



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

Email: [pcc@cleveland.pnn.police.uk](mailto:pcc@cleveland.pnn.police.uk)  
Website: <http://www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk>

Police and Crime Commissioner:  
Chief of Staff (Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer):

Barry Coppinger  
Simon Dennis BA, Solicitor

Tel: 01642 301653  
Tel: 01642 301653

---

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

**21<sup>st</sup> July 2016**

### **Outturn Monitoring Report on progress against the Police and Crime Plan**

#### **1 Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To provide an update of performance scrutiny undertaken by the Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland to support the delivery of the priorities of the Police & Crime Plan for the Q4 2015/16 (January - March 2016).

#### **2 Priorities of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland 2015-17**

- 2.1 In March 2015, the Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Cleveland launched his third Police & Crime Plan 2015-17. The priorities remained:
- 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 In developing his plan, the PCC continues to take account of public consultation (via his *Your Force Your Voice* initiative and thematic surveys carried out throughout each year), liaised and listened to partners and considered current levels of crime and disorder.
- 2.3 This report will update the Police & Crime Panel of scrutiny activity associated with the delivery of the priorities of the Police & Crime Commissioner.

### **3 Performance Monitoring of the Commissioner's Five Priorities**

3.1 Performance measures for the PCC's priorities are set out in the Police & Crime Plan 2015-17. Each priority is listed below with relevant update information.

#### **PCC Priority 1: Retain and Develop Neighbourhood Policing**

##### **How This Priority is Measured**

3.2 In order to measure the delivery of this priority the following will be monitored:

- Levels of Publicly Reported Crime,
- Levels of Antisocial Behaviour (ASB),
- Local Public Confidence Survey / Crime Survey for England & Wales outcomes.

##### *Levels of Publicly Reported Crime*

3.3 During Quarter 4 2015-16 (January - March 2015), the Force experienced an increase in publicly reported crime (victim-based) of 6.1% (645 more offences) against Q3 the previous year. This can be attributed to an increase in all key crime types with the exception of homicide, business robbery, domestic burglary and bicycle theft. Publicly Reported Crime in Local Policing Areas (LPAs) was: Hartlepool (down 4.8%, 93 less offences), Middlesbrough (up 3.3%, 114 offences), Redcar & Cleveland (up 12.6%, 288 offences) and Stockton (up 11.7%, 336 offences). A detailed breakdown for publicly reported crime in Q3 is shown in Appendix 1.

3.4 For the year to date (April - December 2015), the Force shows an increase of 17.3% (4832 more offences) in publicly reported crime. This can be attributed to an increase in all key crime types with the exception of homicide, business robbery, domestic burglary and bicycle theft. Increases in Publicly Reported Crime were observed across all Local Policing Areas (LPAs): Hartlepool, +16% (764 additional offences), Middlesbrough +11.8% (1,115 offences), Redcar & Cleveland 22.1% (1351 offences) and Stockton +21.1% (1602 offences). A breakdown of publicly reported crime for the year to date (April - December 2015) is also shown in Appendix 1.

3.5 Victim-based crime comparisons in England & Wales (for the year to September 2015) were published by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) on 21 January 2016 and a summary of crime category comparisons are listed in Appendix 2. Commentary provided by ONS highlighted that an overall 6% rise in the national rate of crime was as a result of to "a greater proportion of reports of crime being recorded in the last year, following improved compliance with national recording standards by police forces" - an effect reported to the Police & Crime Panel in the last three quarterly reports.

3.6 The Q3 Performance Scrutiny Meeting will take place on 2 February 2016. Questions

and Force responses will be reported to the Police & Crime Panel with the Q4 Monitoring Report.

*Levels of Antisocial Behaviour (ASB)*

- 3.7 For the year to date (April - December 2015), ASB has reduced by 3.5% (1,204 less incidents) against levels recorded for the same period in 2014/15. Of Cleveland's Local Policing Areas, Hartlepool is experiencing the largest ASB reduction (-15%, 907 less offences) which is followed by Stockton with a reduction of 4.6% (454 less offences). Slight increases in ASB incidents are being observed in Middlesbrough (+0.6%, 64 incidents) and Redcar & Cleveland (+1.3%, 99 incidents). A category breakdown of ASB at Force and LPA levels is listed in Appendix 3.

*Local Public Confidence Survey / Crime Survey for England & Wales Outcomes*

- 3.8 The Local Public Confidence Survey provides a structured means of obtaining feedback from local residents about the problems they face in their neighbourhood and their perception of how Cleveland Police are dealing with these problems. Interviews are conducted with a selection of residents from across the Force area, providing a statistically significant and representative baseline sample from each of the four Local Policing Areas.
- 3.9 The latest levels of Local Public Confidence are for the 12 months ending September 2015 compared with the 12 months ending June 2015 (previous quarter) show:
- **66.5%** think that Cleveland Police do a 'good' or 'excellent' job (**up 0.6% points**) against last quarter levels (12 months ending June 2015)). This measure is up 1.6% points against the rate recorded in September 2014).
  - **17.5%** feel that their quality of life is affected by the fear of crime or Antisocial Behaviour (**up 1.2% points**) against last quarter and up 1% points against September 2014).
  - **67.9%** think that the Police and Local Authority are dealing with the crime and antisocial behaviour issues that matter locally (**down 0.3% points**) against last quarter and down 1.1% points against September 2014).
  - **4.8%** perceive there to be a high level of ASB in their area (**up 0.4% points**) against last quarter and down 1.9% points against September 2014).
  - **15.1%** of people perceive drug dealing or usage to be a problem in their local area (**up 0.4% points**) against last quarter and down 0.9% points against September 2014).
  - **85.3%** of people have confidence in the police in this area (**up 0.8% points**) against last quarter and up 1.2% points against September 2014).
- 3.10 It is important to note that this is a survey of residents selected at random as opposed to a survey of residents who have in the past been a victim of a reported crime and therefore the results provide information on general public perception and not a measure of satisfaction on services provided by Cleveland Police. The Local Public Confidence data for the 12 months ending December 2015 are not available at time of publication and will be included with the next report.

3.11 The Crime Survey for England & Wales measures the extent of crime by asking people whether they have experienced any crime in the past year. The crime survey records crimes that may not have been reported to the police and is used alongside the police recorded crime figures to show a more accurate picture of the level of crime in the country. The latest results of the Crime Survey of England and Wales for the 12 months to the end of June 2015 show:

- **58.3%** of people think that Cleveland Police and Local Authority are dealing with the crime and ASB issues that matter locally. This level is **up 0.8% points** against previous quarter levels (12 months ending March 2015). This measure is down 1.1% against the rate recorded for the 12 months ending June 2014. The average for England and Wales is 61.2%.
- **60.2%** of people think that Cleveland Police in this area are dealing with the issues that matter locally. This level is **up 1.2% points** against the previous quarter and up 2.1% against June 2014. The average for England and Wales is 61.4%.
- **58.6%** of people think that Cleveland Police are doing a good or excellent job. This level is **up 0.7% points** against the previous quarter and down 0.7% against June 2014. The average for England and Wales is 62%.
- **73%** of people, taking everything into account, have confidence in Cleveland Police. This level is **up 0.6% points** against the previous quarter and up 0.8% against June 2014. The average for England and Wales is 76.2%.

3.12 The Crime Survey of England and Wales data for the 12 months ending September 2015 are not available at time of publication and will be included with the next report.

### **How the Cleveland PCC Ensures Delivery of this Priority**

3.13 In order to ensure delivery of this priority the following is undertaken by the PCC:

- Weekly accountability meetings with Chief Constable,
- Monthly Crime Performance Monitoring,
- Hold Quarterly Performance Scrutiny Meetings with the Force,
- Attendance at the Force's Tactical (monthly) and Strategic (quarterly) Performance Groups,
- Attend at least one local area meeting in each of Cleveland's neighbourhood police team areas.

#### *Weekly Meetings with the Chief Constable*

3.14 The PCC meets weekly with Temporary Chief Constable Iain Spittal 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 on the PCC's website.

### Monthly Crime Performance Monitoring

- 3.15 Monthly police performance data is available for a large number of strategic policing and organisational areas. The Office of the PCC continually reviews statistics across a range of crime categories, antisocial behaviour levels, stop and search data, vulnerability as well as the Force's national and Most Similar Group (MSG) positions. Other information such as local public confidence and victim satisfaction levels are made available when published quarterly.

### Quarterly Performance Scrutiny Meetings with the Force

- 3.16 Every month, the PCC holds themed scrutiny meetings with the Force Executive Team and/or partners. The first month involves scrutiny of crime performance and consultation with month two assessing corporate health indicators, primarily financial and that of human resource. The third month details commissioning and partnerships activity, and then the cycle repeats.
- 3.17 At Performance Scrutiny Meetings, focussed questions are posed of the Force regarding crime data, ASB statistics and public satisfaction levels together with a review of the latest Performance Exception Report. Despite these meetings being held in private, agendas, minutes and papers are retrospectively posted on the PCC's website to aid transparency.
- 3.18 The next Performance Scrutiny Meeting with Cleveland Police will take place on 2 February 2016 assessing Q3 2015/16. Questions posed and Force responses will be included with the next report

### Attendance at Tactical and Strategic Performance Groups

- 3.19 The PCC attends both the quarterly Strategic Performance Group (SPG) and the monthly Tactical Performance Group (TPG), which are chaired by the Force Executive and attended by senior operational personnel, reviewing the latest performance statistics and associated operational activity.
- 3.20 The PCC publishes public versions of SPG Performance Reports on the performance page of the PCC's website on a quarterly basis.

### Attend at Least One Local Area Meeting in each of Cleveland's Neighbourhood Police Team Areas

- 3.21 The 'Your Force Your Voice' initiative represents Barry Coppinger's personal pledge to attend at least one community meeting in every one of Cleveland's Neighbourhood Police Team areas, as well as meeting with all specialist policing units. It provides a chance for local residents to raise directly with Commissioner, issues that affect their local neighbourhood and livelihood.
- 3.22 The Office of the PCC compiles consultation reports which contain all issues raised at community meetings which are presented to be disseminated by Force at the Performance Scrutiny Meetings.

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

### **How This Priority is Measured**

3.23 In order to measure the delivery of this priority the following will be monitored:

- Victim Satisfaction Survey outcomes,
- Develop and deliver key actions identified through engagement with victims, through the PCC's Victims and Witnesses Planning Group.

#### *Victim Satisfaction Survey*

3.24 The Victim Satisfaction Survey provides a structured means of obtaining feedback from victims of crime who have had direct experience of the service provided by Cleveland Police.

3.25 The survey is conducted via telephone interviews amongst four specific victim groups: domestic burglary, vehicle crime, violent crime and racist incidents.

3.26 The latest victim satisfaction levels relate to the 12 months ending September 2015, telephone interviews were conducted amongst a random selection of 1,588 victims of crime from across the whole force area, listed the following satisfaction levels:

- **95.4%** of people were satisfied with how easy it was to contact someone who could assist them (**up 0.2% points**) based against the 12 months ending June 2015). This measure is down 0.3% points against the rate recorded for the 12 months ending September 2014. The average for England and Wales is 94.5%.
- **75.5%** of people were satisfied with the actions taken by police (**no change**). This measure is down 6% points against the rate recorded for the 12 months ending September 2014. The average for England and Wales is 81.7%.
- **65.6%** of people were satisfied with how well they were kept informed in relation to progress (**up 0.3% points**). This measure is down 6.4% points against the rate recorded for the 12 months ending September 2014. The average for England and Wales is 75.8%.
- **88.3%** of people who are satisfied with the way they were treated by the police officers and staff who dealt with them (**down 0.2% points**). This measure is 3.3% points against the rate recorded for the 12 months ending September 2014. The average for England and Wales is 93.7%.
- **78.2%** of people, taking everything into account, were satisfied with the service provided by the police (**no change**). This measure is down 4.4% points against the rate recorded for the 12 months ending September 2014. The average for England and Wales is 84.2%.

3.27 The Victim Satisfaction Survey data for the 12 months ending December 2015 were not available at time of publication and will be included with the next report.

Develop and deliver key actions identified through engagement with victims through the PCC's Victims and Witnesses Planning Group

- 3.28 The Teesside Victims' and Witnesses Planning Group meets on a quarterly basis to share, discuss, develop and deliver key actions through partnership.
- 3.29 The most recent meeting in January debated victims commissioning, the Soft Intelligence Action Plan, Independent Sexual Violence Advocates (ISVA) and the witness service

**How the Cleveland PCC Ensures Delivery of this Priority**

- 3.30 In order to ensure delivery of this priority the following is undertaken by the PCC:
- Establish Cleveland-wide groups to embed best practice in the support victims of crime,
  - Generate support to influence the future developments and activities with our Force and partner agencies.

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

**How This Priority is Measured**

- 3.31 In order to measure the delivery of this priority the following will be monitored:
- Monitor Youth and Adult Restorative Justice Interventions.

Youth & Adult Restorative Justice Interventions

- 3.32 Restorative Justice (Level 1 – on street disposal) was launched in Cleveland in April 2013 as an alternative means of disposal for a number of offences committed by individuals who are under 18 years of age.
- 3.33 From April 2014, the scheme was extended to incorporate adults who have an appropriate, non offending background, and have been 'clear' of any criminal sanctions for the two years prior to a crime being reported.
- 3.34 The table overleaf shows the breakdown of interventions by month and by category for 2015/16 year to date.
- 3.35 Restorative Justice (Level 2 – face to face conferencing) interventions are managed by *Restorative Cleveland*. For the year to date, 45 restorative face to face conferences have taken place.

April 2015	H	S	M	R&C	Total
Young Person	15	9	13	8	45
Adult	4	15	18	9	46
<i>Total</i>	19	24	31	17	91

May 2015	H	S	M	R&C	Total
Young Person	13	22	16	16	67
Adult	2	23	10	9	44
<i>Total</i>	15	45	26	25	111

June 2015	H	S	M	R&C	Total
Young Person	7	21	13	7	48
Adult	3	13	8	6	30
<i>Total</i>	10	34	21	13	78

July 2015	H	S	M	R&C	Total
Young Person	8	23	9	18	58
Adult	6	26	12	6	50
<i>Total</i>	14	49	21	24	108

August 2015	H	S	M	R&C	Total
Young Person	3	19	11	19	52
Adult	2	11	14	14	41
<i>Total</i>	5	30	25	33	93

September 2015	H	S	M	R&C	Total
Young Person	4	16	9	10	39
Adult	5	15	7	12	39
<i>Total</i>	9	31	16	22	78

October 2015	H	S	M	R&C	Total
Young Person	7	15	7	22	51
Adult	4	15	14	11	44
<i>Total</i>	11	30	21	33	95

November 2015	H	S	M	R&C	Total
Young Person	7	5	15	10	37
Adult	4	13	16	9	42
<i>Total</i>	11	18	31	19	79

December 2015	H	S	M	R&C	Total
Young Person	3	9	10	14	36
Adult	7	19	14	16	56
<i>Total</i>	10	28	24	30	92

	H	S	M	R&C	Total
<b>Total 2015/16</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>825</b>

Restorative Justice Interventions (2015/16 Year to Date)

## How the Cleveland PCC Ensures Delivery of this Priority

3.36 In order to ensure delivery of this priority the following is undertaken by the PCC. Updates, if available, will follow:

- Establish a Young People's Strategic Planning Group to plan and commission services that prevents and diverts young people from becoming involved in crime,
- Established a multi agency reducing re-offending group for the purposes of setting up a central Integrated Offender Management (IOM) hub,
- Develop a restorative justice approach with the Force and partner agencies.

*Establish a Young People's Strategic Planning Group to Plan and Commission Services that Prevents and Diverts Young People from Becoming Involved in Crime*

3.37 The Young People's Strategic Planning Group meets every six months to discuss youth related crime and antisocial behaviour with an aim to prevent and divert young people from offending.

3.38 The group's membership contains Office of the Cleveland PCC, Cleveland Police, Youth Offending Teams, all four Local Authorities, Barnardo's SECOS, Thirteen Care and Support, Catalyst and Show Racism the Red Card and Princes Trust. The group will next meet in January 2016.



### *Develop a Restorative Justice Approach with the Force and Partner Agencies*

- 3.39 In April 2014, Police and Crime Commissioners were provided with grant funding from the Ministry of Justice to cover capacity, capability building and commissioning of Restorative Justice (RJ) services. Part of this funding was utilised to second a member of police staff into the role of RJ Co-ordinator for a period of two years (from April 2014 until March 2016).
- 3.40 A key part of the RJ Co-ordinator role in the first instance was to actively understand the various restorative justice schemes and projects being delivered across Cleveland. This resulted in a detailed mapping exercise which identified there was a 'postcode lottery' in terms of delivery of restorative justice across Cleveland with victims in some areas having access to high quality service provision, whilst in other areas there was no provision at all.
- 3.41 Therefore, to ensure that at any stage of their journey victims have access to high quality RJ, the PCC in consultation with partners has agreed to developing '*Restorative Cleveland*', the aim of which is to:
- Develop a consistent set of standards, principles and practice across the Cleveland area enabling victims to have access to RJ at any stage in their journey,
  - Build capacity and add value to the current RJ provision across Cleveland,
  - Be a central hub for RJ by providing advice, guidance and promoting/supporting the use of RJ across Cleveland.
- 3.42 This commenced in April 2015 and a formal launch took place during National Restorative Justice Week in November 2015. The supporting website can be found at [www.restorativecleveland.co.uk](http://www.restorativecleveland.co.uk).

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

#### **How This Priority is Measured**

- 3.43 In order to measure the delivery of this priority the following will be monitored:
- Monitor partner performance data to inform the PCC's Objectives.

#### *Monitor Partner Performance Data to Inform the PCC's Objectives*

- 3.44 The Office of the PCC is informed by performance data from each of its criminal justice partners, engages individually through regular structured meetings and collectively via the Cleveland & Durham Local Criminal Justice Board.
- 3.45 The Cleveland PCC website contains links to publicly available partner performance data which includes information from Crown Prosecution Service, National Probation Service, Youth Offending Service, Her Majesty's Courts & Tribunals Service and Her Majesty's Prison Service. Links are also provided to overall criminal justice statistics

reports which consolidate criminal statistics, sentencing statistics and reprimand, warning or conviction levels for young people aged 10 to 17.

### **How the Cleveland PCC Ensures Delivery of this Priority**

3.46 In order to ensure delivery of this priority the following is undertaken by the PCC. Updates, if available, will follow:

- Improve partnership working with relevant agencies (e.g. criminal justice, advisory groups, voluntary and community sector) and in the use of police volunteers,

#### *Improve Partnership Working with Relevant Agencies and in the Use of Volunteers*

3.47 Since November 2013, the PCC has held three successful annual Criminal Justice Volunteer Fairs, which encourages local people from across Cleveland to consider volunteering within the criminal justice sector. The event allows those interested in volunteering to speak directly to organisations, to see how they can get involved or ask any questions. Each event has seen hundreds of interests in information which have been converted into many volunteer positions within the criminal justice sector.

3.48 The PCC also provides a 'Mystery Shopper' initiative which provides scrutiny of the level of customer service experienced by members of the public in Cleveland when dealing with the police. The programme is conducted by a team of four volunteers, including one Mystery Shopper Coordinator, who assigns and coordinates the team's work to ensure that all areas are covered. The team includes a mixture of ages and people from the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and hearing impaired community to provide scrutiny as to the equal access to services provided by the Force. Mystery Shoppers attend police ward meetings, as advertised through the Cleveland Police website to check whether meetings are well publicised, well attended, and whether officers give relevant and professional presentations.

3.49 As mandated, the Cleveland PCC funds an Independent Custody Visiting Scheme. Independent Custody Visitors (ICVs) are volunteer members of the public, who live or work in Cleveland. Their role is to visit police custody suites unannounced to evaluate the welfare of detainees held in the two operational suites in Hartlepool and Middlesbrough.

## **PCC Priority 5: Working for Better Industrial and Community Relations**

### **How This Priority is Measured**

3.50 In order to measure the delivery of this priority the following will be monitored:

- Monitor police human resources data and finance data to ensure organisational stability.

Monitor Police Human Resources Data and Finance Data to Ensure Organisational Stability

- 3.51 The PCC monitors organisational data relating to capital investments, revenue expenditure and treasury management via the Finance, Resource and Policy scrutiny meeting. The PCC also 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 equality meetings and staff forums and updates to the Force's Equality & Diversity Action Plan.
- 3.52 Sickness, time off in lieu (TOIL) and rest days in lieu (RIDL) levels are monitored monthly via the Tactical Performance Group and assessed periodically by the PCC at Finance, Resource & Policy Scrutiny Meetings. The latest absence data (to December 2015) is shown below.

Police Staff and Police Officer Sickness

- 3.53 The following tables and commentary regarding police staff and police officer sickness is taken from the Sickness Report reported at the Finance, Resource & Policy Scrutiny Meetings on 25 January 2016.

- 3.54 "The sickness data for the financial year 2014/15 was as follows.

April 2014 – March 2015	Total Working Days Lost	Average Working Days Lost
Police Officers	15,621	11.62 per officer
Police Staff	3,643	11.37 per staff member

*Police Staff and Police Officer Sickness Data (April 2014 - March 2015)*

- 3.55 "The latest force comparator information for the year to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 showed an improvement in police officer sickness. Nationally, the Force improved its position by 10 places and moved out of the bottom quartile and into the third quartile by improving the sickness rate from 5.09% to 4.71%. Three of our most similar Forces are also in the third quartile. Police staff are also in the third quartile in the same position as police officers but with an absence rate of 4.5%.
- 3.56 For the first three quarters of 2015/16, the average working days lost are as follows:

April 2015 – Dec 2015	Total Working Days Lost	Average Working Days Lost
Police Officers	10,103	7.75 per officer
Police Staff	2,049	6.36 per staff member

*Police Staff and Police Officer Sickness Data (April - December 2015)*

- 3.57 "For the nine months of 2015/16 we have continued to see a decrease in sickness for both officers and staff compared to the previous year. For staff in particular the reduction is extremely positive. If we were to take sickness levels for the first nine months as an indication for the rest of the year, the rate for officers could reduce to 10.33 and staff could reduce to 8.48. This is an estimate and of course, the figures could go up or down throughout the final three months of the year.

3.58 However, if the current levels are sustained the number of working days lost for police officers will have reduced by approximately two thousand. Likewise for police staff if the figures are maintained at current levels this would equate to a potential reduction of approximately 25% in average working days lost.”

Time Off in Lieu (TOIL) / Rest Days in Lieu (RIDL)

3.59 The table below details the latest TOIL and RDIL levels for officers.

Performance Data	Comparison to Previous Month			Comparison to Previous Year			Direction of Travel
	Dec 15	Nov 15	+/-	Dec 15	Dec 14	+/-	
Average TOIL per officer*	8.40	9.65	-1.25	8.40	8.67	-0.27	Increasing
Total outstanding TOIL (Hours)	12507	12310	197	12507	11721	786	Increasing
Total officers exceeding 30hrs	120	127	-7	120	106	14	Stable
Average RDIL per officer*	3.23	3.92	-0.69	3.23	3.55	-0.32	Decreasing
Total outstanding RDIL (days)	4787	4951	-164	4787	4590	197	Stable
Total officers exceeding 5 days	295	313	-18	295	287	8	Decreasing

\* Includes officers of all ranks – all other data relates to Inspector rank and below only

3.60 Over the past three years outstanding TOIL and RDIL balances have been monitored and actively challenged via the Monthly Performance Review (MPR) process. As a result both the levels of outstanding TOIL and RDIL have reduced significantly since 2012, with total TOIL levels having reduced by 46.5% (10,867 hours), and RDIL levels having reduced by 51% (4946 days). Longer term outstanding balances have been reducing however, over recent months outstanding TOIL has begun to rise. A number of officers continue to hold balances above the agreed levels (i.e. 30 hours of TOIL or 5 days RDIL), but the Force continues to seek reductions in both of these areas, whilst at the same time acknowledging the significant progress made to date.

**How the Cleveland PCC Ensures Delivery of this Priority**

3.61 In order to ensure delivery of this priority the following is undertaken by the PCC. Updates, if available, will follow:

- Establish stability in the Chief Constable's team,
- Develop new ways of working and prepare a balanced budget,
- Emphasise the importance of integrity and openness,
- Fight for the interests of Cleveland Police locally, regionally and nationally.

### Establish Stability in the Chief Constable's Team

- 3.62 It was announced earlier this year that the Chief Constable Jacqui Cheer would retire in 2016 after almost 32 years' dedicated police service and four years at Cleveland Police. From December 2015, she was asked to assist in directing the prestigious Strategic Command Course (SCC) for a second year and will officially retire from policing during her attachment to the College.
- 3.63 Deputy Chief Constable Iain Spittal was appointed to the role as Temporary Chief Constable in January 2016, alongside Temporary Deputy Chief Constable Simon Nickless and Temporary Assistant Chief Constable Ciaron Irvine. A recruitment process for the permanent Chief Constable position will take place following the Police and Crime Commissioner elections in May.

### Develop New Ways of Working and Prepare a Balanced Budget

- 3.64 With reductions in police funding nationwide, the PCC has had to ensure that the Force can continue to operate and provide as efficient and effective a policing service as possible. A number variety of collaborative arrangements for the delivery of policing services are already in place nationally and across the National Police Chiefs' Council North East Region. Agile working arrangements are also being rolled out force wide.

## **4 Finance**

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

## **5 Risk**

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

## **6 Diversity and Equal Opportunities**

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

## **7 Recommendations**

- 7.1 This Q3 2015/16 Monitoring Report on Progress against the Police and Crime Plan is noted.

**Barry Coppinger**  
**Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland**

### Author of Report:

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

## Publicly Reported Crime - Force and Local Policing Areas (Quarter 3 and Year to Date)

### Force - Quarter 3 (October – December)

FORCE	Q3 2015/16	Q3 2014/15	Change	% Change
<b>Violence against the Person</b>	<b>2895</b>	<b>2358</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>22.8%</b>
<i>Homicide</i>	0	2	-2	-100.0%
<i>Violence With Injury</i>	1274	1156	118	10.2%
<i>Violence Without Injury</i>	1621	1200	421	35.1%
<b>Sexual Offences</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>36.3%</b>
<i>Rape</i>	105	97	8	8.2%
<i>Other Sexual Offences</i>	218	140	78	55.7%
<b>Robbery</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>
<i>Business Robbery</i>	10	12	-2	-16.7%
<i>Personal Robbery</i>	66	66	0	0.0%
<b>Theft</b>	<b>5481</b>	<b>5522</b>	<b>-41</b>	<b>-0.7%</b>
<i>Burglary - Domestic</i>	572	704	-132	-18.8%
<i>Burglary - Non domestic</i>	806	705	101	14.3%
<i>Bicycle Theft</i>	231	308	-77	-25.0%
<i>Theft from the person</i>	105	106	-1	-0.9%
<i>Vehicle Crime (Inc. Interference)</i>	868	803	65	8.1%
<i>Shoplifting</i>	1478	1480	-2	-0.1%
<i>Other Theft</i>	1421	1416	5	0.4%
<b>Criminal Damage &amp; Arson</b>	<b>2458</b>	<b>2393</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>11233</b>	<b>10588</b>	<b>645</b>	<b>6.1%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>12246</b>	<b>11706</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>4.6%</b>

### Local Policing Areas - Quarter 3 (October – December)

HARTLEPOOL	Q3 2015/16	Q3 2014/15	Difference	% Change
Violence against the Person	470	420	50	11.9%
Sexual Offences	55	36	19	52.8%
Robbery	9	10	-1	-10.0%
Theft	896	1002	-106	-10.6%
Criminal Damage & Arson	405	460	-55	-12.0%
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>1835</b>	<b>1928</b>	<b>-93</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>2124</b>	<b>-127</b>	<b>-6.0%</b>

MIDDLESBROUGH	Q3 2015/16	Q3 2014/15	Difference	% Change
Violence against the Person	1069	801	268	33.5%
Sexual Offences	104	78	26	33.3%
Robbery	22	41	-19	-46.3%
Theft	1640	1797	-157	-8.7%
Criminal Damage & Arson	786	790	-4	-0.5%
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>3621</b>	<b>3507</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>4006</b>	<b>3953</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>1.3%</b>

REDCAR & CLEVELAND	Q3 2015/16	Q3 2014/15	Difference	% Change
Violence against the Person	563	464	99	21.3%
Sexual Offences	80	53	27	50.9%
Robbery	10	7	3	42.9%
Theft	1272	1157	115	9.9%
Criminal Damage & Arson	643	599	44	7.3%
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>2568</b>	<b>2280</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>12.6%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>2717</b>	<b>2473</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>9.9%</b>

STOCKTON	Q3 2015/16	Q3 2014/15	Difference	% Change
Violence against the Person	793	673	120	17.8%
Sexual Offences	84	70	14	20.0%
Robbery	35	20	15	75.0%
Theft	1673	1566	107	6.8%
Criminal Damage & Arson	624	544	80	14.7%
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>3209</b>	<b>2873</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>11.7%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>3526</b>	<b>3156</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>11.7%</b>

*Force – Year to Date (April – December 2015)*

FORCE	YTD 2015/16	YTD 2014/15	Change	% Change
<b>Violence against the Person</b>	<b>8070</b>	<b>5686</b>	<b>2384</b>	<b>41.9%</b>
<i>Homicide</i>	2	7	-5	-71.4%
<i>Violence With Injury</i>	3802	3106	696	22.4%
<i>Violence Without Injury</i>	4266	2573	1693	65.8%
<b>Sexual Offences</b>	<b>929</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>47.5%</b>
<i>Rape</i>	322	237	85	35.9%
<i>Other Sexual Offences</i>	607	393	214	54.5%
<b>Robbery</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>18.8%</b>
<i>Business Robbery</i>	24	35	-11	-31.4%
<i>Personal Robbery</i>	222	172	50	29.1%
<b>Theft</b>	<b>16720</b>	<b>15236</b>	<b>1484</b>	<b>9.7%</b>
<i>Burglary - Domestic</i>	1676	1728	-52	-3.0%
<i>Burglary - Non domestic</i>	2229	1934	295	15.3%
<i>Bicycle Theft</i>	699	934	-235	-25.2%
<i>Theft from the person</i>	284	267	17	6.4%
<i>Vehicle Crime (Inc. Interference)</i>	2358	2250	108	4.8%
<i>Shoplifting</i>	4961	4159	802	19.3%
<i>Other Theft</i>	4513	3964	549	13.8%
<b>Criminal Damage &amp; Arson</b>	<b>6730</b>	<b>6104</b>	<b>626</b>	<b>10.3%</b>
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>32695</b>	<b>27863</b>	<b>4832</b>	<b>17.3%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>35713</b>	<b>30851</b>	<b>4862</b>	<b>15.8%</b>

*Local Policing Areas – Year to Date (April – December 2015)*

<b>HARTLEPOOL</b>	<b>YTD 2015/16</b>	<b>YTD 2014/15</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Violence against the Person	1377	1008	369	36.6%
Sexual Offences	152	97	55	56.7%
Robbery	36	24	12	50.0%
Theft	2767	2588	179	6.9%
Criminal Damage & Arson	1199	1050	149	14.2%
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>5531</b>	<b>4767</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>16.0%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>6031</b>	<b>5277</b>	<b>754</b>	<b>14.3%</b>

<b>MIDDLESBROUGH</b>	<b>YTD 2015/16</b>	<b>YTD 2014/15</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Violence against the Person	2942	2029	913	45.0%
Sexual Offences	294	203	91	44.8%
Robbery	88	105	-17	-16.2%
Theft	5133	5120	13	0.3%
Criminal Damage & Arson	2070	1955	115	5.9%
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>10527</b>	<b>9412</b>	<b>1115</b>	<b>11.8%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>11702</b>	<b>10598</b>	<b>1104</b>	<b>10.4%</b>

<b>REDCAR &amp; CLEVELAND</b>	<b>YTD 2015/16</b>	<b>YTD 2014/15</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Violence against the Person	1585	1030	555	53.9%
Sexual Offences	204	126	78	61.9%
Robbery	41	29	12	41.4%
Theft	3847	3388	459	13.5%
Criminal Damage & Arson	1776	1529	247	16.2%
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>7453</b>	<b>6102</b>	<b>1351</b>	<b>22.1%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>7902</b>	<b>6607</b>	<b>1295</b>	<b>19.6%</b>

<b>STOCKTON</b>	<b>YTD 2015/16</b>	<b>YTD 2014/15</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Violence against the Person	2166	1619	547	33.8%
Sexual Offences	279	204	75	36.8%
Robbery	81	49	32	65.3%
Theft	4973	4140	833	20.1%
Criminal Damage & Arson	1685	1570	115	7.3%
<b>Publicly Reported Crime</b>	<b>9184</b>	<b>7582</b>	<b>1602</b>	<b>21.1%</b>
<b>Total Crime</b>	<b>10078</b>	<b>8369</b>	<b>1709</b>	<b>20.4%</b>



## Crime Comparisons in England and Wales (Year ending Sept 2015)

The following data is taken from the report compiled by the Office for National Statistics, *Crime in England and Wales (Year ending September 2015)*, released on 21 January 2016.

National Comparisons - 12 months ending September 15					
Crime Type	Rate*	National average	% diff	Quartile	National Position
<i>Violence with injury</i>	8.42	7.00	20.3%	4	39
<i>Violence without injury</i>	9.01	8.28	8.9%	4	34
<i>Sexual Offences</i>	1.94	1.71	13.6%	4	34
<i>Burglary - Domestic</i>	10.47	8.29	26.3%	4	38
<i>Burglary - Non domestic</i>	5.10	3.64	40.1%	4	40
<i>Robbery</i>	0.60	0.88	-31.5%	3	31
<i>Vehicle Crime (Inc Inter.)</i>	5.49	6.23	-11.9%	3	23
<i>Shoplifting</i>	11.46	5.75	99.4%	4	42
<i>Other Theft</i>	10.19	8.42	21.0%	4	40
<i>Criminal Damage &amp; Arson</i>	15.81	9.00	75.7%	4	42
<i>Total Publicly Reported Crime</i>	74.90	57.08	31.2%	4	42
<i>Total Crime</i>	82.63	64.23	28.6%	4	41

\*Rate per 1000 population

"The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) shows there were an estimated 6.6 million incidents of crime covered by the survey in the year ending September 2015. This latest estimate was not significantly different compared with the previous years.

There was a 6% increase in police recorded crime compared with the previous year, with 4.3 million offences recorded in the year ending September 2015. Most of this rise is thought to be due to a greater proportion of reports of crime being recorded in the last year, following improved compliance with national recording standards by police forces.

Improvements in recording of crime are thought to have particularly affected some categories of violent crime recorded by the police. There was a 27% rise in violence against the person offences (an additional 185,666 offences) which was largely driven by increases within the violence without injury sub-group (up by 130,207 offences; a 37% increase).

The CSEW estimate for violent crime showed no significant change compared with the previous year's survey.

There were also increases in some of the more serious types of police recorded violence, including a 9% rise in offences involving knives or sharp instruments and a 4% increase in offences involving firearms. Such offences are less likely to be prone to changes in recording practices though there is some anecdotal evidence to suggest that a tightening of recording procedures may also be contributing to some of the increase in some forces.

Sexual offences recorded by the police continued to rise with the latest figures up 36% on the previous year; equivalent to an additional 26,606 offences. The numbers of rapes (33,431) and other sexual offences (66,178) were at the highest level since the introduction of the National Crime Recording Standard in the year ending March 2003. As well as improvements in recording, this is also thought to reflect a greater willingness of victims to come forward to report such crimes.

There was a 5% increase in the volume of fraud offences referred to the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau (NFIB) at the City of London Police. Over 0.6 million offences were referred to NFIB, including 234,878 offences reported by victims to Action Fraud (the UK's national fraud reporting centre), 283,654 referrals from Cifas (a UK-wide fraud prevention service) and 86,066 cases from FFA UK (that represents the UK payments industry). It is known that many cases of fraud do not come to the attention of the police, and these figures provide a very partial picture."

Source: "Crime in England and Wales, year ending September 2015" Office for National Statistics, 21 January 2016 (<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/crime-stats/crime-statistics/crime-in-england-and-wales---year-ending-september-2015/stb-crime-sept-2015.html>)

**Antisocial Behaviour– Year to Date (April - December 2015)**

A breakdown of the ASB categories for the Force and its LPAs is shown below.

*Force*

<b>FORCE</b>	<b>YTD 2015/16</b>	<b>YTD 2014/15</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Personal ASB	12148	9921	2227	22.4%
Nuisance ASB	20246	23686	-3440	-14.5%
Environmental ASB	900	891	9	1.0%
<b>TOTAL ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR</b>	<b>33294</b>	<b>34498</b>	<b>-1204</b>	<b>-3.5%</b>

*Local Policing Area*

<b>HARTLEPOOL</b>	<b>YTD 2015/16</b>	<b>YTD 2014/15</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Personal ASB	1884	1651	233	14.1%
Nuisance ASB	3159	4265	-1106	-25.9%
Environmental ASB	115	149	-34	-22.8%
<b>TOTAL ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR</b>	<b>5158</b>	<b>6065</b>	<b>-907</b>	<b>-15.0%</b>

<b>MIDDLESBROUGH</b>	<b>YTD 2015/16</b>	<b>YTD 2014/15</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Personal ASB	3861	3048	813	26.7%
Nuisance ASB	6470	7241	-771	-10.6%
Environmental ASB	264	242	22	9.1%
<b>TOTAL ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR</b>	<b>10595</b>	<b>10531</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>0.6%</b>

<b>REDCAR &amp; CLEVELAND</b>	<b>YTD 2015/16</b>	<b>YTD 2014/15</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Personal ASB	2839	2273	566	24.9%
Nuisance ASB	4858	5346	-488	-9.1%
Environmental ASB	289	268	21	7.8%
<b>TOTAL ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR</b>	<b>7986</b>	<b>7887</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>1.3%</b>

<b>STOCKTON</b>	<b>YTD 2015/16</b>	<b>YTD 2014/15</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Personal ASB	3528	2912	616	21.2%
Nuisance ASB	5695	6771	-1076	-15.9%
Environmental ASB	230	224	6	2.7%
<b>TOTAL ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR</b>	<b>9453</b>	<b>9907</b>	<b>-454</b>	<b>-4.6%</b>