



## RESPONSE BY THE PCC TO HMIC INSPECTIONS OF CLEVELAND POLICE

### INSPECTION DETAILS

Title of Inspection

**PEEL: 2015 Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy (PEEL)**

Date Inspection Published

**February 2016**

Type of Inspection:

- Cleveland Specific  
 Follow Up  
 Partner Inspection

- National  
 Thematic

Is Cleveland Police quoted in the Report?

Yes

No

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 24<sup>th</sup> February, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) published Cleveland Police's 2015 Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy (PEEL) assessment.

This is HMIC's second assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy with which Cleveland Police keeps people safe and reduces crime. PEEL (police effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy) gives you information about how your local police force is performing in several important areas. It does this in a way that is comparable both across England and Wales, and year-on-year.

- **Effectiveness** - The extent to which Cleveland Police is effective at keeping people safe and reducing crime requires improvement.
- **Efficiency** - The extent to which Cleveland Police is efficient at keeping people safe and reducing crime requires improvement.
- **Legitimacy** - The extent to which Cleveland Police is legitimate at keeping people safe and reducing crime requires improvement.
- This year, HMIC also assessed **Leadership** across the force at every level. The assessment has led to a narrative rather than graded judgment.

A summary of HMIC's judgements in each area are listed below:

#### **Effectiveness**

HMIC judged Cleveland Police to require improvement in the way in which it keeps people safe and reduces crime. The force investigates crime and manages offenders effectively. The force works very well to tackle serious and organised crime. Although Cleveland Police understands the importance of protecting vulnerable people, there is improvement needed in the way it initially identifies and responds to vulnerable people. How it prevents crime and anti-social behaviour

also requires improvement. This is the first year HMIC has graded forces on their overall effectiveness so a year-on-year comparison is not possible.

### **Efficiency**

Cleveland Police is partly prepared to face its future financial challenges. It has balanced the budget and has a good track record of achieving savings, although future plans beyond 2016 are projecting a budget deficit. The force needs to improve its understanding of the demand on its services and will need to change its processes and workforce allocation significantly to meet demand and address this deficit. In last year's value for money inspection, which considered how forces had met the challenge of the previous spending review period, Cleveland was judged to be good.

### **Legitimacy**

Cleveland Police has an ethical culture, and the workforce know the standard of behaviour that is expected of them. During our spring inspection, the force was integrating the Code of Ethics into its policy and practice – our later inspection recognised improvements. We found that the force had started to respond to concerns raised by its workforce about their wellbeing. Cleveland Police fully understands the relationship between engagement and legitimacy at both a strategic and local level, and we are impressed by the commitment of officers to engaging and working closely with their local communities. HMIC is satisfied that Cleveland Police is complying with almost all the features of the Best Use of Stop and Search scheme, and that Taser is used fairly and appropriately.

### **Leadership**

The workforce of Cleveland Police has high regard for chief officers, whom they view as credible, visible and approachable. The force is improving its communications and the engagement with its workforce. The force has developed some effective leadership programmes, although these could be improved by covering a broader range of skills.

### **Looking ahead to PEEL 2016**

HMIC will be interested to see how the force responds to the cause of concern and areas for improvement identified. In particular, he would be interested to see:

- how the new senior leadership team leads improvements across the force;
- how the force develops its ability to understand and manage its demand, such that priority is given to responding quickly and appropriately to the most vulnerable victims, and officers have time to spend on crime prevention;
- the progress of the force's organisational reviews to ensure the workforce model matches the service demands in priority areas;
- the outcome of work to explore options for maximising funding opportunities and working collaboratively with other forces such that, in combination with the organisational reviews, the force achieves the further savings required; and
- improvements to the wellbeing and morale of the workforce.

## **FORCE RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS**

In order to address the areas for improvement, the Force will focus improvement activity in the following key areas:

- Downward communication of Force Towards 2020 Plan
- Mobile phone and Computer forensics development
- Demonstrate long term financial planning and stability
- Sustain Organised Crime improvements
- Specialist training to officers such as CID and VEMT (Vulnerable Exploited, Missing, Trafficked)
- Incident and Crime Management Team (ICMT) refocus
- Evidence by quality assurance of THRIVE (threat, Harm, Risk, Investigation, Vulnerability, Engagement) compliance in the Force's Control Room
- Victim's First implementation
- The restructure of Control Room
- New shift pattern implementation
- Restructure to the Protecting Vulnerable Persons Hub and spoke model
- A reduction in IRT overwork (example: case files and re-work)
- The implementation of Integrated Neighbourhood Team 3 'S' Model (Strengthen, Sustain, Support) linked to problem solving and preventative strategies
- The implementation of the Multi-Agency Children's Hub (MACH)
- The VEMT Team implementation
- Implementation of volunteers scheme

## **PCC RESPONSE TO INSPECTION**

Comment by the PCC:

In response to the outcomes of each strand of the 2015 PEEL assessment, I have written directly to HMIC outlining my views on the judgements reached by his inspectors. The main points of the letter follow:

### **Press Release**

I am extremely unhappy about the manner in which HMIC has chosen to word its covering press release, which has been issued in your name. It seems to me that a choice has been made to deliberately express the press release in terms which have a negative emphasis, notwithstanding the significant aspects of the PEEL findings which reflect good practice on the part of Cleveland Police. Each of the four opening paragraphs opens with an adverse comment in your name, which underplays in each case the more positive expressions which several of the paragraphs contain which are lost in the body text of those paragraphs. I am aware that press releases in relation to other Forces with similar PEEL ratings have been constructed with a less negative emphasis - and I would ask for an explanation of why HMIC considered that to be appropriate. I would be grateful if you would provide me with an explanation of the approach taken to the construction of the press release and how HMIC ensures consistency of key message between forces whose PEEL assessments are broadly similar – or if it does not do so, why that is the case.

### **Legitimacy**

I was particularly pleased to note the positive remarks made in relation to the commitment of officers to public engagement and the understanding of the importance of treating people with fairness and respect. I accept the overall grading and I am working closely with T/Chief Constable Spittal to drive forward

further step changes in organisational standards, ethics and inclusivity. I am grateful for HMIC's support and recognition in this regard.

### **Efficiency**

As you will know, I published my response to the October 2015 Efficiency response and this is accessible at <http://www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk/Decisions/HMIC-Inspection-Responses.aspx>. You will know that this report was not common ground between us and I will not rearticulate in this letter the detailed extent of my concerns about HMIC's , which are a matter of public record. I have however formally adopted a balanced Long Term Financial Plan to the 2019/20 financial year.

### **Effectiveness**

I was pleased to see that HMIC recognised the retention and development of neighbourhood policing in line with the key features of my Police & Crime Plan. I also took reassurance from HMIC's findings that when crimes occur, the Force investigates them well and provides support to victims. I felt that HMIC were right to place emphasis on the good understanding that Cleveland Police has of the threat and risk posed by serious and organised crime and the effectiveness of arrangements for Cleveland Police to meet its national policing responsibilities.

### **Leadership**

I am pleased that it recognises the strong interim leadership in place within Cleveland Police, a judgement with which I agree.

### **Conclusion**

Whilst I have expressed concerns about HMIC's approach to the Efficiency Pillar – and reservations about HMIC's press engagement – I am aware that the T/Chief Constable and his team are committed to working closely with HMIC in relation to the substantive findings of the year's PEEL assessment work. I share that commitment and I will hold the T/Chief Constable to account going forward for addressing the areas for improvement identified by HMIC. We share a common aim of improving police performance and ensuring that the public can have confidence in their policing. As you know, Cleveland is an area challenged by significant deprivation and addressing policing and crime is a major task. It is for that reason that I simultaneously express concern about key messages to the public, as well as assuring HMIC of my commitment to continuing to work closely together with the Force and with HMIC to improve policing for the whole community.