

**ORIGINATOR: CHIEF CONSTABLE**

**PAPER NO: AP18/63**

**SUBMITTED TO: ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE PANEL –  
14 DECEMBER 2018**

**SUBJECT: VICTIM SATISFACTION AND CONFIDENCE**

**SUMMARY:**

1. This report illustrates Constabulary activity and performance in respect of public confidence in policing and the satisfaction of victims.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The Accountability and Performance Panel is asked to consider the report and provide comments to inform future performance monitoring reports.

## DETAIL OF THE SUBMISSION

### 1. KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- 1.1. Measures of public confidence and victim satisfaction are prominent within most police force performance frameworks and indeed both are prioritised within the Suffolk Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021. While the two are often discussed together it is important to emphasise the distinction between confidence and satisfaction.
- 1.2. Public confidence relates to measurements taken from the general public regardless of whether they have had contact with the police. Like most forces, Suffolk Constabulary uses the Office of National Statistics Crime Survey of England and Wales (CSEW) to track the confidence of the Suffolk public. The CSEW is a robust national survey which provides results from a statistically reliable sample<sup>1</sup> and a consistent method of asking questions primarily from face to face interviews. It is not only used to track confidence within the county, but to compare to other police Constabulary areas. Measurements are published every quarter and since 2012 each measure refers to results from at least 650 interviews taken from the county within the last 12 months.
- 1.3. Victim satisfaction relates to measurements taken from victims of certain forms of reported crime. Until March 2017, the Home Office required each police Constabulary to submit statutory returns on satisfaction in relation to burglary dwelling, violent crime (excluding domestic violence), vehicle crime and hate crime. This requirement was discontinued in April 2017 and replaced with a new requirement relating only to domestic abuse although the Home Office set out clear non-prescriptive expectations that each Constabulary would continue to seek feedback from victims of other forms of crime. In Suffolk, a private research company is used to conduct telephone interviews with victims. Measurements have been available each month and usually refer to satisfaction rates over the prior 12 months to ensure sufficiently small margins of error.
- 1.4. Within the Police and Crime Plan 2017-2020, the Police and Crime Commissioner has prioritised the measurement of the following areas:

#### Confidence Measures:

- % of respondents who agree police are doing a good job
- % of respondents who agree police deal with community priorities
- % of respondents who agree police would treat them fairly
- % of respondents who have confidence in the police overall

#### Satisfaction Measures:

(Domestic Abuse, Serious Sexual Offences, Hate Crime, Online Crime, Rural Crime and Business Crime)

- % of victims satisfied with overall service
- % of victims satisfied with accessibility

---

<sup>1</sup> The sample is representative of the general population of the county and we can have strong confidence the results are accurate within a small margin of error.

- % of victims satisfied with actions taken
- % of victims satisfied with treatment
- % of victims satisfied with how well they were kept informed

1.5. This paper outlines progress in respect of each of these indicators, either with regard to actual performance or arrangements to capture the required information. It also details several of the key programmes of activity the Constabulary is operating to sustain and improve performance in these areas.

### Public Confidence

1.6. ONS typically publishes CSEW confidence data three months in arrears. The most recent data was published in October 2018 and covers the period July 2017 to June 2018. Levels of confidence are displayed in Table 1 below:

**Table 1: Suffolk Constabulary Confidence Data July 2017 to June 2018**

Measure	Last 12 months	3 year average	Difference	National Average	National Ranking (/43)
% of public who agree police are doing a good job	59.0%	62.3%	-3.3%	60.5%	26
% of public who agree police deal with community priorities	55.7%	58.6%	-2.9%	57.7%	31
% of public who agree police would treat them fairly	69.6%	69.8%	-0.2%	67.9%	18
% of public who have confidence in the police overall	75.9%	78.9%	-3.0%	77.0%	24

1.7. As at June 2018 confidence in Suffolk Police sits below the three year average in all four measures. In relation to the national average, Suffolk sits just above for 'fair treatment', and just below for the remaining measures.

### Victim Satisfaction

1.8. In April 2017, the Home Office requirements for Victim Satisfaction surveys changed. All forces were given the opportunity to survey whichever victim groups they felt most appropriate, with the stipulation that all forces would survey victims of Domestic Abuse. Suffolk Constabulary decided that the groups of victims to be surveyed going forward would be:

- Hate Crime
- Rural Crime
- Online Crime
- Business Crime
- Domestic Abuse (Home Office Mandated)
- Sexual offences

1.9. Of the victim satisfaction measures specified in the police and crime plan, the Constabulary only had arrangements previously in place for Hate Crime. This area therefore required new survey and sampling designs and a new procurement exercise to be undertaken to identify a supplier to undertake victim surveys. However, both domestic abuse and serious sexual offence require additional levels of scrutiny and safeguarding considerations prior to surveys being conducted and, to this end, the Constabulary has adopted different approaches to surveying victims of

these crimes than for victims of hate crime, online crime, rural crime and business crime.

### **Domestic Abuse Surveys (Annual Data Requirement [ADR] 444) and Sexual Offences**

- 1.10. For domestic abuse surveys the Constabulary must submit a statutory return to the Home Office for more than 500 victims of domestic abuse of all risk levels on an annual basis. The Constabulary is only required to submit the number of victims surveyed to the home office so the questions relating to the police and crime plan are not reported elsewhere and will not be comparable with other forces (with the exception of Norfolk Constabulary).
- 1.11. A joint approach has been established with Norfolk Constabulary to ensure efficiency. The Constabulary's Performance and Analysis Department has been working with domestic abuse professional leads from both counties since the beginning of 2017 to design a process that will meet all the requirements set out by the Home Office and deliver the surveys required to report for police and crime plans. Whilst designing this new process there has been an overarching requirement to ensure victim safety and to consider all safeguarding risks. Whilst this has built in a delay in the deployment of the survey it was considered an essential element that took priority over speed.
- 1.12. Following a pilot in 2017, Norfolk and Suffolk have chosen to carry out the surveying of victims of Domestic Abuse Offences in-house. This option has entailed the recruitment of a Victim Survey Coordinator – one in Suffolk and one in Norfolk. Both these roles have now been recruited for, and the individuals in post are currently undergoing training to facilitate their roles. It has also required the design and implementation of a new in-house software solution to record not only the survey results, but the wider processes involved too. It is expected that the domestic abuse surveys in Suffolk will begin in November 2018.
- 1.13. Surveying serious sexual offence (SSO) victims is not subject to statutory guidance from the Home Office but given the serious nature of these crimes the Constabulary is adopting the same principles as set out for domestic abuse. A separate programme of work exploring options for these surveys is underway, but it is anticipated that the surveying of victims of SSO could be integrated with the domestic abuse surveys.

### **Hate Crime, Online Crime, Rural Crime and Business Crime**

- 1.14. For hate crime, online crime, rural crime and business crime the Constabulary awarded a contract to the research company SMSR in June 2017. SMSR previously conducted victim satisfaction surveys for Suffolk over several years and began reporting findings for the new topics in August.
- 1.15. Since that time, surveys have been conducted on a monthly basis, and it is now possible to report on the findings to date, having more than twelve months' worth of data. Data for the twelve month period to September 2018 is displayed in Table 2, overleaf.

Table 2: Suffolk Constabulary User Satisfaction September 2018

Suffolk		% satisfied		
		12 months ending		
		Sep-18	Sep-17	Diff.
Business Crime	First contact	90.3%	N/A	N/A
	Action taken	71.7%	N/A	N/A
	Kept informed	71.0%	N/A	N/A
	Treatment	92.8%	N/A	N/A
	<b>Whole experience</b>	<b>72.5%</b>	N/A	N/A
<i>Number of respondents</i>		<b>138</b>	N/A	N/A
Hate Crime	First contact	79.1%	N/A	N/A
	Action taken	64.4%	N/A	N/A
	Kept informed	66.9%	N/A	N/A
	Treatment	78.0%	N/A	N/A
	<b>Whole experience</b>	<b>75.4%</b>	N/A	N/A
<i>Number of respondents</i>		<b>118</b>	N/A	N/A
Online Crime	First contact	92.5%	N/A	N/A
	Action taken	77.8%	N/A	N/A
	Kept informed	72.7%	N/A	N/A
	Treatment	84.8%	N/A	N/A
	<b>Whole experience</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	N/A	N/A
<i>Number of respondents</i>		<b>99</b>	N/A	N/A
Rural Crime	First contact	84.6%	N/A	N/A
	Action taken	63.8%	N/A	N/A
	Kept informed	61.7%	N/A	N/A
	Treatment	86.2%	N/A	N/A
	<b>Whole experience</b>	<b>75.5%</b>	N/A	N/A
<i>Number of respondents</i>		<b>94</b>	N/A	N/A
Total	First contact	86.6%	N/A	N/A
	Action taken	69.5%	N/A	N/A
	Kept informed	68.4%	N/A	N/A
	Treatment	85.7%	N/A	N/A
	<b>Whole experience</b>	<b>75.9%</b>	N/A	N/A
<i>Number of respondents</i>		<b>449</b>		

1.16. There is not yet enough data to be able to carry out year on year comparisons, and it is no longer possible to compare performance in this area with other police forces – as each will be surveying different victim types, in different ways.

- 1.17. Caution should be applied when reviewing the individual indicators (i.e. total for just online crime or rural crime etc.) as the sample sizes for these, taken on their own, are relatively small. As more data becomes available additional cumulative information will be provided against each individual crime area.

## **2. SUPPORTING VICTIMS AND PUBLIC CONFIDENCE BOARD**

- 2.1. In order to improve public trust and confidence, a Supporting Victims and Public Confidence Board has been in place since June 2018. The Terms of Reference of the board are attached at Appendix A.

- 2.2. Meetings of the Supporting Victims and Public Confidence Board are held bi-monthly and chaired by the Assistant Chief Constable. The membership of the Board is as follows:-

- ACC Local Policing - Chair
- Head of Safeguarding and Investigations Command
- Head of County Policing Command
- All County Policing Command Superintendents
- All Safeguarding and Investigation Superintendents
- Head of Protective Services (or nominee)
- Head of Joint Justice Services (or nominee)
- Head of Joint Performance and Analysis Department (or nominee)
- Head of Learning and Development (or nominee)
- Head of Communications and Media
- Representative of 2025 (Corporate Improvement and Innovation) Team
- Representative of Contact and Control Room
- Representative of Incident and Crime Management Hub
- Representative of Professional Standards Department
- Representative of the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner

- 2.3. At each meeting, the Joint Performance and Analysis Department provides a presentation which includes a user satisfaction update and analysis of victims' responses in relation to Business Crime, Hate Crime, Online Crime and Rural Crime.

- 2.4. A number of projects are being progressed by the Board including:-

- Improved multi-agency working and communications following critical incidents, providing more public visibility;
- Improvements to the Athena system for better compliance of the Victims Code;
- Stop Search training undertaken across the force;
- Consideration being given to additional student officer training, within their two year probation period, from other departments including Corporate Communications to provide continuous development;
- Better use of social media to promote positive messages;
- Lay listener scheme allowing volunteers to listen to CCR calls and provide feedback on how calls are managed;
- Communication Strategy developed to improve victim satisfaction and public confidence;
- Use of COSAIN system to assist with analysis of what the public are thinking about the Police.

- 2.5. Work has also been undertaken to review national good practice. Essex Police have a dedicated 'Head of Public Engagement and Customer Service' who works with a team of staff to research and review public confidence. Using an external company, they have been able to identify areas for development in the organisation through 'mystery shopping' techniques. The Supporting Victims and Public Confidence Board is in the process of assessing the cost implications to their initiatives which will in turn inform the development of proactive approaches in force.

### **3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1. There are no financial implications relating to this report.

### **4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

- 4.1. There are no other implications and risks associated with this report.

<b>ORIGINATOR CHECKLIST (MUST BE COMPLETED)</b>	<b>PLEASE STATE 'YES' OR 'NO'</b>
Has legal advice been sought on this submission?	<b>No</b>
Has the PCC's Chief Finance Officer been consulted?	<b>Yes</b>
Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered including equality analysis, as appropriate?	<b>No</b>
Have human resource implications been considered?	<b>Yes</b>
Is the recommendation consistent with the objectives in the Police and Crime Plan?	<b>Yes</b>
Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?	<b>No</b>
Has communications advice been sought on areas of likely media interest and how they might be managed?	<b>No</b>
Have all relevant ethical factors been taken into consideration in developing this submission?	<b>Yes</b>