:
- 85.3% of people have confidence in Cleveland Police (-2.1% based against the same period last year i.e. October 2011 to September 2012),
 - 72.3% have confidence in Cleveland Police and their Local Authority (-5.5%),
 - 64.7% think that Cleveland Police do a 'good' or 'excellent' job (-7.1%),
 - 16.1% feel that their quality of life is affected by the fear of crime/ASB (+1.2%),
 - 5.4% perceive there to be a high level of ASB in their area (+0.7%).
- 4.7 During the second quarter of 2013-14, the PCC continued to fulfil his obligations to retain and improve neighbourhood policing by:
- Launching Cleveland's first Community Safety Awards, recognising the achievements of community officers, volunteers and organisations, who have greatly assisted in tackling crime and antisocial behaviour in their local communities,
 - Awarding £17,000 to local charitable voluntary and community groups via the Police Property Act Fund,
 - Attending the Primary School Council Annual Conference in Hartlepool,
 - Conducting regular PCC neighbourhood visits across Cleveland, and
 - Attending a further 18 community meetings as part of the Your Force Your Voice initiative, publishing responses to public questions on the PCC website.

¹ HMIC Crime Comparator, <http://www.hmic.gov.uk/crime-and-policing-comparator/>

4.8 PCC Priority 2: Ensuring a Better Deal for Victims & Witnesses

4.9 The latest findings from the Victim Satisfaction Survey for the period October 2012 - September 2013 state where 84.18% of victims surveyed expressing a level of satisfaction with the overall service received by Cleveland Police (up 1.65% based against the same period last year i.e. October 2011 to September 2012). The satisfaction sub-categories break down as:

- Ease of Contact - 96.97% (up 0.76% against the same period last year),
- Actions Taken - 82.71% (up 2.06%),
- Follow Up & Feedback - 72.63% (up 1.42%), and
- Treatment by Staff - 92.28% (up 0.92%)

4.10 During the second quarter of 2013-14, the PCC continued to fulfil his obligations to ensure a better deal for victims and witnesses by:

- Working with the Teesside Victims Strategic Planning Group to review and commission services,
- Hosting an event and workshop with a focus to reduce all forms of Violence against Women and Girls.
- Supporting targeted activity to eliminate Hate Crime and posted information about Third Party Reporting Centres on the PCC's website,
- Being a key stakeholder in the launch of the Safe Houses Scheme in Cleveland
- Hosted a Disability Hate Crime Summit
- Supported press events highlighting attacks on Guide Dogs and the use of the Guide Dog's Sensory Tunnel, which informs the way police officers and staff deal with the visually impaired, and
- Supported the International Day against Homophobia (IDAHO) and launched Middlesbrough Pride.

4.11 Looking forward, during October 2013, the PCC will host a workshop to improve co-ordination and collaboration between Restorative Justice Agencies in Cleveland, which will focus on the service to and interaction with victims.

4.12 PCC Priority 3: Diverting People from Offending, with a focus on Rehabilitation and the Prevention of Re-offending

4.13 Restorative Justice was launched in Cleveland in April 2013 as an alternative means of disposal for a number of offences committed by Under 18s –

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| • Other Theft & Burglary | • Minor Drug Crimes |
| • Vehicle Crime | • Antisocial Behaviour |
| • Common Assault | • Public Order |
| • Criminal Damage/Arson | • Harassment |
| • Minor Robbery | • Neighbour & Family Disputes |

4.14 For the PCC's Performance Scrutiny Meeting in September, the Force prepared a briefing on the 'Impact of Restorative Justice in Cleveland', which is attached in

Appendix 3 of this report. The table below, taken from this briefing, outlines the use of Restorative Justice Interventions recorded in Cleveland from April – August 2013.

Month	H District	R&C District	M District	S District	Grand Total
April	2	6	4	15	27
May	8	14	12	18	52
June	6	13	15	10	44
July	6	12	13	27	58
August	13	1	9	12	35
Grand Total	22	45	44	70	216

*the use of RJ interventions with Under 18s has not adversely affected the Force's 'positive outcome' rate (detected crime)

4.15 During the second quarter of 2013-14, the PCC continued to fulfil his obligations to divert people from offending and prevent re-offending by:

- Engaging with young people in contact with the criminal justice system via Youth Offending Teams,
- Being a key stakeholder in the Young Peoples Strategic Planning Group to review support services,
- Supporting the work of the Troubled Families Programme, and
- Publishing a list of foodbanks on the PCC's website in a bid to inform struggling families.

4.16 PCC Priority 4: Developing Better Co-ordination, Communication and Partnership between Agencies - to make the Best Use of Resources

4.17 The Office of the PCC receives and is informed by quarterly performance data from each of its criminal justice partners: Probation, Crown Prosecution Service, Court Service, Prison Service and Youth Offending Service.

4.18 The PCC engages with each of these services through regular structured meetings and collectively via the Cleveland & Durham Local Criminal Justice Board, where performance data is discussed and monitored.

4.19 During the second quarter of 2013-14, the PCC continued to fulfil his obligations to develop better co-ordination, communication and partnership between agencies by:

- Ensuring resources were focused to the front-line, through a review of service provision,
- Bringing together partners to deliver shared priorities and work better together,
- Championing partnership working across Criminal Justice Agencies, and
- Working closely with the Voluntary and Community Sector to develop solutions to local problems.

4.20 PCC Priority 5: Working for Better Industrial and Community Relations

- 4.21 The Office of the PCC monitors Force reports and monitors data relating to capital investments, revenue expenditure, treasury management, sickness, time off in lieu (TOIL) and rest days in lieu (RIDL), which are presented and scrutinised at the quarterly Finance, Resource and Policy meeting.
- 4.22 The PCC monitors the embedding of Equality, Diversity and Human Rights legislation, both as an employer and an emergency service provider, via monthly Equality and Diversity reports, attendance at Force Equality meetings, Staff Forums and updates to the Force Equality and Diversity Action Plan.
- 4.23 During the second quarter of 2013-14, the PCC continued to fulfil his obligations to work for better industrial and community relations by:
- Developing new models of working (i.e. Project Orbis, Business Transformation Projects) and enhanced leadership skills,
 - Ensuring a balanced budget is achieved through regular scrutiny, and
 - Preparing and negotiating Stage 2 transfer arrangements.

5 Finance

- 5.1 There are no further financial implications arising from this report.

6 Risk

- 6.1 There are no further risk implications arising from this report.

7 Diversity and Equal Opportunities

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

8 Recommendations

- 8.1 The report be noted.

Barry Coppinger
Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland

Author of Report:

Dr Neville Cameron, Performance Officer, Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland

PCC Scrutiny Performance Questions (April- June 2013)

1. Recognising the background that in 2012/13 the Force experienced the lowest reports of ASB on record, what is the explanation for the 9.5% increase seen in the first quarter of this year, and how is it being tackled. [Include reference to criminal damage rise in the answer]

- In 2012/13 reports of ASB fell by 19.7%, continuing a long-term downward trend and creating an all time low.
- As highlighted by the question, against this low backdrop the 1st quarter of 13/14 saw an increase of 9.5% in ASB (943 more incidents) in comparison to the first three months of 12/13. This contrasts with an overall increase in calls for service of 3.2% over the same period (about half of which is attributable to ASB)
- ASB is classified into three nationally identified categories: 'Personal', 'Nuisance' and 'Environmental'.
- On a positive note, Personal ASB (which reflects the most serious situations where ASB is suffered directly by an individual rather than, for instance, occurring in a neighbourhood generally) in fact reduced by 23.7% over the quarter. The increase in overall ASB reflected increases of 28.5% and 28.2% in the Nuisance and Environmental categories, respectively, which whilst clearly unwelcome, represent the less grave types of ASB.
- This overall pattern was reflected across the force, with the exception of Middlesbrough where Environmental ASB also reduced.
- An immediate question is whether there has been a change in public reporting habits and / or any change in recording practice by the force.
- As regards recording practice variation, an initial analysis by the Force Crime & Incident Registrar would suggest not, but further analysis by the Tasking, Coordination and Performance command is under way.
- A review of Criminal Damage (which will often move in tandem with ASB) shows that two of four Local Policing Areas (Middlesbrough and Hartlepool) have shown a reduction over the same period, albeit at force level there is a slight increase of 1.2% (30 offences). As such, this examination does not particularly assist in understanding the issue.
- It is not possible to know whether public reporting habits have changed but, of potential note is the fact that despite the increase in ASB reports, the latest survey data (12 months to June 2013) reveals that the percentage of people who believe that there is a high level of ASB in their area has fallen by 2.3%pts year on year and is static on the last quarter.
- In any event, the response to this pressure is:
 1. Further research and analytical work to better understand the potential drivers for these changes, with a view to communicating and tackling the true issues;
 2. Attention to the most vulnerable through the development of the 'Victims First' approach to the management of ASB and other incident types
 3. Ongoing robust oversight and management of local ASB problems through effective Neighbourhood Policing

2. Has the shift towards Restorative Justice had an adverse impact on the Force detection rate?

- In previous years, forces who have introduced Restorative Justice have tended to see a decrease of around 5%pts in the published detection rate as Home Office rules have not allowed these types of outcomes to be counted as detections. Clearly this represented a potential disincentive to adoption of an otherwise sound approach
- In anticipation of facing a similar problem, from 1st April 2012 Cleveland Police began using the language 'positive outcomes' instead of 'detections', this with a view to changing both internal and external expectations in a way that would facilitate the introduction of RJ and reduce any 'criticism' of a falling detection rate
- Culturally this proved helpful, but as it transpired, the Home Office also helpfully changed its stance just as the force began to roll-out RJ in April 2013. The consequence has been that all positive RJ outcomes achieved by the force have 'counted' alongside other means of detection in the calculation of a nationally recognised and comparable positive outcome rate.
- As for the rate itself, by end of the first quarter 13/14 this stood at 35.3%, compared to a 12/13 year end position of 37.7%.
- Although representing a slight reduction, this continues to place the force 2nd in its MSF and on the most recent Home Office data (to 31st March 2013), 3rd nationally. Accordingly is not seen as an area of weakness.
- When at such high levels, action to further increase the positive outcome rate runs the risk of driving unhelpful behaviours which can be to the detriment of overall crime prevention and reduction. By parallel, an example of this is seen in some large retail outlets where security staff whose effectiveness is measured by number of detections secured, allow a crime to occur rather than intervening to prevent it. Accordingly, specific care is needed when addressing detection performance.
- Nevertheless there is a keen focus within the force in improving the positive outcome rate in those categories where it can have the greatest impact on crime reduction and detection, a specific example being that for house burglary where there are investigation and detection improvement plans in place in a number of Local Policing Areas. Other positive outcome rate changes, such as those for sexual offences, are being closely examined for cause. The overall adage, however, remains 'better no victim than a detected crime'.

3. Despite notable reductions in house burglary, the Force has seen some significant increases in some other categories involving theft of property. How does the force account for this and what steps is it taking to tackle it? [include shoplifting in the answer]

- A 1st quarter 14% reduction in the category of house burglary is very welcome, particularly when seen in the context of a 12% reduction in 12/13 – the best performance on record.
- Overall, however, offences involving theft ('acquisitive crime') have risen 4.9% compared with the 1st quarter of 12/13, with particular pressures in shoplifting (+14.5%), vehicle crime (+11.3%), burglary of sheds & garages (+4.6%) and other acquisitive crime (+3.5%).
- Whilst it must be borne in mind that each of these increases is set against very significant reductions in 2012/13, they nevertheless come as a disappointment.

- The majority of these crimes are relatively low level with shoplifting accounting for 170 out of the 244 crimes net increase over the three months, and thefts of metal and garden items / equipment accounting for much of the other. The diagnosis is that many of these crimes are likely to be economically driven, a position forewarned since the onset of the recession.
- In terms of response, the force has re-visited and revitalised its various plans and processes to tackle shoplifting and metal theft, and to robustly police high crime causers and persistent offenders generally. These existing pressures have since been exacerbated by the prolonged good weather, leading to a parallel increase in calls for service generally and anti-social behaviour / public disorder.
- As regards shoplifting, there are two issues of note. Firstly, the force is being proactive in highlighting the availability of food-banks to striving families. Secondly, in various locations, there is evidence that the national or regional policies of some retail chains are not consistent with effective crime prevention, for instance in terms of store layout, the positioning of goods or the expectations placed on security staff. This is an issue that is currently being mapped more specifically in order to better inform the PCC.

4. Stockton appears to have seen a more significant increase in crime than elsewhere. How does the Force account for this and what steps are being taken to tackle it? [introduce resource allocation issues within answer]

- In contrast to the other Local Policing Areas, Stockton achieved its lowest crime on record in the year 2010/11 rather than 2012/13. It has since fluctuated around this level showing a year on year increase in 11/12, a decrease in 12/13 and a year to date increase of 10.2% for the 1st quarter of 13/14.
- To put this in perspective, Stockton has a below average crime rate per thousand population in terms of the force, and as a Community Safety Partnership area has also been below its Most Similar Group average for at least three.
- Nevertheless, whereas in the medium term (2 years) there has been a downward trend in Publicly Reported Crime in other areas of the force, Stockton's position is broadly static.
- In response to these challenges, the force has ensured that Stockton has benefitted from the flexible 'cross border' deployment approaches increasingly adopted since August 2011 and now being structurally embedded under the 'Project Orbis' force change programme. This has provided it with temporary support in the areas of incident and crime management, in particular.
- In the meantime, Stockton's pre and post Project Orbis management teams have worked hard to improve its own ability to match demand within existing resources, and this has paid dividends. This work is continuing and being extended to other processes. In addition, the supervisory skills mix at Stockton relative to other areas of the force is being examined by both the Neighbourhood and Response commanders
- In response to the immediate challenge of the current increase, additional temporary support has also recently been given. This of course comes at the expense of like support to other areas of the force and is a less than satisfactory long-term solution.
- The force has not undertaken a fundamental review of resource allocation between the Local Policing Areas for at least a decade, and the question must arise as to whether the significant growth in population at Stockton has influenced the policing

demand in a way that has been sufficiently reflected. The intention is that further examination of relative resourcing across all functions is conducted as part of a lean review once the current Orbis structural changes are complete (i.e. post November 2013).

- It is reiterated that in a climate of shrinking resources, any positive resource allocation changes must of necessity come at the expense of another geographical area or function; and that the debate could ultimately become one not of growth, but of which business area faces reductions last.
- Finally, give the particular pressure at Stockton, that Local Policing Area has been the first to benefit from the roll-out of the revised and refreshed approaches to crime management described in the response to Question 3, above.

5. Why have offences involving theft of property reduced at Middlesbrough whilst rising elsewhere?

- It is true that whilst at force level overall offences involving theft have risen in the 1st quarter by 4.9%, at Middlesbrough they have reduced by a similar amount (4.6%). Looking at the detail, Middlesbrough's only areas of increase over this period were vehicle crime and shoplifting.
- This difference potentially reflects a number of different issues:
 - The clear variations in crime / offending behaviour that can and do exist between the four Local Policing Areas – for instance, in Middlesbrough the incidence of metal theft is significantly less pronounced than elsewhere; whereas the Autumn peak in antisocial behaviour and criminal damage that seems to be part of the youth culture of central Teesside does not prevail in Hartlepool.
 - Peaks or troughs in the levels of crime in the months of 12/13 that form the baseline – in this instance there being abnormal spikes in house and other burglary in individual months of the first quarter of last year that render still creditable reductions in those crime types this quarter especially pronounced (particularly in percentage terms)
 - Other issues of normal variation such as the impact of the release or otherwise from custody of high crime causers who take time to catch and re-convict
 - Variations in practice and procedure
- These issues of course become exacerbated the narrower the reporting period and the lower the level of crime that on average occurs. It is for these reasons that the force concentrates through local Monthly Performance Review in particular on:
 - Examining trends over time and significant variations from the norm
 - Understanding the contributing factors to those variations / trends, in doing so:
 - i. best placing the force to make decisions on any supplementary actions or interventions that may be required;
 - ii. identifying innovation and good practice that can be shared across the other areas

6. What is the Force doing to meet its target to further improve the positive outcome rate for crimes involving domestic abuse? Is there any particular explanation for why Hartlepool appears to be doing better than elsewhere?

- Based on 1st quarter 2013/14, the force had a projected year-end positive outcome rate of 48.5% for crimes involving domestic abuse. This compares with a positive rate for all crimes of violence of around 43% and 35.3% for crime generally.
- In Summer 2012/13 the force improved and re-launched its approach to the investigation of domestic abuse, placing additional expectations upon officers in terms of quality of investigation and the need to make positive interventions.
- Although there has been an historic issue with data collection methodology that makes local analysis difficult, at force level there is evidence of a subsequent downward trend in domestic abuse incidents, with repeat victimisation also falling until at least year-end.
- The method used to calculate repeat victimisation has been improved for 2013/14, but the change means it will be some time before we are in a position to know with confidence whether levels locally are rising or falling.
- In the context of work at Hartlepool, however, local specialist workers in the domestic abuse field report increased confidence among their client base in reporting incidents to the police.
- Associated with this is a stronger than average domestic abuse positive outcome rate which is projected to be 60.9% at year end. To some extent, this is believed to reflect a higher than force average positive outcome rate for crime (and crimes of violence) generally.
- There may, however, be another factor: that is the particular model of specialist intervention scheme being delivered under the auspices of the Harbour project. Such schemes exist in all areas of the force, but it is understood that Harbour at Hartlepool has enjoyed a level of funding that may have enabled it to deliver a depth and breadth of intervention that generates improved outcomes compared with other areas, including increased detections.
- This is an area that the PCC may want to consider more closely as he considers his commissioning decisions for 2014/15. In the meantime, Head of Vulnerability has been asked to assess the operating practice and effectiveness of the various models in place across the force with a view to identifying transferable good practice.
- Returning to force level activity, another area of potential interest to the PCC will be the force's work to secure prosecutions in those cases where a victim will not testify. The force has already influenced the multi-agency decision making process to better reflect the cumulative risk associated with repetition rather than just the gravity of an individual offence, and we have also been influential in discussions regionally and locally with the DPP, CPS and local judiciary on the overall approach. Most recently we have become party to a joint regional CPS-Police protocol to improve the standard of evidence gathering and CPS decision making in domestic abuse cases with a view to securing more 'unsupported prosecutions'. If successful, this should aid further improvements in the positive outcome rate for such offences.

7. The Force enjoys an 83% satisfaction rate from the public, but this is lower than might be expected relative to other forces. What is the Force's plan to secure long-term improvements in satisfaction?

- As the question identifies, in absolute terms levels of victim satisfaction with the force are high. Furthermore, the most recent data from the Local Policing Survey

shows that a tailing off seen during 2012 appears to have been stabilised and reversed, with an overall 0.5%pt increase for the 12 months to June 2013.

- In addition, at 12th in England & Wales on the police only measure for dealing with local concerns, public confidence in the force remains well above the national average, significantly above that 3 years ago (when it was ranked 25th), and broadly stable. Given the reputational challenges faced by the force over the last 24 months, that is a key achievement.
- However, it is recognised that in comparison to the national position and some of those in our group of most similar forces, there is room for improvement in victim satisfaction levels.
- In response to the tailing off in 2012, the force identified the need to put in place a long-term force-wide improvement plan around this under the auspices of a dedicated working group. This was delayed slightly to enable new roles and responsibilities under the force change programme 'Orbis' to be clarified, thereby ensuring that the most suitable cross-representation could be secured. The membership has now been drawn up, Terms of Reference agreed and an inaugural workshop meeting scheduled for early September, this to include representation from the office of the PCC. The group will examine the customer journey 'end to end', consider special needs such as those relating to victims of hate crime and domestic abuse, and seek out best practice from other forces.
- A key challenge will of course be securing improvements in satisfaction in the context of shrinking resources and increased pressures on those having front line contact with victims and witnesses.

Publicly Reported Crime Data (Second Quarter and Year to Date)

Crime Type	JULY - SEPTEMBER 2013				YEAR TO DATE (APRIL – SEPT 2013)			
	2013/14	2012/13	Change	% Change	2013/14	2012/13	Change	% Change
Violence Against The Person	1635	1698	-63	-3.7%	3147	3442	-295	-8.6%
<i>Violence With Injury</i>	929	1008	-79	-7.8%	1820	2080	-260	-12.5%
<i>Violence Without Injury</i>	706	690	16	2.3%	1327	1362	-35	-2.6%
Sexual Offences	163	144	19	13.2%	308	281	27	9.6%
<i>Rape</i>	62	42	20	47.6%	107	95	12	12.6%
<i>Other Sexual Offences</i>	101	102	-1	-1.0%	201	186	15	8.1%
Theft	5453	5063	390	7.7%	10700	10062	638	6.3%
<i>Burglary - Domestic</i>	489	579	-90	-15.5%	961	1134	-173	-15.3%
<i>Burglary - Non Domestic</i>	662	601	61	10.1%	1348	1254	94	7.5%
<i>Robbery - Personal</i>	64	64	0	0.0%	119	140	-21	-15.0%
<i>Robbery - Business</i>	8	8	0	0.0%	16	17	-1	-5.9%
<i>Vehicle Crime (Inc Inter.)</i>	778	740	38	5.1%	1586	1466	120	8.2%
<i>Shoplifting</i>	1356	1197	159	13.3%	2700	2368	332	14.0%
<i>Other Theft</i>	2096	1874	222	11.8%	3970	3683	287	7.8%
Criminal Damage & Arson	1928	1804	124	6.9%	3898	3739	159	4.3%
Publicly Reported Crime	9179	8709	470	5.4%	18053	17524	529	3.0%
Total Crime	10171	9827	344	3.5%	20062	19718	344	1.7%

Links to other Force performance related information including:

- Official Cleveland Police Crime Statistics
- Neighbourhood Crime Statistics including outcomes (at postcode level)
- Cleveland Police Performance against English and Welsh Forces
- Local and National Confidence Figures
- HMIC Inspection Outcomes

are listed on the PCC's website at:

<http://www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk/Performance/Police-and-Partner-Performance.aspx>

**Briefing Note to the
Police & Crime Commissioner**

13th September 2013



Restorative Justice & Restorative Interventions

What is Restorative Justice (RJ)?

Restorative Justice (RJ) processes bring those harmed by crime or conflict, and those responsible for the harm, into communication, enabling everyone affected by a particular incident to play a part in repairing the harm and finding a positive way forward.

What is a Restorative Intervention (RI)?

A Restorative Intervention (RI) is the professional intervention that a member of Cleveland Police (police officer, PCSO or police staff member) makes within the community or custody environment to resolve a reported matter of crime, disorder or antisocial behaviour using a Restorative Justice (RJ) technique.

The Restorative Justice Agenda

- Improving victim satisfaction;
- Sustainably reducing re-offending;
- Restoring confidence in police & the Criminal Justice System;
- Promoting effective community engagement;
- Building community resilience & social capital;
- Tackling low level crime, disorder & antisocial behaviour effectively;
- Promoting the 'Respect' agenda.

Cleveland Police's Restorative Justice Approach

- From April 2013, most offences committed by under 18s dealt with by way of Restorative Intervention (RI);
- Restorative Intervention in the community; swift, effective, sustainable and impactful;
- Neighbourhood Policing Teams, Response, Prisoner Handling Teams at the forefront of the use of RI;
- A focus upon low level crime, disorder & antisocial behaviour
- Officers, PCSOs, police staff are skilled, confident and supported to use Restorative Interventions;
- Fewer U18s arrested and channelled into the criminal justice system thereby receiving criminal sanctions;
- Victim satisfaction enhanced, re-offending reduced.

Crime 'in-scope' for Restorative Interventions (* Most common RJ interventions)

- Theft* & burglary (other)
- Vehicle crime
- Common assault* (S.39)
- Criminal damage*/arson

- Minor robbery
- Minor drug crimes
- Anti-social behaviour*
- Public order offences
- Harassment
- Neighbour dispute*
- Family conflict

Other crimes where officers retain discretion to use a restorative intervention but only following very careful consideration

- Assault (above S.39)
- Dwelling house burglary
- High monetary value crimes
- High profile crimes
- Aggravated hate crime

Crimes that are not considered suitable for a restorative intervention:

- Domestic violence
- Sexual offences
- Motoring offences

RJ – the story so far...

- RJ commenced (as planned) on 1st April 2013;
- Training, advice, guidance & support material all delivered within timescales prior to project launch;
- Extensive support material on intranet & internet;
- System changes made to Storm, crime, NICHE;
- Focused upon Neighbourhood Policing Teams, Response Teams & Prisoner Handling Teams as the largest 'source' of RJ activity;
- Soft & formal media launch (coverage positive);
- Very well received by colleagues across the Force & strong support from PCC & partner agencies;
- Colleagues are confident & creative in its use;
- QA & reputation safeguard measures put in place;

RJ Crime Results (as at 29/8/13)

Month	H District	R&C District	M District	S District	Grand Total
April	2	6	4	15	27
May	8	14	12	18	52
June	6	13	15	10	44
July	6	12	13	27	58
August	13	1	9	12	35
Grand Total	22	45	44	70	216

*the use of RJ interventions with U18s has not adversely affected the Force's 'positive outcome' rate (detected crime)

Recent Restorative Justice Examples

- In a public park an argument between three girls (11 years old) escalates to a fight with one girl receiving minor injuries. The two other females were found and spoken to, they admitted to the officer that a fight had taken place and understood it was wrong. A RJ champion was spoken to and recommended an essay on why violence is wrong should be completed, to give the girls the time to reflect on their actions. The injured girl and her mother were happy for this to take place together with an apology.
- Police received a report of theft from a shop in the Saltburn area. Following an initial investigation a 13-year-old boy admitted to police in front of his parents that he had stolen pastries and beverages. With approval from the store manager, the boy was given a number of tasks to complete in order to repair the harm. He had to write a letter of apology to staff at the store. He had said he wanted a career in the armed forces so was tasked under the supervision of his parents to provide the rank structure of these forces, who the heads of each are, the Government department and the current minister. He was tasked to write 200 words on the consequences of being a thief. He was also tasked with writing a list of ten symptoms of drug, tobacco and alcohol use in young people and a clear understanding of the impact upon health now and in 30 years. The parents of the boy ensured that he stayed in to complete the tasks and also took away some of his electronic goods as a consequence of his actions
- A driver reported anti social behaviour to the Police, a pot of yogurt had been thrown at their car; unfortunately a small child in the car was hit by some of the yogurt through an open window. The young person involved was identified and remorseful for what they had done, they apologised to the driver and paid for the vehicle to be cleaned.

What does a Restorative Intervention outcome look like?

- A personal or written apology from the person responsible to the person 'harmed';
- A commitment from the person responsible to sustainably improve their future conduct and behaviour and to access alcohol/drug/behavioural treatment and support (where appropriate);
- Reparation i.e. financial restitution or repair for damage caused;
- Putting things right; cleaning graffiti, improving a damaged environment;
- An act or acts that benefit the wider community i.e. litter picking, the tidying of communal areas etc.

What are the benefits of Restorative Interventions?

- Reduction in bureaucracy, better use of valuable and reducing police resources;
- Victim(s) feels satisfied and reassured;
- Holds person responsible to account;
- Protects society by deterring future acts;
- Less involvement in the criminal justice system;
- No criminal record (for first time offenders);
- Empowers the community by being involved in their own resolution to local problems; and
- Swift and lasting resolution to the problem.

Although not filmed in Cleveland Police, there is a good video on YouTube showing a good example of restorative justice: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z6dMNn1gPxM>