



Inspecting policing  
in the public interest



## **DELIVERING THE POLICING PLEDGE**

Cleveland Police

# “Are the local police delivering for you?”

The ‘Policing Pledge’ sets out ten minimum standards that the police service promised to deliver from 31 December 2008.

Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) has reviewed how well the 43 forces in England and Wales are delivering the standards they promised the public.

This report provides members of the public with information on the performance of their local force.

Each Pledge standard and the three areas relating to how the force is working towards its delivery have been graded. HMIC has combined these assessments to give an overall grade for the force.

The overall grade for Cleveland Police is:

**FAIR**

## The different grades

**EXCELLENT**

is awarded for exceptional performance which is consistently above and beyond the required standard.

**GOOD**

is defined as meeting the standard, although there may be minor dips in performance.

**FAIR**

is awarded where performance is variable and falls short of the required standard. Remedial action is needed.

**POOR**

is used when performance fails to meet an acceptable level. Immediate remedial action is needed.

## THE POLICING PLEDGE POINTS

## HMIC GRADING

### PLEDGE POINT 1

Always treat you fairly with dignity and respect, ensuring you have fair access to our services at a time that is reasonable and suitable for you.

GOOD

### PLEDGE POINT 2

Provide you with information so you know who your dedicated Neighbourhood Policing Team are, where they are based, how to contact them and how to work with them.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 3

Ensure your Neighbourhood Policing Team and other police patrols are visible and on your patch at times when they will be most effective and when you tell us you most need them. We will ensure that your team is not taken away from neighbourhood business more than is absolutely necessary. Officers will spend at least 80% of their time visibly working in your neighbourhood, tackling your priorities. Staff turnover will be minimised.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 4

Respond to every message directed to your Neighbourhood Policing Team within 24 hours and, where necessary, provide a more detailed response as soon as we can.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 5

Aim to answer 999 calls within 10 seconds, deploying to emergencies immediately, giving an estimated time of arrival (ETA), and getting to you safely, and as quickly as possible. In urban areas, we will aim to get to you within 15 minutes and in rural areas within 20 minutes.

GOOD

### PLEDGE POINT 6

Answer all non-emergency calls promptly. If attendance is needed, send a patrol, giving you an ETA, and:

- if you are vulnerable or upset, we will aim to be with you within 60 minutes;
- if you are calling about an issue that we have agreed with your community will be a neighbourhood priority and attendance is required, we will aim to be with you within 60 minutes;
- alternatively, if appropriate, we will make an appointment to see you at a time that fits in with your life and within 48 hours;
- if agreed that attendance is not necessary, we will give you advice, answer your questions and/or put you in touch with someone who can help.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 7

Arrange regular public meetings to agree your priorities at least once a month, giving you a chance to meet your local team with other members of your community. These will include opportunities such as surgeries, street briefings and mobile police station visits, which will be arranged to meet local needs and requirements.

GOOD

### PLEDGE POINT 8

Provide monthly updates on progress, and on local crime and policing issues. This will include the provision of crime maps, information on specific crimes and what happened to those brought to justice, details of what action we and our partners are taking to make your neighbourhood safer, and information on how your force is performing.

GOOD

### PLEDGE POINT 9

If you have been a victim of crime, agree with you how often you would like to be kept informed of progress in your case and for how long. You have the right to be kept informed at least every month if you wish, and for as long as is reasonable.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 10

Acknowledge any dissatisfaction with the service you have received within 24 hours of reporting it to us. To help us fully resolve the matter, discuss with you how it will be handled, give you an opportunity to talk in person to someone about your concerns and agree with you what will be done about them and how quickly.

FAIR

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### PLEDGE POINT 1

The force carried out consultation with the community and local partners to find out the kind of service the public want. Through a joint problem solving approach called “Hartlepool New Deal for Communities,” the force and other public services deal with community needs. This project was awarded exemplar status. The force specifically looks at the amount of complaints from minority communities to make sure that they meet the needs of different communities. The force then fed back to communities about their findings.

### PLEDGE POINT 2

The force publicised their Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) in a variety of ways, including displaying posters on partner agency notice boards and in areas of community congregation. The force proactively advertised the Pledge and hand-delivered 7,000 local policing leaflets in one area. Community volunteers were used to help out in police stations. **But** the force displayed some inaccurate and out of date information in some police stations and on some information sites. The force did not always ensure communities were given reasonable notice of meeting cancellations.

### PLEDGE POINT 3

The force had guidelines in place to ensure that the time NPTs spent away from the community on other tasks was kept to a minimum. Support teams were in place for those unavoidable times when NPTs were called away from the neighbourhood. NPT officers remained in post for a minimum of two years to develop close relationships with communities. NPTs were flexible in their duties when responding to community needs. Handheld computers and partner-funded Community Support Assistants allowed them to stay out on their beats. **But** some enquiry desks were closed during advertised times. NPTs and other police staff needed to work more closely together to provide a better service to the community.

### PLEDGE POINT 4

Public Service desks responded to general enquiries that did not require a response from an individual officer. NPT officers had mobile phones and one to one contact with community members took place. The force had communication guidelines that explained the need to respond to telephone and email enquires within 24 hours. **But** the force did not have checks in place to ensure that all enquiries were responded to within 24 hours. Messages sent to officers who were off duty were not dealt with by other staff who were on duty.

### PLEDGE POINT 5

The force’s Communications Centre was one of the top three control centres in England and Wales. 99% of emergency calls were answered within 10 seconds. The urban response time target was 5 minutes faster than the national 15 minute threshold. This high level of service was reached by all staff working together to ensure patrols were immediately en-route to emergencies while callers were asked for further information and provided with support and reassurance. Staff had received guidance on the Policing Pledge and their performance was reviewed on a monthly basis. **But** the force needed to map out where the urban and rural areas were so that it was clear to all staff what level of response was required.

### PLEDGE POINT 6

The call centre and public service desk staff could quickly contact partner agencies, such as local authorities, for assistance. Staff understood the needs of ‘vulnerable’ and ‘upset’ callers. The call centre system provided information to call handlers about neighbourhood priorities and this triggered the required police response. **But** the local priorities are not detailed enough for call handlers to decide the best response. The force did not always give estimated times of arrival to callers.

### PLEDGE POINT 7

The force publicised community meetings in many ways, including posting information on the force website and poster displays in prominent public areas. Some areas had carried out door to door visits to promote community meetings. Police and Community Team (PACT) meetings were held to find out the needs of particular communities. These PACT meetings took place on a three monthly, monthly and interim progress basis. **But** the force should have updated its publicised meeting schedules to give the community enough notice of changes and cancellations.

### PLEDGE POINT 8

Local communities and councillors were asked about the kind of information they wanted to receive from the force. Communities were updated about local priorities in various ways. These included presentations made at street meetings, published material distributed at community forums and the distribution of monthly newsletters.

### PLEDGE POINT 9

The force monitored victim care through the Crime Management and Administration Forum, chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable. Quality assurance checks were made and included 'mystery shopping' to test the services provided to elderly victims. The force provided a high standard of care in sensitive cases and in one area; victims were asked how they wished to be contacted. **But** the victim's care guidelines did not outline the need to agree with victims when and how often they wished to be contacted.

### PLEDGE POINT 10

Expressions of dissatisfaction were recorded as complaints against the police. In cases where they could be resolved locally, they were passed to local supervisors, who were overseen by the Professional Standards Unit. **But** not all dissatisfaction was responded to within 24 hours. The force were looking at ways to deal with dissatisfaction more effectively.

## WHAT THE FORCE WAS DOING TO IMPROVE ITS PERFORMANCE

As well as reporting on the force's delivery of each Pledge standard, HMIC has also assessed and graded the efforts it was making to improve performance:

#### HMIC GRADING

Surveys and management meetings were being used to improve performance; public satisfaction and confidence data were taken into account.

GOOD

The force had identified deficiencies in its delivery of the Pledge and was taking action in those areas.

FAIR

Implementation was led by the force's senior team, the Police Authority was involved, staff were being trained and the Pledge was communicated to staff and the public.

GOOD



**50% recycled**  
This publication is printed  
on 50% recycled paper

The report is available in alternative languages and formats on request.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary  
Ashley House  
2 Monck Street  
London SW1P 2BQ

This report is also available from the HMIC website  
<http://inspectors.justice.gov.uk/hmic>

Published in October 2009.

Printed by the Central Office of Information.

© Crown copyright 2009

ISBN: 978-1-84726-987-4

Ref: 297705