


**OPCC**

 Office of the Police &  
 Crime Commissioner  
 for Gloucestershire

## PART ONE FORM - For publication

**AUTHOR:**

Victoria Bishop

**SPONSOR:**

Becky Beard

**DECISION NUMBER:**

(to be completed on approval)

**SUBMITTED TO:**

Chris Nelson, Police and Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire

**SUBJECT:**

Future of OPCC perception of crime survey

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

A decision was made at the last CMT to bring the Perceptions of Crime Survey back 'in house' so it is managed and carried out by the OPCC, at a cost saving of £30,000. Subsequently a number of options have been considered as to how to approach this going forward.

These are summarised below in the recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION/S:**

That the options contained in the paper regarding the future approach to the OPCC perceptions of crime survey are considered and agreed.

**SPECIFIC BUSINESS BENEFITS:**
**Police and Crime Commissioner responsibilities – voice of the public**

- Consultation Officer provides voice of the public in particularly harder to reach communities

**Police and Crime Prevention Plan – plan priorities**

- Cuts across all priority areas within the Plan

**New Government Priorities**

- The Home Office has announced that confidence in policing will be a priority for the new Government. As such, the expectation to continue to focus on this area will remain within criminal justice and community safety, led by the OPCC.

**Specific business benefits:**

- More flexibility in how to use the data at the end of the survey and access to this earlier which can help the Community Safety Partnerships

- Partners might have a more vested interest in the survey and can involve them in it more for the initial process
- Opportunity to do something different, engage more with the public and improve the response rate depending on the option chosen
- Cost saving of around £30,000

**PERSON/S RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION:**

- Project leads – Victoria Bishop and Jo Arnold, with work to be completed by OPCC Research and Policy officers
- Support will be required from Annabelle White, Debbie Powell and Communications and Engagement Team colleagues, however this will be advisory only.

**THIS SECTION IS REQUIRED FOR ALL PAPERS**

**Public Access to Information**

*Information continued within Constabulary papers is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Reports which are submitted for consideration at PCC Governance Board are likely to be made public. If the paper contains sensitive information then please detail below.*

**Is this a decision of significant public interest?**

*This includes a decision with any impact on the community, expenditure in excess of £50,000, or any decision that would be of obvious interest to the media or the general public*

No

**Does this report contain sensitive information?**

*Does this report contain any information which falls into these categories?*

- a) *would, in the view of the chief officer of the police, be against the interests of national security;*
- b) *might, in the view of the chief officer of police, jeopardise the safety of any person;*
- c) *might, in the view of the chief officer of police, prejudice the prevention or detection of crime, the apprehension or prosecution of offenders, or the administration of justice; or*
- d) *is prohibited by any enactment.*
- e) *breaches commercial sensitivity*

No

**ORIGINATOR CHECKLIST (MUST BE COMPLETED)**

**Comments**

These sections must not be left blank

Has legal advice been sought on this submission if required?

No

Has the Chief Finance Officer been consulted, if required?

No

Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered, as appropriate?

Yes

How are the recommendations consistent with the Police and Crime Commissioner's objectives?

Understanding the perceptions, fears and

	confidence of the public cuts across all areas of the Police & Crime Prevention Plan, specifically the new 'confidence' priority however.
Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?	No
Has communications advice been sought on areas of likely media, community, staff or partner interest and how they might be managed?	Yes
Have all relevant implications and risks been considered?	Yes
Has this paper /proposal been submitted through any other Constabulary boards? If so, please detail along with the date and result.	N/A

## PART TWO FORM - Not for publication

*This section should only include information that, if published:*

- f) would, in the view of the chief officer of the police, be against the interests of national security;*
- g) might, in the view of the chief officer of police, jeopardise the safety of any person;*
- h) might, in the view of the chief officer of police, prejudice the prevention or detection of crime, the apprehension or prosecution of offenders, or the administration of justice; or*
- i) is prohibited by any enactment.*
- j) breaches commercial sensitivity*

### 1. Purpose of the report

Following the decision to bring the administration of the Perceptions of Crime Survey back into the OPCC, the purpose of this report is to provide options as to how future surveys might be delivered. Recommendations will be provided that concern all options, however three options have been presented, each consider how data should be collected, and how regularly.

### 2. Background

One of the primary roles of any PCC is to act as the public voice in policing. As such, it is important that the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) liaises with the public to look at improving the facets of safety in Gloucestershire, residents' perception and experience of crime is important when informing the necessary changes. Perception and fear of crime is dispositional, and therefore can be difficult to measure as it is dependent on individual experiences such as beliefs, past experiences, socioeconomic status, and other demographic factors. Therefore, perceptions of crime are expected to be diverse as they represent various demographic groups within a community.

The OPCC for Gloucestershire has for a number of years conducted an online survey with the aim of understanding residents' perception of crime in the local area, and to identify opportunities for improvement. Recent iterations have been commissioned to DJS research at a cost. In line with current savings requirements, it was recently decided to bring the survey back 'in house' so it is administered and conducted by OPCC staff in full. The survey has previously been developed in partnership with Gloucestershire's Community Safety Partnerships, an online perception of crime survey has been devised to improve understanding of local peoples' perceptions and fears.

The results of the survey will help to identify areas of work for community safety in Gloucestershire and will be used as a basis for an annual survey to help better understand changes in the levels and types of crime and anti-social behaviour in Gloucestershire over time. The countywide Safer Gloucestershire Board and the six district Community Safety Partnerships will utilise the feedback to:

- Identify issues at a county and district level and to discover how these correlate with reported crimes.
- Identify locations of concern to enable further work/investigation.
- Ascertain the level of confidence in partners and knowledge of the public as to where/who to report issues (for engagement purposes).
- Help formulate partnership plans.
- Identify outlier areas with regards to perceptions, fears and confidence that may require further consultation and engagement by the OPCC and/or with partners.

### 3. Options, associated risks and cost implications

There are a number of recommendations that are suggested regardless of the options presented. These are:

- **Firstly**, the questions asked on the survey should be reviewed and adapted to ensure that they gather the desired information.
- **Secondly**, a communications strategy would need to be written. Engagement will need to be adapted as would the data collection method. Previous iterations of the survey have gone ‘door to door’ collecting responses, alongside digital data collection methods. This paper recommends that the following data collection methods would be introduced alongside a digital media and collection strategy:
  - Responses collected by NEV/CEV/SEV
  - Additional attendance at open days (university days etc.)
  - Consideration of asking older cadets to put leaflets through doors – however would need to consider the printing cost
- **Thirdly**, the responsibility of the survey will be transferred, oversight will still be with the two team leads in the Performance, Policy and Partnerships team, however the analysis of the surveys will be carried out by the Research and Policy officers.

**Option 1: Do nothing**  
Continue with the survey delivered via out-sourced arrangement etc....

**Cost:**

- £30,000

**Identified benefit/s:**

- Independence
- Continuity
- Established

**Identified dis-benefit/s:**

- Costly
- Less flexible

**Identified risk/s**

Risk	Mitigation	Owner	Status
Impact on the budget	Could consider reducing the ask from the external provider and therefore reducing the spend		

**Option 2: Two Surveys with different purposes**

This option proposes that there is one survey which is a longer survey, reflective of what has been carried out previously, asking for in-depth detail on perceptions of crime in Gloucestershire, this is also where we would ask about the tax precept. This would be conducted annually and would essentially be conducted as a project where there is a beginning and conclusion to analysis and a final report presented at the end. This survey would be a snapshot in time, but would be more in-depth.

However, during the month(s) where the above project is not being carried out, there would also be a continual survey. This would be a shorter set of questions and would provide continual feedback from the public about what the OPCC could be doing to improve.

<b>Cost:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within core budget – Some comms costs (minimal)</li> </ul>												
<b>Identified benefit/s:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular input into what is going on in Gloucestershire and perceptions of crime</li> <li>• More opportunity to engage with the public</li> <li>• Month on month comparison so you can see seasonal trends</li> <li>• Visually the office would appear to be more transparent as everyone could have the link/QR code in their signatures</li> <li>• Flexibility in setting questions in line with OPCC requirements such as emerging issues or needs assessment activity</li> </ul>												
<b>Identified dis-benefit/s:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shorter survey may only be fed back by people who are disgruntled at the time, and may not be reflective of Gloucestershire residents</li> <li>• The survey may not get many responses each month and therefore may not be representative</li> <li>• This option would require more comms engagement as you would need to put out the survey on social media on a monthly basis</li> <li>• Comms strategy would need to be adapted as you couldn't leaflet all year round</li> <li>• Survey fatigue - people might not fill in both surveys</li> </ul>												
<b>Identified risk/s</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Risk</th> <th>Mitigation</th> <th>Owner</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Not representative</td> <td>Could do a rolling annual total and statistical analysis</td> <td>Victoria Bishop</td> <td style="background-color: #92d050;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Increased demand on comms team</td> <td>Comms team feel this can be managed</td> <td>Emma Hillary</td> <td style="background-color: #ffc000;"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Risk	Mitigation	Owner	Status	Not representative	Could do a rolling annual total and statistical analysis	Victoria Bishop		Increased demand on comms team	Comms team feel this can be managed	Emma Hillary	
Risk	Mitigation	Owner	Status										
Not representative	Could do a rolling annual total and statistical analysis	Victoria Bishop											
Increased demand on comms team	Comms team feel this can be managed	Emma Hillary											

<b>Option 3: One continual survey</b>	
<p>This option proposes that there is one survey, with reviewed questions and still 'long form' however this is open for the public to complete all year round, with analysis only being done once a year.</p>	
<b>Cost:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within core budget – Some comms costs (minimal)</li> </ul>
<b>Identified benefit/s:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This may increase the response rate as people have more time to respond</li> <li>• More opportunity to engage with the public</li> <li>• Month on month comparison so you can see seasonal trends</li> <li>• Visually the office would appear to be more transparent as everyone could have the link/QR code in their signatures</li> <li>• Flexibility in setting questions in line with OPCC requirements such as emerging issues or needs assessment activity</li> <li>• Potential for it to become common knowledge and embedded into the community as a way for them to get their voices heard in policing.</li> </ul>
<b>Identified dis-benefit/s:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option would require more comms engagement as you would need to put out the survey on social media on a monthly basis</li> <li>• Respondents may only fill in the survey when something negative has happened to them, so it is possible the survey would be biased and may not be reflective of Gloucestershire residents</li> <li>• Comms strategy would need to be adapted as you couldn't leaflet all year round</li> <li>• Could be a smaller sample size</li> </ul>

Risk	Mitigation	Owner	Status
Not representative	Could do a rolling annual total and statistical analysis	Victoria Bishop	
Same person filling in the survey several times throughout the year skewing results	Some form of identification required to complete survey could be considered or a cut off, only filling it in once every 6 months		
Increased demand on comms team	Comms team feel this can be managed	Emma Hillary	
Survey gets forgotten about	Time put into the comms plans at regular points in the year to make sure it is at the forefront of the public and OPCCs minds.		

#### Option 4: One survey run either six monthly or yearly

This option proposes a limited change to how regularly the data is collected, it suggests that there is one survey, with reviewed questions. This survey will be open for a number of weeks at either six monthly or yearly intervals.

**Cost:**

- Within core budget – Some comms costs (minimal)

**Identified benefit/s:**

- Could increase the response rate with dedicated comms strategy
- Opportunity to do a long form survey as there would be less chance of producing survey fatigue so participants may be more inclined to answer a longer survey
- Flexibility in setting questions in line with OPCC requirements such as emerging issues or needs assessment activity

**Identified dis-benefit/s:**

- Limited opportunity to complete the survey which could impact the response rate
- Provides a snapshot view, you cannot complete month on month comparison, and therefore cannot see seasonal trends in perceptions of crime

Risk	Mitigation	Owner	Status
Not representative	Comms plan targeted specifically at those classed as having protected characteristics.	Emma Hilary	

## 4. Equality & diversity impact assessment

In discussion of the above options, there has been consideration of how to ensure that Equality and Diversity is accounted for. Regardless of the above options, equality and diversity information will be collected in the survey so we can monitor the demographic of respondents.

Each of the options would account for equality and diversity in data collection methods, all can allow for a mixed data collection method (for example both paper based and digital) in order to not exclude any age groups or other specific groups within the county.

If the survey continues to be sourced out, then the company carrying out the survey would be responsible for ensuring that there is support for completing the survey if required, however if it were brought back in house (options 2-4) then the support would need to be provided by the OPCC, which could impact workload and capacity of staff, but may also provide more of an opportunity to engage with the public.

## 5. Environmental impact assessment

N/A

## 6. Consultation

Consultation was carried out with the previous project leads from the last perceptions of crime survey, and their opinions have helped form the basis of these options.

The communications and engagement team in the OPCC was also consulted and their considerations are below:

- In regards to option 2 or 3 it is possible to keep up with the capacity/workload that this might bring
- Whilst options 2, 3 and 4 will reduce the cost, if we want an increased response rate then it cannot be cost neutral. There will need to be a budget for 'advertising the survey' otherwise it is unlikely to reach many people. Paid posts can cost between £25 per post to £200
- We would need to consider which budget this would come out of
- Public outreach suggestions such as going on NEV/CEV or attending other events is proven to be successful

The Community Safety Partnerships were also consulted to understand how any changes may impact them.

The Safer Gloucestershire lead says that they have been previously consulted on the matter. The CSP's are aware that there is a 2 year deal for the survey, and as long as the survey is conducted they do not have strong opinions on who/how it is conducted.

They have appreciated the results and that we are moving more towards data to evidence the reasons why we do things.

CSP's have been consulted about increasing the response numbers, and partners have said they would be happy to help and support where they can.

SPONSORING BOARD MEMBER APPROVAL

Name:



Job title:

Signature:

Date:

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE APPROVAL**

I am satisfied that relevant advice has been taken into account in the preparation of the report and that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the PCC.

Signature:

Date: