

## HMIC Value for Money Profiles 2010/11

### Cleveland Police

compared with all forces in England and Wales

*The forces in the most similar group can be identified  
in the charts in this section by using the key below*

- a Cleveland
- b Gwent
- c Merseyside
- d Northumbria
- e South Wales
- f South Yorkshire
- g West Midlands

# Index and Contents

## Introduction

### Section One - Income and Expenditure

- 1 Introduction
- 3 Expenditure
- 4 Police Officers
- 5 Police Staff and PCSOs
- 6 Non-Staff Costs as percentage of Workforce Costs
- 7 Supplies and Services as percentage of Workforce Costs
- 8 Financing of Expenditure
- 9 Specific Grants
- 10 Funding Source Trends

### Section Two - Workforce

- 11 Introduction
- 13 Workforce
- 14 Workforce Trends
- 15 Police officers/PCSOs by Rank
- 16 Police Workforce and Crime
- 17 Workforce by Function - Summary
- 18 Workforce by Function - Detail
- 19 Workforce by Function
- 20 Changes in Workforce
- 21 Business Support
- 22 Investigation
- 23 Operational Support
- 24 Specialist Functions
- 25 Leavers
- 26 Joiners
- 27 Sickness Absence

### Section Three - Offences

- 28 Introduction
- 29 Recorded Offences - All Crimes
- 30 Recorded Offences - Violent Crimes
- 31 Recorded Offences - Acquisitive Crimes
- 32 Recorded Offences - All Other Offences
- 33 Recorded Offence Trends - All Crimes
- 34 Recorded Offence Trends - Violent Crimes
- 35 Recorded Offence Trends - Acquisitive Crimes
- 36 Recorded Offence Trends - All Other Offences

### Section Four - Outcomes and Satisfaction

- 37 Introduction
- 38 Sanction Detection Rates
- 39 Sanction Detection Rates by Crime Type
- 40 Changes in Sanction Detection Rates
- 41 Sanction Detections by Type
- 42 Changes in Detection Types
- 43 Charges
- 44 Arrest to charge
- 45 999 Calls
- 46 British Crime Survey Outcomes
- 47 Satisfaction with the Police by Crime Type

## Introduction

HMIC's value for money profiles identify questions, rather than make judgements. As ever, the information needs to be set within the local context. For example several forces are using restorative justice measures instead of sanctioned detections to deal with some offences.

The profiles were developed for two reasons:

- to help forces and police authorities investigate reasons for differences in performance or costs and take action to improve
- to help HMIC focus its inspection effort on the most fruitful areas in each force

Much has remained the same as last year's profiles, published on the HMIC website in March 2010: the focus is on comparison of staff numbers, as they are easier to compare than costs, which are subject to local market factors. Non staff costs are reported as a percentage of staff costs to provide some adjustment for local area costs. But we have also taken the opportunity to make some improvements:

- data quality has been improved – HMIC provided each force with draft profile in mid August 2010 to enable checking and resubmission of data.
- a six page executive summary, which includes comparisons with the most similar forces and the England and Wales averages.
- some additional data sources have been considered and included where appropriate while other data has been removed.
- a Pick Your Own (PYO) facility, so that forces can choose their own forces for comparison – contact HMIC Head of Performance, Analysis and Research for more details [Lawrencero.Morris33@hmic.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Lawrencero.Morris33@hmic.gsi.gov.uk).

The CIPFA finance data on specific grants includes an extra line, showing how your force's funding was reduced this year in the emergency budget. We have removed the page on police staff overtime because it was so low. We also considered showing detailed trends for reserves, but as the two most recent periods were based on estimates which proved to be unreliable, HMIC and the Audit Commission decided that it should not be included. (The estimated reserves figures shown on the funding trends page 10 is merely shown as a balancing item).

Staffing information now includes special police officers and contractors There is a further breakdown of supplies and services e.g medical fees. The quality of sickness absence data has improved on last year and there is an analysis of joiners and leavers, with an estimate of the financial impact of those leaving the service. (NB PCSOs recorded as leaving may be returning to the service as police officers).

There are two main changes to the crime data. Charge rates are now shown by crime types for two reasons: these types of disposal are more often time consuming and as they give a clearer view than sanctioned detections, which include offences taken into consideration (TIC), cautions, cannabis warnings and penalty notices for disorder (PND). Arrest rates for criminal offences are also included, using the latest data the Home Office can provide (2008/09). This is shown alongside arrest rates, sanctioned detection rates and charge rates per local police officer (a better predictor than police officers working in community functions such as neighbourhoods and response).

We reviewed the inclusion of Crown Prosecution Service data in the profiles, but decided to exclude this because of counting differences between the police and the courts and because the Home Office is currently conducting a joint review of data in this area. But three aspects of the data struck us. First, the low level of convictions compared with charges for crimes that were less affected by counting differences. Second, the lack of variation in success rates for prosecutions, typically around 80 to 85 percent successful. Third, the significant increase in prosecutions at Crown Courts and a reduction in those at Magistrate courts.

Lastly, we have not included Police Objective Analysis data because of data quality problems, even though we would have liked to do so. Once these are resolved we will endeavour to include some further comparisons focusing on functions which may have been contracted out, those which have more detail than that available in the profiles such as forensics and overtime, and also other areas with high non-staff costs.

## Section One - Income and Expenditure

### INTRODUCTION

The first section of the profiles focuses on how the police authority is funded and how it uses its financial resources. Approximately 80% of police funding is spent on the workforce. Therefore this section considers expenditure on workforce in some detail.

#### **Workforce expenditure**

The profiles use the term 'workforce' to refer to all those who are paid by the police authority. Workforce costs are salary costs (including overtime unless specified otherwise), national insurance and pension contributions. Other related expenses such as training or redundancy are not included. Information in the charts is shown as cost per head of population.

#### **Non-staff expenditure**

Non-staff expenditure is shown as a percentage of workforce expenditure, since the main determining factor of non-staff costs is the size of the workforce. Non-staff resources include premises, vehicles, computers etc. Showing non-staff expenditure as a percentage of workforce expenditure also takes some account of regional differences in costing.

#### **Income and funding**

Income is shown as a percentage of workforce cost. The profiles distinguish between income the force generates itself e.g. through charging for services (part of which may be paid for by overtime) and the funding it receives locally from council tax precept and centrally from the Home Office. It should be noted that some of the funding received is dedicated for specific posts.

#### **Collaboration**

Forces are developing joint working arrangements with national and regional partners to respond to serious threats to the community and exploiting opportunities where value for money could be improved. Each force is likely to be involved in a range of collaborative arrangements to minimise the risk to the public and to ensure value for money. This includes policing operations and business support functions, which means that workforce resources may be shared with other forces. This information cannot be captured in these data sets, however, if a force is an outlier in a particular function, collaboration may be the reason for this difference.

### **How to use this section**

Police authorities and forces should focus on those charts where the force is an outlier, i.e. where they are significantly different from the average, or where they are particularly high or low. Outliers are highlighted in red in the tables of the 'all forces' profiles and fall within the top or bottom 10% of forces and with a financial value of more than £1 million. They should explore the reasons for any differences by looking at the force as a whole. Expenditure levels should also be considered in the context of workforce modernisation, collaboration efforts and outsourcing of services.

### **Key to the bar charts and tables:**

- *the black bar represents this force*
- *the dark blue bars represent its most similar forces as listed in the title page*
- *the horizontal line shows the average*
- *outliers in the tables are highlighted in red*
- *the difference column shows the difference from the average*

Throughout the profiles the chart scales may differ and the differences shown may not be as significant as they appear.

### **Key to the calculations**

Averages are simple unweighted averages including the force.

Please note: as the Metropolitan Police data distorts the chart scales, the Met has been excluded from the profiles for all other forces, as has the City of London.

Non-staff expenditure is shown as a percentage of workforce expenditure, since the main determining factor of non-staff costs is the size of the workforce. Workforce data for support functions is shown as FTE per 100 workforce to compare the size of the support function in relation to the workforce.

The profiles use a different calculation for net revenue expenditure to CIPFA; it is calculated as total expenditure minus income to show the total cost of policing to the taxpayer.

Police Objective Analysis data has not been included as CIPFA have advised that it is currently unreliable to use.


### **Glossary:**

<b>ACPO</b>	Association of Chief Police Officers
<b>ADR</b>	Annual data requirement (data collection by the Home Office)
<b>CIPFA</b>	Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accounting
<b>FTE</b>	Full time equivalent
<b>PCSO</b>	Police Community Support Officer

# EXPENDITURE

## 2010/11 estimates £ per head of population

These charts give an overview of what policing in each force costs per head of population. As HMIC is inspecting in the public interest, this measure is a good starting point to consider value for money. NB: the profiles use a different calculation for net revenue expenditure to CIPFA; it is calculated as total expenditure minus income to show the total cost of policing to the taxpayer.










Population 558,500

	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
Police officers	87	155	118	20.7 <<
Police staff	22	40	46	-3.5 <<
PCSOs	6	11	7	1.9 <<
Workforce	115	205	171	19.1 <<
Non-staff costs	33	59	42	9.6 <<
Income	-4	-6	-7	0.5
Net revenue exp.	144	258	206	29.2 <<

Non-staff % staff cost 29% 24% 4.8

Source: CIPFA Statistics 2010/11 estimates

HMIC








Cleveland

# POLICE OFFICERS

## 2010/11 estimates £ per head of population

These charts break down police officer costs into salary and overtime costs (OT). Police officer overtime costs are also shown as a percentage of the overall salary costs. The data table shows any discrepancy between Home Office published police strength figures at 31.03.10 and CIPFA average strength figures across 2010/11. Any difference above 2% is highlighted in red. NB: ADR502 and ADR601 totals are a snapshot taken at the end of the financial year.



	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
Police officers (exc. OT)	84	150	114	20.0 <<
Police overtime	3	5	4	0.7
Total	87	155	118	20.7 <<

Police Officer overtime %	3.5%	3.5%	-0.1
---------------------------	------	------	------

		Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	3.06	2.25	23.0 <<
£000/FTE	48.9k	50.7k	-3.1 <<

Avg FTE 2010/11 (CIPFA)	1,710
FTE Mar 10 (ADR601)	1,724
FTE Mar 10 (HO published)	1,724

Source: CIPFA Statistics 2010/11 estimates

# POLICE STAFF AND PCSOs

## 2010/11 estimates £ per head of population

These charts break down police staff and PCSO costs into more detail. The data table shows any discrepancy between Home Office published police strength figures at 31.03.10 and CIPFA average figures across 2010/11. Any difference above 2% is highlighted in red. NB: ADR502 and ADR601 totals are a snapshot taken at the end of the financial year, and Home Office FTE data excludes temporary contract staff and traffic wardens. CIPFA includes traffic wardens, and takes an average of staff numbers over the year.

£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
22	39.7	45.9	-3.5 <<

	Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	1.27	1.50 <<
£000/FTE	31.2k	30.6k

Avg FTE 2009/10 (CIPFA)	710
FTE Mar 10 (ADR601)	711
FTE Mar 10 (HO published)	711







### PCSOs

£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
6.0	10.7	7.4	1.9

	Avg	Diff. £m
FTE/1,000	0.35	0.26
£000/FTE	30.8k	28.8k

Source: CIPFA Statistics 2010/11 estimates

Avg FTE 2009/10 (CIPFA)	194
FTE Mar 10 (ADR601)	193
FTE Mar 10 (HO published)	193












# NON-STAFF COSTS AS PERCENTAGE OF WORKFORCE COSTS

2010/11 estimates

These charts provide information about non-staff costs broken down into specific types of running costs. Non-staff costs are shown as a percentage of staff costs as non-staff costs are mainly dependent on the number of staff working for an organisation. Third party payments include scientific services (eg DNA testing), mutual aid from other police authorities, contributions to inter-authority services, transfer payments and national levies.



Staff costs £115m










	£m	% staff	Avg	Diff. £m
Supplies & services	12.1	10.6%	10.9%	-0.4
Premises	8.5	7.4%	5.0%	2.8 <<
Transport	3.1	2.7%	2.9%	-0.1
Other employee exps	4.2	3.7%	1.7%	2.3 <<
Capital financing	1.4	1.2%	1.9%	-0.8
Third party	1.5	1.3%	1.5%	-0.2
Other	1.9	1.6%	0.5%	1.3 <<
<b>Non-staff costs</b>	<b>32.8</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>4.8</b>

Source: CIPFA Statistics 2010/11 estimates

# SUPPLIES AND SERVICES AS PERCENTAGE OF WORKFORCE COSTS

## 2010/11 estimates

These charts break down supplies and services costs, and give some indication about which services a force may be outsourcing. This page should be read in relation to the relevant staff column on p.18 to identify those services which are contracted out, compared with those delivered in house.



Staff costs £115m







Supplies & services	£m	% staff	Avg	Diff. £m
Computing	2.4	2.1%	2.2%	-0.07
Telecoms & radio	1.6	1.4%	1.7%	-0.36
Forensics	1.4	1.2%	1.3%	-0.16
Office eq. & expenses	1.2	1.0%	1.0%	-0.02
Investigation expenses	0.2	0.1%	0.5%	-0.38
Surgeons & doctors	0.2	0.1%	0.6%	-0.53
Custody	0.8	0.7%	0.5%	0.27
Uniform & laundry	0.4	0.3%	0.4%	-0.07
Insurance	0.4	0.3%	0.2%	0.13
Interpreters	0.1	0.1%	0.2%	-0.09
Catering contractors	0.1	0.1%	0.1%	-0.03
Other	3.4	3.0%	2.2%	0.90
<b>Total</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>-0.41</b>

Source: CIPFA Statistics 2010/11 estimates

# FINANCING OF EXPENDITURE

## 2010/11 estimates £ per head of population

These charts show how the force funds its expenditure broken down into more detail. Specific grants go to all forces and are formula based, while special grants are not formula based and are for one-off policing activities, e.g. policing of party conferences.



Population 558,500

	£m	£/head	Avg
<b>Central funding</b>			
Formula funding*	100	179	128
Specific grants	11	19	19
<b>Local funding</b>			
Council tax	32	57	58
Reserves	1	2	1
<b>Net revenue exp.</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>206</b>

\* Sum of Police Grant, Non-Domestic Rates, & Revenue Support Grant

Source: CIPFA Statistics 2010/11 estimates

Band D tax rate	Avg	Diff £m
£188	£162	4

Cleveland


# SPECIFIC GRANTS

## 2010/11 estimates £ per head of population

These charts break down information into different categories of specific grants.

Additional Rule 2 funding includes rural policing fund, forensic grant (previously referred to as DNA Expansion), special priority payments and London and South East allowances.

*NB: Additional Rule 2 funding was amended in the emergency budget in June 2010.*








Population 558,500

	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff. £m
PCSO grant	3.0	5.3	4.9	0.2
Security grants	0.9	1.7	2.9	-0.7
Crime Fighting Fund	2.2	3.9	4.1	-0.1
Additional Rule 2	1.5	2.6	3.3	-0.4
PFI grant	2.1	3.8	1.2	1.4
BCU Fund	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.2
Other special grants	0.7	1.2	1.6	-0.2
<b>Total specific grants</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>18.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>

Reduction in Rule 2 grant 1.4 2.4 1.8

Source: CIPFA Statistics 2010/11 estimates







# FUNDING SOURCE TRENDS

2006/07 - 2009/10 actuals, 2010/11 estimates £ per head of population

These charts show how the financial position and funding of forces has changed since 2006/07. Estimates of reserves are unreliable.  
 NB: the scales in the graphs have been chosen so that the graph highlights the changes over time.

Cleveland ———  
 Average - - - -



£ per 1,000	06/7 act	07/08 act	08/09 act	9/10 act	10/11 est	Increase
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	241.3	252.1	242.3	256.2	258.0	7%
<b>Financed by:</b>						
Specific grants	20.7	22.3	21.0	24.9	19.4	-6%
Formula grants	160.7	166.5	170.6	174.9	179.2	12%
Reserves	14.8	15.4	-1.8	0.9	1.9	-87%
Council tax	45.1	47.9	52.5	55.6	57.4	27%
<b>Band D Tax Rate</b>	£151	£158	£174	£188	£188	25%

Average	06/7 act	07/08 act	08/09 act	9/10 act	10/11 est	Increase
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	194.0	199.5	198.8	204.6	205.7	6%
<b>Financed by:</b>						
Specific grants	18.0	20.8	23.3	23.4	18.7	4%
Formula grants	114.1	118.5	121.6	124.5	128.1	12%
Reserves	15.3	10.6	0.8	0.4	1.1	-93%
Council tax	46.5	49.5	53.1	56.3	57.9	24%
<b>Band D Tax Rate</b>	£133	£140	£152	£162	£162	22%

Source: CIPFA Statistics 2009/10 estimates

## Section Two - Workforce

### INTRODUCTION

This section looks at how a force deploys its workforce, broken down in detail. Most of the information is based on ADR data supplied by forces to the Home Office. Home Office published figures are taken from ADR502 and ADR 601 which allocates police officers, PCSOs and police staff to over 60 different functional categories. Staff with multiple responsibilities (or designations) are recorded under their primary role or function. For instance forces may include surveillance teams in the investigation function. This may lead to a force appearing different from their peer group. Overall force totals include those on career breaks or maternity/paternity leave. *NB: Police staff numbers exclude traffic wardens and contract staff and include S.38 police staff and designated officers (investigation, detention and escort). All ADR 601 data is to 31 March 2010 except for South Yorkshire's data which is to 19 August 2010. This data was extracted from Home Office systems in September 2010 and is as per the draft profile issued in October 2010.*

This data comprises full-time equivalent (FTE) figures which have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Because of rounding, there may be an apparent discrepancy between the totals in these charts and totals in similar published tables. Some functions data from the ADR601 does not match total published figures from ADR502, but is now subject to more detailed cross checking. Any discrepancies greater than 2% between these two sources are shown. In some areas, such as support services, the profiles compare numbers of staff per 100 FTE staff as staffing levels for support services are less likely to be affected by local demographics.

### Local policing workforce by function

The ADR workforce data is initially divided into three groups: local policing, national functions, and not available for duty.

Local policing is made up of police officers, PCSOs and police staff allocated to the following ADR categories:

- Community (ADR categories: community safety, response and neighbourhoods).
- Roads policing (ADR categories: traffic and traffic wardens).
- Investigation (ADR categories: asset confiscation, burglary, child/sex/domestic, Criminal Investigation Department (CID), CID specialist crime unit, drugs, fraud, hate crime, Home Office Large Major Enquiry System Unit (HOLMES), vehicle crime and vice).
- Forensics (ADR categories: fingerprinting/photographic and scenes of crime).
- Intelligence (ADR category: intelligence only).
- Dealing with the public (ADR categories: control room and enquiry/station).
- Criminal justice (ADR category: criminal justice units only).
- Custody (ADR category: custody only).
- Specialist functions (ADR categories: air, dogs, firearms (tactical and explosives), marine, mounted, surveillance unit, technical support unit and underwater).
- Operational support (ADR categories: ACPO and directors, coroner's officer, crime and incident management, criminal records office, departmental heads, drivers, local commanders, operational planning, property, staff officers and vehicle workshop/fleet).
- Business support (ADR categories: IT/communications, complaints and discipline, corporate development, finance, other admin/clerical, press and public relations, Personnel/HR, staff associations, welfare/occupational health).
- Training (ADR category: training only).
- Other (including ADR categories: catering, building and stores/supplies).

**National functions**

These are resources allocated for a range of functions, such as national security, that may cross force boundaries. These officers are therefore unavailable for local duties. It should be noted that some forces may provide national functions for other forces, so this figure does not necessarily imply the full complement.

**Not available for duty**

These are members of the workforce who were unavailable for duty, either because they are probationary police officers who are still completing their training, or who are absent due to maternity leave, career breaks, full time education or absent on long term leave (e.g. compassionate or unpaid leave). Please note that the ADR data for 'other' may not reconcile with other returns about long term absence, which may mean that the numbers of staff not available for duty can be distorted.

**Other workforce data**

The profiles also include information about contract staff. However forces do not record contract staff consistently and this data is included for completeness only (i.e. because contract staff represent a cost to the force). The profiles also include other ADR data which provides information on numbers of staff joining and leaving the police service as well as figures on sickness absences.









**How to use this section**

Police authorities and forces should focus on those charts where the force is an outlier, i.e. where they are significantly different from the average, or where they are particularly high or low. Outliers are highlighted in red in the tables of the 'all forces' profiles and fall within the top or bottom 10% of forces and with a financial value of more than £1 million (approximately 25 staff difference from the average). They should explore the reasons for any differences by looking at the force as a whole, using relevant local knowledge. Staffing levels should also be considered in the context of workforce modernisation, collaboration efforts and the outsourcing of services.

# WORKFORCE

## March 2010 FTE per 1,000 population

These charts show the overall police workforce per 1,000 population which are then broken down into police officers, police staff and PCSOs.



Population 558,500

	N	per 1,000	Avg	Diff.		% Total	Avg
Police officers	1,724	3.09	2.26	460	<<	66%	57%
Police staff	711	1.27	1.46	-106		27%	37%
PCSOs	193	0.35	0.25	51	<<	7%	6%
Total	2,629	4.71	3.98	405		100%	100%

Contract staff	-	-	0.03	-17
Traffic wardens	-	-	0.00	-2
Special constables	238	0.43	0.28	82

Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10)

Special constables source: ADR 502 (as at 31/03/2010)



## WORKFORCE TRENDS

### Changes March 2005 to March 2010

These tables show workforce changes since March 2005. These highlight the impact of workforce modernisation and the introduction of PCSOs.

#### FTE

	Mar-05	Mar-06	Mar-07	Mar-08	Mar-09	Mar-10
Police officers	1,689	1,709	1,757	1,707	1,759	1,724
PCSOs	75	100	114	170	198	193
Police staff	748	697	776	707	723	711
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,512</b>	<b>2,507</b>	<b>2,647</b>	<b>2,585</b>	<b>2,680</b>	<b>2,629</b>

#### FTE/1,000

Police officers	3.02	3.06	3.15	3.06	3.15	3.09
PCSOs	0.13	0.18	0.20	0.30	0.35	0.35
Police staff	1.34	1.25	1.39	1.27	1.29	1.27
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>4.74</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>4.71</b>

Increase
2%
158%
-5%
5%

#### All-force Average

Police officers	2.28	2.29	2.29	2.28	2.29	2.26
PCSOs	0.08	0.09	0.20	0.24	0.25	0.25
Police staff	1.24	1.29	1.33	1.33	1.44	1.46
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>3.98</b>






-1%
200%
18%
11%

Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10)

# POLICE OFFICERS/PCSOs BY RANK

March 2010 % of FTE



These charts show the percentage of the total officer and PCSO workforce by rank. The chart for superintendents includes chief superintendents, and the chart for inspectors includes chief inspectors. Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) are officers above the rank of chief superintendents. Additionally two charts show numbers of constables (and PCSOs) per sergeant giving an indication of the supervision requirement for each sergeant.



	FTE	%	Avg
ACPO	4	0.2%	0.2%
Chief Superintendent	4	0.2%	0.3%
Superintendent	10	0.5%	0.7%
Chief Inspector	24	1.3%	1.3%
Inspector	84	4.4%	4.7%
Sergeant	247	12.9%	14.1%
Constable	1,351	70.5%	68.5%
PCSO	193	10.1%	10.2%
Force total	1,918	100.0%	100.0%

Constables per Sergeant	5.5	4.9
Const. & PCSOs per Sergeant	6.2	5.6

Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10)








# POLICE WORKFORCE AND CRIME

## March 2010 Workforce, 2009/10 crime

These charts show numbers of police officers allocated to community duties in relation to the amount of crime in the force. While police officers are not just dealing with crime, the numbers of crimes per police officer allocated to community duties gives some indication of how busy these officers are compared to their peer group of forces.

*NB: this does not include officers attending incidents, which do not result in a notifiable offence.*



Population 558,500

	N	per 1,000	Avg
Violent crimes	9,919	17.8	15.1
Acquisitive crimes	21,429	38.4	34.5
All other crimes	15,907	28.5	21.8
Total crimes	47,255	84.6	71.4


Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10

Crimes per community police officer	62	68
Crimes per community + roads police officer	54	61

Source: ADR 601 as at 31/03/10

	Total staff *	4.44	3.76
Community police officers	766	1.37	1.10
Roads police officers	115	0.21	0.11
PCSOs	193	0.35	0.25

\* excluding national functions  
HMIC







% total staff	Avg
31%	29%
5%	3%
8%	7%

# WORKFORCE BY FUNCTION - SUMMARY

March 2010 FTE per 1,000 population

These charts show the total workforce of the force, broken down into those who perform national functions, those who have local duties and those who are not available for duty. Local workforce numbers offer better comparisons across forces for similar functions.



	N	per 1,000	Avg
Local policing	2,477	4.44	3.76
National functions	39	0.07	0.07
Not available for duty*	113	0.20	0.15
Total	2,629	4.71	3.98

Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10)

\* e.g. probationers or officers on maternity or long term leave

## WORKFORCE BY FUNCTION - DETAIL

### March 2010 FTE per 1,000 population

This table shows police officer and police staff (incl PCSOs) numbers broken down into more detail by their function. This information is also presented as charts on the following pages. Please refer to the introduction to this section for definitions of the workforce categories. *NB: Special constables are headcount figures not FTE.*

Population 558,500













	Cleveland per 1,000 population			All force average per 1,000 population			Difference FTE			% Officers		% Force Total				
	Officers	Staff	Total	Officers	Staff	Total	Officers	Staff	Total	Avg		Avg				
Community	766	198	964	1.37	0.36	1.73	1.10	0.29	1.39	153	38	191	79%	79%	39%	37%
Roads policing	115	6	121	0.21	0.01	0.22	0.11	0.02	0.14	51	-6	45	95%	84%	5%	4%
Specialist functions	72	13	85	0.13	0.02	0.15	0.12	0.03	0.15	7	-3	3	85%	80%	3%	4%
Investigation	305	25	329	0.55	0.04	0.59	0.41	0.10	0.51	75	-30	44	93%	81%	13%	14%
Intelligence	66	54	120	0.12	0.10	0.22	0.09	0.07	0.16	18	13	31	55%	54%	5%	4%
Forensics	7	29	36	0.01	0.05	0.07	0.00	0.08	0.08	5	-14	-8	19%	4%	1%	2%
Operational support	84	29	114	0.15	0.05	0.20	0.08	0.15	0.23	42	-56	-14	74%	33%	5%	6%
Dealing with the public	53	173	226	0.10	0.31	0.41	0.04	0.27	0.30	33	23	57	24%	12%	9%	8%
Criminal justice	70	68	138	0.13	0.12	0.25	0.03	0.16	0.19	55	-21	34	51%	14%	6%	5%
Custody	34	10	45	0.06	0.02	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.10	7	-19	-12	77%	49%	2%	3%
Business support	20	210	229	0.04	0.38	0.41	0.04	0.35	0.39	-0	14	14	9%	9%	9%	10%
Training	33	19	53	0.06	0.03	0.09	0.05	0.04	0.09	7	-5	2	63%	52%	2%	2%
Other	-	17	17	-	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.05	0.05	-1	-12	-13	0%	3%	1%	1%
<b>Local policing</b>	<b>1,625</b>	<b>852</b>	<b>2,477</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>1.52</b>	<b>4.44</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>1.66</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>-77</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
National functions	32	7	39	0.06	0.01	0.07	0.06	0.01	0.07	-0	-2	-2	83%	80%		
Not available for duty	67	47	113	0.12	0.08	0.20	0.11	0.04	0.15	7	24	31	59%	72%		
<b>Total workforce</b>	<b>1,724</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>2,629</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>1.62</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>-55</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>57%</b>		
<i>Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10)</i>																
Contract staff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.03	-	-	-	-17				
Traffic wardens	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	-	-	-	-2				
Special constables	-	238	238	-	0.43	0.43	-	0.28	-	-	-	82				

*Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10) for contract staff and traffic wardens, ADR 502 (as at 31/03/10) for special constables*

# WORKFORCE BY FUNCTION

## March 2010 FTE per 1,000 population


These charts show the workforce broken down by function. For definitions of the workforce categories, please refer to the introduction to this section.















# CHANGES IN WORKFORCE

## Changes March 2006 to March 2010

These charts show workforce changes since March 2006. Some changes, especially large ones, may be due to corrections or past data quality concerns. Changes below 50% or above 100% are therefore not presented in the charts, or used in calculating the averages, though they are still shown in the data table.



	Mar-06	Mar-10	%	Avg
Community	838	964	15%	13%
Roads policing	61	121	98%	-8%
Specialist functions	100	85	-15%	18%
Investigation	246	329	34%	21%
Intelligence	66	120	83%	20%
Forensics	39	36	-6%	-1%
Operational support	147	114	-23%	13%
Dealing with the public	48	226	369%	1%
Criminal justice	76	138	82%	-5%
Custody	132	45	-66%	17%
Business support	374	229	-39%	1%
Training	93	53	-43%	11%
Other	10	17	70%	5%
Local policing	2,230	2,477	11%	8%
Force total	2,507	2,629	5%	8%




Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/06 & 31/03/10)  
HMIC

# BUSINESS SUPPORT







## March 2010 FTE per 100 workforce

These charts show business support workforce broken down into more detail. *NB: This data is FTE per 100 total FTE and differs from other staffing charts. The 'Diff' column in the table shows the difference in FTE from the average.*



Total force FTE 2,629

	FTE	per 100	Avg	Diff.
IT/Communications	37	1.42	1.81	-10
Corporate development	15	0.57	1.83	-33
Personnel/HR	26	0.99	1.28	-8
Finance	29	1.09	0.90	5
Complaints & discipline	31	1.20	0.70	13
Press & public relations	5	0.21	0.42	-6
Occup. health & welfare	5	0.19	0.22	-1
Staff associations	4	0.14	0.16	-1
Other admin./clerical	77	2.92	2.38	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>8.72</b>	<b>9.71</b>	<b>-26</b>




Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10)  
HMIC



# INVESTIGATION

## March 2010 FTE per 1,000 population

These charts show the investigative workforce broken down into more detail. *NB: Actual numbers in some categories are low.*  
 The 'Diff' column in the table shows the difference in FTE from the average.









Population 558,500

	FTE	per 1,000	Avg	Diff.
CID*	200	0.36	0.34	10
Child/sex/domestic	68	0.12	0.11	8
Fraud	24	0.04	0.02	15 <<
HOLMES unit	4	0.01	0.01	-4
Drugs	21	0.04	0.01	16 <<
Asset confiscation	6	0.01	0.01	1
Vehicle crime	1	0.00	0.00	0
Vice	1	0.00	0.00	0
Burglary	0	0.00	0.00	-3
Hate crime	4	0.01	0.01	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>44</b>

\* inc. Special crime unit








Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10)



# OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

## March 2010 FTE per 100 workforce

These charts show the operational support workforce broken down in more detail. Not all forces have staff in all categories, e.g. where services are outsourced. NB: This data is FTE per 100 total FTE and differs from other staffing charts. The 'Diff' column in the table shows the difference in FTE from the average.



Total force FTE 2,629


	FTE	per 100	Avg	Diff.
ACPO & directors	11	0.41	0.20	5
Departmental heads	9	0.34	0.34	0
Local commanders	4	0.15	0.34	-5
Senior Management	24	0.90	0.88	0
Crime & incident management	46	1.76	1.95	-5
Criminal records office	8	0.30	0.98	-18
Vehicle workshop/fleet	5	0.19	0.63	-11
Operational planning	18	0.68	0.53	4
Property	3	0.11	0.28	-4
Drivers	1	0.04	0.25	-6
Coroner's officer	7	0.27	0.17	3
Staff officers	2	0.08	0.13	-1
<b>Total</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>5.80</b>	<b>-39</b>

Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10)  
HMIC

# SPECIALIST FUNCTIONS

## March 2010 FTE per 1,000 population







These charts show the specialist functions workforce broken down in more detail. Not all forces have staff in all categories, e.g. where services are outsourced. *NB: The 'Diff' column in the table shows the difference in FTE from the average.*



Population 558,500

	FTE	FTE/1,000	Avg	Diff.
Firearms - tactical	9	0.02	0.06	-23
Dogs	21	0.04	0.03	5
Surveillance unit	22	0.04	0.02	8
Firearms/explosives	0	-	0.01	-8
Technical support unit	9	0.02	0.01	5
Air	12	0.02	0.01	8
Mounted	12	0.02	0.00	10
Underwater	0	-	0.00	-1
Marine	0	-	0.00	-1
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>3</b>








Source: ADR 601 (as at 31/03/10)  
HMIC



# LEAVERS

2010

These charts show the percentage of the workforce that left the force in 2009/10; officers are broken down into those who transferred or left the service. A further chart shows the percentage of officers working beyond 30 years service. Because of the current financial climate, we have costed the salary impact of staff leaving the service. However, PCSOs leaving forces may return as police officers.  
 NB: The leavers figures are headcount figures not FTE.



	Leavers (headcount)	% Force	Avg	Salary £m
<b>Police officers</b> [1,724]				3.6
Transfer	11	0.6%	0.7%	
Leaving force	73	4.2%	4.5%	
<b>Total leavers</b>	84	4.9%	5.2%	
<b>Police staff</b> [711]				1.1
Transfer	-	0.0%	0.0%	
Leaving force	36	5.1%	6.6%	
<b>Total leavers</b>	36	5.1%	6.7%	
<b>PCSO</b> [193]				0.5
Transfer	-	0.0%	0.2%	
Leaving force	17	8.8%	11.3%	
<b>Total leavers</b>	17	8.8%	11.4%	
<b>All leavers</b>	137	5.2%	6.2%	5.2





Source: ADR531 (as at 31/03/10)

POs > 30yr service	60	3.5%	1.6%
--------------------	----	------	------

Source: ADR582 (as at 31/03/10)

# JOINERS 2010


These charts show the percentage of the workforce that joined the force in 2009/10.  
NB: The joiners figures are headcount figures not FTE.



	Strength	%	Avg
Police officers	1,724	3.0%	4.3%
Police staff	711	6.0%	9.4%
PCSO	193	8.8%	11.9%
Overall	2,629	4.2%	6.7%

Source: ADR521 (as at 31/03/10)

	% strength	Avg
PO Probationers	2.1%	2.8%



# SICKNESS & OTHER LONG TERM ABSENCE

2010

These charts show sickness & other long term absence broken down into absences of less than 28 days and 28 days or more (long term absence) which includes maternity leave, compassionate leave etc. Officers on restricted duties (i.e. officers who, because of a disability or other limiting factor, are unable to undertake the full range of operational duties) and recuperative duties (officers returning to work in a phased way after injury or illness) are not included in the absence figures. *NB: The gaps towards the left of some charts indicate that data is not available or has not been included; absence above 12% of the workforce and zero absence have been excluded.*





	FTE	%	Avg
<b>Officers</b> [1,724]			
Long term absence	72	4.2%	3.0%
Sickness absence	531	na	1.7%
<b>PCSO</b> [193]			
Long term absence	12	6.0%	2.6%
Sickness absence	103	na	2.2%
<b>Staff</b> [711]			
Long term absence	43	6.1%	3.5%
Sickness absence	308	na	2.0%

<b>Officers</b> [1,724]			
Recuperative	18	1.0%	2.3%
Restricted	36	2.1%	4.2%





Source: ADR 502, 551 and 582 (as at 31/03/10)

ADR 582 figures are headcount not FTE

Long-term Absence



Sickness absence



## Section Three - Offences & Sanctioned Detections

### INTRODUCTION

This section focuses on criminal offences dealt with by each force, using the Home Office published categories of offences.

Data is shown as offences per 1,000 population.

Definitions of offences in each category can be found on the Home Office website [www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/). Burglary, violent and vehicle offences are further broken down into sub-categories. The 10 Home Office categories into which all recorded crime has been divided are:

- > **Violent crime**
  - > Violence against the person
    - > with injury
    - > without injury
  - > Sexual offences
- > **Acquisitive crime**
  - > Robbery
  - > Burglary
    - > in a dwelling
    - > not in a dwelling
  - > Offences against vehicles
    - > Taking a vehicle without consent
    - > Other offences against a vehicle (interfering with a vehicle & theft from a vehicle)
  - > Other theft offences
- > **Other crime**
  - > Criminal damage
  - > Drug offences
  - > Fraud and Forgery
  - > Other offences

A sanction detection means that a recorded crime has been resolved by the police. The types of outcomes are:

- > Caution - police have identified a suspect and issued them with a caution
- > Penalty notice for disorder - a fine issued by the police for anti-social behaviour
- > Charge summons - the suspect has been charged and/or brought to court
- > Taken into consideration (TIC) - courts take this offence into consideration when sentencing for other crimes

### How to use this section





Police authorities and forces should focus on those charts where the force is significantly different from the average or particularly high or low. They should explore the reasons for any differences by looking at the force as a whole, using relevant local knowledge.

**Up to date quarterly crime statistics are available on the HMIC website as part of the Police Report Card**

# RECORDED OFFENCES - ALL CRIMES

## 2009/10 per 1,000 population

These charts show all crimes reported to the force, broken down into violent, acquisitive and all other crimes.



Population 558,500

	N	per 1,000	Avg	Difference	
Violent crimes	9,919	17.8	15.1	1,510	18%
Acquisitive crimes	21,429	38.4	34.5	2,182	11%
All other crimes	15,907	28.5	21.8	3,713	30%
Total	47,255	84.6	71.4	7,405	19%





Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10



# RECORDED OFFENCES - VIOLENT CRIMES

## 2009/10 per 1,000 population

These charts show violent crimes broken down into more detail.










Population 558,500

	N	per 1,000	Avg	Difference	
Violence against the person					
- with injury	4,743	8.5	6.8	929	24%
- without in jury	4,577	8.2	7.3	494	12%
Sexual offences	599	1.1	0.9	87	17%
<b>Violent crimes</b>	<b>9,919</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>18%</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10

# RECORDED OFFENCES - ACQUISITIVE CRIMES 2009/10 per 1,000 population

These charts show acquisitive crimes broken down into more detail. *NB: Burglary is shown per 1,000 population (not per dwelling).*








Population 558,500

	N	per 1,000	Avg	Difference	
Robbery	286	0.5	0.7	-107	-27%
Burglary					
- Burglary in a dwelling	2,460	4.4	4.1	188	8%
- Burglary not in a dwelling	3,082	5.5	5.1	254	9%
Offences against vehicles					
- Theft ...of a vehicle	1,168	2.1	1.8	136	13%
- Other vehicle offences	2,920	5.2	6.0	-431	-13%
Other theft offences	11,513	20.6	16.8	2,143	23%
Acquisitive crimes	21,429	38.4	34.5	2,182	11%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10

# RECORDED OFFENCES - ALL OTHER OFFENCES 2009/10 per 1,000 population

These charts show all other crimes broken down into more detail. *NB: The number of drug offences recorded is a measure of police activity, which is why detections are close to 100%.*



Population 558,500





	N	per 1,000	Avg	Difference	
Criminal damage	11,183	20.0	15.1	2,765	33%
Drug offences	2,972	5.3	3.4	1,096	58%
Fraud and forgery	807	1.4	2.2	-424	-34%
Other offences	945	1.7	1.2	276	41%
All other crimes	15,907	28.5	21.8	3,713	30%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10

# RECORDED OFFENCE TRENDS - ALL CRIMES

## 2005/06 and 2009/10

These charts show how recorded crime levels have changed since 2005/06.







	2005/06	2009/10	Change	Avg
Violent crimes	15,076	9,919	-34%	-18%
Acquisitive crimes	33,870	21,429	-37%	-21%
All other crimes	23,016	15,907	-31%	-26%
Total	71,962	47,255	-34%	-22%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2005/06 to 2009/10

# RECORDED OFFENCE TRENDS - VIOLENT CRIMES 2005/06 and 2009/10

These charts show how violent crime levels have changed since 2005/06.








	2005/06	2009/10	Change	Avg
Violence against the person				
- with injury	7,354	4,743	-36%	-27%
- without injury	6,958	4,577	-34%	-6%
Sexual offences	764	599	-22%	-12%
Violent Crime	15,076	9,919	-34%	-18%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2005/06 to 2009/10

# RECORDED OFFENCE TRENDS - ACQUISITIVE CRIMES 2005/06 and 2009/10

These charts show how acquisitive crime levels have changed since 2005/06.








	2005/06	2009/10	Change	Avg
Robbery	715	286	-60%	-20%
Burglary				
- Burglary in a dwelling	4,185	2,460	-41%	-11%
- Burglary not in a dwelling	4,351	3,082	-29%	-19%
Offences against vehicles				
- Theft ...of a vehicle	2,901	1,168	-60%	-43%
- Other vehicle offences	7,510	2,920	-61%	-35%
Other theft offences	14,208	11,513	-19%	-13%
Acquisitive crime	33,870	21,429	-37%	-21%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2005/06 to 2009/10

## RECORDED OFFENCE TRENDS - ALL OTHER OFFENCES 2005/06 and 2009/10

These charts show how all other crime levels have changed since 2005/06. NB: The number of drug offences recorded is a measure of police activity, which is why detections are close to 100%.




	2005/06	2009/10	Change	Avg
Criminal damage	18,604	11,183	-40%	-31%
Drug offences	1,822	2,972	63%	27%
Fraud and forgery	1,752	807	-54%	-39%
Other offences	838	945	13%	-4%
All other offences	23,016	15,907	-31%	-26%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2005/06 to 2009/10

# ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

2009/10 per 1,000 population

Please note this data is not validated and as such should only be used for indicative purposes. This does not constitute recorded crime and there have been differences as to how forces interpret categories.



	Avg	
ASB Incidents per 1,000 pop	113	68



# SANCTION DETECTION RATES



2009/10

These charts show the overall detection rates and compare them with the crime adjusted detection rates. The crime adjusted detections shows what the force would have achieved if they had matched the average for each crime type.

	Offences	Detections	%	Avg	Crime Adjusted Detections	Diff.
<b>Violent crime</b>						
Violence against the person						
- with injury	4,743	2,365	50%	43%	2,049	316
- without in jury	4,577	3,109	68%	55%	2,519	590
Sexual offences	599	241	40%	31%	187	54
	9,919	5,715	58%	48%	4,755	960
<b>Acquisitive crime</b>						
Robbery	286	94	33%	29%	82	12
Burglary in a dwelling	2,460	466	19%	18%	440	26
Burglary in other building	3,082	471	15%	10%	308	163
Theft ...of a vehicle	1,168	322	28%	20%	234	88
Other vehicle offences	2,920	458	16%	9%	275	183
Other theft offences	11,513	5,029	44%	28%	3,202	1,827
	21,429	6,840	32%	20%	4,542	2,298
<b>Other crime</b>						
Fraud and forgery	807	407	50%	33%	266	141
Criminal damage	11,183	2,031	18%	14%	1,559	472
Drug offences	2,972	2,939	99%	95%	2,819	120
Other offences	945	871	92%	72%	679	192
	15,907	6,248	39%	31%	5,323	925
All offences	47,255	18,786	40%	30%	14,620	4,183

**Actual % Expected 128%**









Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10



# SANCTION DETECTION RATES BY CRIME TYPE

2009/10

These charts show detection rates by type of crime.  
 NB: The number of drug offences recorded is a measure of police activity, which is why detections are close to 100%.













Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10

Cleveland

# CHANGES IN SANCTION DETECTION RATES



2005/06 and 2009/10

These charts break down sanction detections by type of crime. NB: The number of drug offences recorded is a measure of police activity, which is why detections are close to 100%.







	2005/06	2009/10	Change % points	Avg
Violence against the person				
- with injury	33%	50%	17%	2%
- without injury	51%	68%	17%	1%
Sexual offences	40%	40%	0%	-1%
Robbery	18%	33%	15%	4%
Burglary	12%	17%	5%	0%
Offences against vehicles	9%	19%	10%	1%
Other theft offences	28%	44%	16%	4%
Fraud and forgery	37%	50%	13%	0%
Criminal damage	11%	18%	7%	1%
Drug offences	94%	99%	4%	4%
Other offences	78%	92%	14%	0%
All offences	24%	40%	16%	4%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2005/06 to 2009/10



## SANCTION DETECTIONS BY TYPE 2009/10

These charts show how different types of sanction detections are used.







	%	Avg
Charge summons	60%	56%
Cautions	24%	24%
Penalty notices	7%	8%
Cannabis warnings & other	4%	5%
Taken into consideration	5%	7%
Total	100%	100%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10

# CHANGES IN DETECTION TYPES

## Changes 2005/06 to 2009/10

These charts show how types of sanction detections have changed since 2005/06.



	2005/06	2009/10	Change % points	Avg
Charge summons	57%	60%	3%	1%
Cautions	25%	24%	-1%	-1%
Penalty notices	11%	7%	-4%	1%
Cannabis warnings & other	1%	4%	3%	1%
Taken into consideration	6%	5%	-1%	-2%
Total	100%	100%		

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10

# CHARGES

## 2009/10



These charts and tables show the overall charge rates and compare them with the expected charge rates. The expected charge rates show what the force would have achieved if they had matched the average for each crime type.

	Offences	Charges	%	Avg
<b>Violent crime</b>				
Violence against the person				
- with injury	4,743	1,375	29%	29%
- without injury	4,577	1,664	36%	32%
Sexual offences	599	215	36%	26%
	9,919	3,254	33%	30%
<b>Acquisitive crime</b>				
Robbery	286	92	32%	27%
Burglary in a dwelling	2,460	348	14%	10%
Burglary in other building	3,082	297	10%	6%
Theft ...of a vehicle	1,168	243	21%	14%
Other vehicle offences	2,920	239	8%	3%
Other theft offences	11,513	3,123	27%	15%
	21,429	4,342	20%	11%
<b>Other crime</b>				
Fraud and forgery	807	249	31%	20%
Criminal damage	11,183	1,105	10%	8%
Drug offences	2,972	1,488	50%	37%
Other offences	945	796	84%	60%
	15,907	3,638	23%	16%
All offences	47,255	11,234	24%	17%

Actual % Expected 138%

Source: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10

Expected charges	Diff.
1,366	9
1,455	209
156	59
2,978	276
78	14
257	91
171	126
164	79
96	143
1,729	1,394
2,495	1,847
163	86
846	259
1,095	393
567	229
2,671	967
8,144	3,090







# ARREST TO CHARGE

2008/09 and 2009/10

These charts show the number of arrests per crime, as well as arrests, sanction detections and charges per local police officer (local police officers are those deployed in local policing functions as set out in the workforce section).

*NB: The latest arrest data available is for 2008/09. The arrest data does not include arrests for non-notifiable offences. Arrests shown are for notifiable offences only, but there are non-notifiable arrests & other detentions which are not counted by Home Office.*



Crimes	47,255
--------	--------

Local police officers	1,625
-----------------------	-------

Arrests	21,603
---------	--------

	N	per local PO	Avg
Arrests	21,603	13.3	12.5
Sanction detections	18,786	11.6	10.0
Charges	11,234	6.9	5.6




Arrests per 100 crimes	46
------------------------	----

Average	37
---------	----

Sources: Arrest data: ADR 121-124 (2008/09), Detection data: Home Office Crime Statistics 2009/10

# 999 CALLS 2009/10

These charts show how the force managed 999 calls received in 2009/10. This data is based on management information and is not subject to as many detailed checks as other figures. For example several 999 calls could come from a single incident.  
*NB. The gaps towards the left of some charts indicate that data is not available or has not been included. Control room staff are included in the workforce category 'Dealing with the public' and are not shown separately in the workforce section. Control room staff figure includes contractors*



Population 558,500

	N	per 1,000	Avg
Calls received	87,836	157	147

Calls answered on time	85,738	98%	92%
------------------------	--------	-----	-----

Control room staff 189

Calls per control room staff	465	608
------------------------------	-----	-----

Source: ADR 441 2009/10



## Section Four - Confidence and Satisfaction

### INTRODUCTION

#### **Confidence and satisfaction**

Customer surveys are conducted to measure the public's perception of the police. Information from these surveys show levels of public confidence and satisfaction with policing and perceptions of some issues being faced. 95% confidence intervals are shown and the size of these provide a measure of uncertainty. Large intervals reflect more uncertainty because of small sample sizes. *NB: The data is based on average figures within confidence intervals and the ranking is indicative only. Satisfaction and perception data has been collected for the London metropolitan area as a whole and the figures for the City of London are included in an overall London figure.*

#### **How to use this section**

Police authorities and forces should focus on those charts where the force is significantly different from the average, or particularly high or low. They should explore the reasons for any differences by looking at the force as a whole, using relevant local knowledge.

**Up to date quarterly victim satisfaction are available on the HMIC website as part of the Police Report Card**


# BRITISH CRIME SURVEY OUTCOMES

2009/10

These charts show information from the British Crime Survey about levels of public confidence and satisfaction with policing and perceptions of some issues being faced. 95% confidence intervals are also shown.


## Perception of Problems

% who perceive that:



	Avg	
2010	33.8%	24.6%
2006	36.1%	24.6%

Confidence interval +/- 6.0%




	Avg	
2010	19.0%	13.1%
2006	20.5%	13.1%

Confidence interval +/- 5.5%

## Opinion of the Police

% who agree that:








	Avg	
2010	54.4%	55.3%
2006	na	na

Confidence interval +/- 2.8%

Source: British Crime Survey 2009/10

## SATISFACTION WITH THE POLICE BY CRIME TYPE 2009/10 percentage satisfied

These charts show victim satisfaction with the police for a selection of crimes. 95% confidence intervals are also shown.



### % Satisfied

	Violent crime	Burglary	Road traffic collision	Vehicle crime
2010	79.2%	85.9%	88.4%	82.1%
2006	67.4%	85.5%	85.2%	66.7%

All users*
83.9%
77.0%

### Confidence interval

3.4%	3.0%	3.0%	2.9%
------	------	------	------

1.5%
------

### Average Values

2010	79.4%	88.9%	88.2%	82.0%
2006	73.9%	86.2%	80.3%	74.4%

84.6%
79.8%

\*excludes racist incidents

Source: Victims of Crime Survey 2009/10