


# Victim (Service User) Satisfaction Survey Overview of Findings January 2014 to Dec 2014



## CLEVELAND FORCE AREA

Cleveland Police are committed to treating everyone, fairly, with dignity and respect. We aim to provide clear standards of expected service and conduct and are continuously seeking to improve the methods of policing used across the force area, particularly when dealing with victims of crime and those who contact us for assistance. The 'Victim Satisfaction Survey' provides a structured means of obtaining feedback from victims of crime who have had direct experience of the service we provide. Between January 2014 and December 2014, telephone interviews were conducted amongst a random selection of 1526 victims of crime from across the whole force area. This document provides a summary of the responses obtained.



### Ease of Contact

Survey participants were first asked a number of questions regarding their initial contact with Cleveland Police and their satisfaction with how easy it was to contact someone to assist them.


The responses obtained are summarised below:

- The most common method of contacting the police was via a non emergency telephone number (**41.6%**) or via a 999 call (**27.9%**). Only a small proportion of those people surveyed contacted the police in another way for example, directly via police officer or by e-mail.
- The majority of victims said they knew how to get in touch with the police (**85.7%**). They also found it quick (**95.5%**) and easy (**96.7%**) to speak to someone who could assist them. Upon speaking to someone, **95.9%** said the person was able to take all of the relevant details from them.

Overall, **95.4%** of people surveyed were satisfied with how easy it was to contact someone who could assist them. This represents a decrease of **1.8%** points compared to the same period last year and a reduction of **0.3%** points compared to the previous quarter. The former is considered to be a 'statistically significant'.

| Satisfaction with Ease of contact | Comparison to last Year |                         |           | Comparison to last Quarter |                          |           |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
|                                   | 12 months ending Dec 14 | 12 months ending Dec 13 | % PT Diff | 12 months ending Dec 14    | 12 months ending Sept 14 | % PT Diff |
|                                   | 95.4%                   | 97.2%                   | -1.8%     | 95.4%                      | 95.7%                    | -0.3%     |

The graph below shows the satisfaction rate over a longer period of time compared to its historical average and its upper and lower bounds. As shown, satisfaction in this area has now fallen for four consecutive quarters and is below the lower control limit showing deterioration in performance has occurred. Despite this, the current rate remains above the national average (95.3%) and just below the MSF average (96.2%).



**The most frequent reasons given for a positive response included:**

- The speed of the initial police response.
- Very easy to get in touch with Police.
- Getting through to the right person straightaway/getting all questions answered.
- The professional attitude and manner of the staff (calm/supportive/helpful/reassuring/sympathetic).
- Excellent service.
- Initial telephone call was answered very quickly/efficiently.

**The most frequent reason given for a negative response included:**

- Police should be more accessible/long time to wait to see Officer.
- No interest shown.
- Ease of finding the correct telephone number/contact details (passed around).
- Delay in answering telephone.
- Poor communication – had to ring back.
- Dialed 999 and told to re-dial the non-urgent number.

## Actions Taken by the Police

Survey participants were next asked a number of questions regarding the initial actions taken by Cleveland Police and their satisfaction with these actions.


The responses obtained are summarised below:

- **36.7%** of victims were told an officer would arrive within 4 hours of the crime being reported with a further **17.7%** being told an officer would arrive as soon as they could. An officer did arrive within 4 hours in **55.2%** of cases with **14.1%** arriving within 10 minutes. A total of **83.0%** of victims stated they were satisfied with the time it took police to arrive with **11.2%** expressing a level of dissatisfaction.
- The majority of victims thought the police appeared to know what they were doing (**84.9%**), explained what was going to happen (**81.0%**) and felt reassured (**74.0%**). **44.8%** of victims felt the police gave practical advice whilst a further **6.4%** felt that they should have. **63.8%** of victims were given contact details for the person dealing with their case whilst a further **10.5%** feel they should have been given them. **50.5%** of victims were offered advice whilst a further **7.8%** felt they should have.

**Overall, 79.4% of people surveyed were satisfied with the initial actions taken by police This represents a decrease of 3.4% points compared to the same period last year and -2.1% points compared to the previous quarter. Once again the decrease compared to the same period last year is considered to be a 'statistically significant'.**

| Satisfaction with Police actions | Comparison to last Year |                         |           | Comparison to last Quarter |                          |           |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
|                                  | 12 months ending Dec 14 | 12 months ending Dec 13 | % PT Diff | 12 months ending Dec 14    | 12 months ending Sept 14 | % PT Diff |
|                                  | 79.4%                   | 82.8%                   | -3.4%     | 79.4%                      | 81.4%                    | -2.1%     |

The graph below shows the satisfaction rate over a longer period of time compared to its historical average and its upper and lower bounds. This is the third consecutive quarterly decrease with the rate of satisfaction now falling both below the average and the lower control limit showing a deterioration on performance has occurred. The current rate is below the National Average (83.8%) and the MSF Average (82.4%)



### **The most frequent reasons given for a positive response included:**

- A belief that the police did everything they possible to deal with the crime. (Fantastic/excellent service).
- The professional attitude or manner of the officers/staff who dealt with them.
- The incident was dealt with smoothly with all requests dealt with efficiently. (All the questions asked by injured party were answered).
- Caught perpetrator.
- Being kept up to date.
- Fast response time.
- Stolen goods recovered.

### **The most frequent reason given for a negative response included:**

- The lack of information/feedback provided in relation to any progress made.
- A perceived lack of action taken by the police/SOCO. Respondents indicated they needed more support. Felt more should be done to recover stolen items.
- Poor attitude of officers/no interest shown.
- Length of time police took to action (speak to people/arrival).
- Perpetrator only got a caution.
- Being charged for vehicle recovery.

## **Feedback and Follow-up**

**Survey participants were next asked a number of questions regarding subsequent actions taken by Cleveland Police and the feedback they received in relation to any follow-up.**


### **The responses obtained are summarised below:**

- **72.9%** of people said they wanted to be kept informed of progress.
- **56.0%** of respondents said that since the initial response the police had contacted them in relation to the incident whilst **19.9%** of respondents said they had contacted the police themselves.
- **75.3%** of people said they were informed about what the police would do with **79.8%** agreeing that the information they needed was provided quickly and over **87.8%** agreed that their questions were answered adequately.

**Overall, 68.8% of people surveyed were satisfied with how well they were kept informed in relation to progress. This represents a decrease of 5.2% points compared to the same period last year and a drop of 3.3% points compared to the previous reporting quarter. Both of these changes are considered to be 'statistically significant'.**

| Satisfaction with Follow-Up | Comparison to last Year |                         |           | Comparison to last Quarter |                          |           |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
|                             | 12 months ending Dec 14 | 12 months ending Dec 13 | % PT Diff | 12 months ending Dec 14    | 12 months ending Sept 14 | % PT Diff |
|                             | 68.8%                   | 74.0%                   | -5.2%     | 68.8%                      | 72.0%                    | -3.3%     |

The graph below shows the satisfaction rate over a longer period of time compared to its historical average and its upper and lower bounds. As with 'actions taken', this is the third consecutive quarterly decrease and the rate is now below the average and the lower control limit. The current rate is below the National Average (77.7%) and the MSF average (78.1%).



**The most frequent reasons given for a positive response included:**

- Being kept well informed and receiving regular updates (explanation given of what was happening with the case/outcome of the case).
- The professional attitude or manner of the officers/staff who dealt with them. (Thorough and efficient). Gave reassurance.
- Information provided quickly (e.g. crime reference given & contact details given).
- Contact was made when officer said it would be.

**The most frequent reasons given for a negative response included:**

- No feedback/information provided at all.
- The police failed to keep to touch as agreed and the victim had to initiate contact.
- A lack of advice/support provided.
- Did not have Officer(s) name or number.

## Treatment by Officers and Staff

Survey participants were next asked a number of questions regarding the treatment they received from the police officers and staff who deal with them.


The responses obtained are summarised below:

- The majority of victims said they felt police officers/staff listened carefully to what they had to say (**86.8%**) and they felt the matter had been taken seriously (**83.3%**). **87.1%** felt staff had communicated clearly with them whilst **79.0%** felt they had been shown sympathy and **91.9%** stated staff had been polite. **77.3%** of people also felt that police officers/staff took account of their personal circumstances and **85.7%** felt they had been treated fairly.

**Overall, 89.4% of people surveyed were satisfied with the treatment they received from the police. This represents a decrease of 3.5% points compared to the same period last year and a decrease of 2.3% points compared to the previous quarter. Again both of these changes are considered to be a 'statistically significant'.**

| Satisfaction with Treatment | Comparison to last Year |                         |           | Comparison to last Quarter |                          |           |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
|                             | 12 months ending Dec 14 | 12 months ending Dec 13 | % PT Diff | 12 months ending Dec 14    | 12 months ending Sept 14 | % PT Diff |
|                             | 89.4%                   | 92.9%                   | -3.5%     | 89.4%                      | 91.7%                    | -2.3%     |

The graph below shows the satisfaction rate over a longer period of time compared to its historical average and its upper and lower bounds. As with the other indicators, the current rate has now fallen below the historical average and the lower control limit. The current rate is below the national average (94.3%) and the MSF average (94.3%).



**The most frequent reasons given for a positive response included:**

- The professional attitude or manner of the officers/staff who dealt with them.
- A belief that the police did everything they possible could to deal with the crime (Efficient service).
- Good/clear explanation given (Efficient/informative).

**The most frequent reason given for a negative response included:**

- The poor or unprofessional attitude or manner of the officers/staff who dealt with them. (Didn't seem interested/not helpful/arrogant).
- Made to feel that they had done something wrong/time wasting.
- Felt the Police didn't do anything (no confidence in Police).
- Made to feel as if they (victim(s)) were the criminal.
- The lack of information/feedback provided in relation to the incident.

**Overall Satisfaction**


**Finally, survey participants were asked a number of questions in relation to their overall satisfaction with the service received from Cleveland Police.**

- Prior to this experience, **58.5%** of people said their overall opinion of the police was generally high whilst **10.0%** said their overall opinion of the police was generally low.
- As a result of their contact with the police **53.6%** of people said their opinion of the police had not changed although **35.5%** said they now had a better opinion. **10.9%** stated they now had a worse opinion of the police.

**Overall, 80.8% of people surveyed were satisfied with the whole experience. This represents a decrease of 3.8% points compared to the same period last year and a decrease of 1.8% points compared to the previous quarter. The decrease in comparison to the same period last year is considered to be 'statistically significant'.**

| Satisfaction with Whole Experience | Comparison to last Year |                         |           | Comparison to last Quarter |                          |           |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
|                                    | 12 months ending Dec 14 | 12 months ending Dec 13 | % PT Diff | 12 months ending Dec 14    | 12 months ending Sept 14 | % PT Diff |
|                                    | 80.8%                   | 84.5%                   | -3.8%     | 80.8%                      | 82.6%                    | -1.8%     |

The graph below shows the satisfaction rate over a longer period of time compared to its historical average and its upper and lower bounds. Once again the current rate has now fallen below the historical average and the lower control limit. The rate is below the national average (85.6%) and the MSF average is (86.1%).



**The most frequent reasons given for a positive response included:**

- Whole experience was good.
- The professional attitude or manner of the officers/staff who dealt with them.
- A belief that the police did everything possible to deal with the crime.
- Quick response.
- Good communication, kept informed and explanation given.

**The most frequent reason given for a negative response included:**

- Time taken resolving case.
- The lack of information/feedback provided in relation to the incident/case.
- A perceived lack of action taken by the police.
- The poor or unprofessional attitude or manner of the officers/staff who dealt with them.
- Delay in arrival.

**Comparison across Local Policing areas**

The following table provides a comparison of satisfaction ratings with the various aspects of the service received across the four Local policing areas. These figures are shown for illustration only. Local Policing area samples should be treated with caution due to the small sample size involved.

|                                     | <b>H'pool</b> | <b>R&amp;C</b> | <b>M'bro</b> | <b>S'ton</b> | <b>Force</b> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| • Satisfaction with ease of contact | 94.1%         | 94.7%          | 95.7%        | 96.7%        | 95.4%        |
| • Satisfaction with actions taken   | 82.9%         | 78.7%          | 78.5%        | 79.3%        | 79.4%        |
| • Satisfaction with feedback        | 75.4%         | 67.9%          | 68.7%        | 65.5%        | 68.8%        |
| • Satisfaction with treatment       | 92.6%         | 88.6%          | 88.5%        | 89.6%        | 89.4%        |
| • Overall satisfaction              | 83.2%         | 78.2%          | 81.7%        | 80.3%        | 80.8%        |

**Further information**

***For further information on Local Policing areas (historical comparisons and graphical illustrations) please refer to the Victim Satisfaction database located on the Performance Information Portal under the performance tab on Sharepoint.***

***The database also has a function to view the satisfaction level of all the headline indicators by the 3 victim types (Burglary, Violent and Vehicle) allowing comparisons to be made across the victim types and across the local policing areas.***

***Alternatively, please contact the Performance Management Team within the Tasking, Performance and Coordination Command.***

**The next Victim Satisfaction Survey update will be published in APRIL 2015**