



Inspecting policing  
in the public interest



## **DELIVERING THE POLICING PLEDGE**

Hampshire Constabulary

# “Are the local police delivering for you?”

The ‘Policing Pledge’ sets out ten minimum standards that the police service promised to deliver from 31 December 2008.

Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) has reviewed how well the 43 forces in England and Wales are delivering the standards they promised the public.

This report provides members of the public with information on the performance of their local force.

Each Pledge standard and the three areas relating to how the force is working towards its delivery have been graded. HMIC has combined these assessments to give an overall grade for the force.

The overall grade for Hampshire Constabulary is:

**FAIR**

## The different grades

**EXCELLENT**

is awarded for exceptional performance which is consistently above and beyond the required standard.

**GOOD**

is defined as meeting the standard, although there may be minor dips in performance.

**FAIR**

is awarded where performance is variable and falls short of the required standard. Remedial action is needed.

**POOR**

is used when performance fails to meet an acceptable level. Immediate remedial action is needed.

## THE POLICING PLEDGE POINTS

## HMIC GRADING

### PLEDGE POINT 1

Always treat you fairly with dignity and respect, ensuring you have fair access to our services at a time that is reasonable and suitable for you.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 2

Provide you with information so you know who your dedicated Neighbourhood Policing Team are, where they are based, how to contact them and how to work with them.

GOOD

### PLEDGE POINT 3

Ensure your Neighbourhood Policing Team and other police patrols are visible and on your patch at times when they will be most effective and when you tell us you most need them. We will ensure that your team is not taken away from neighbourhood business more than is absolutely necessary. Officers will spend at least 80% of their time visibly working in your neighbourhood, tackling your priorities. Staff turnover will be minimised.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 4

Respond to every message directed to your Neighbourhood Policing Team within 24 hours and, where necessary, provide a more detailed response as soon as we can.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 5

Aim to answer 999 calls within 10 seconds, deploying to emergencies immediately, giving an estimated time of arrival (ETA), and getting to you safely, and as quickly as possible. In urban areas, we will aim to get to you within 15 minutes and in rural areas within 20 minutes.

GOOD

### PLEDGE POINT 6

Answer all non-emergency calls promptly. If attendance is needed, send a patrol, giving you an ETA, and:

- if you are vulnerable or upset, we will aim to be with you within 60 minutes;
- if you are calling about an issue that we have agreed with your community will be a neighbourhood priority and attendance is required, we will aim to be with you within 60 minutes;
- alternatively, if appropriate, we will make an appointment to see you at a time that fits in with your life and within 48 hours;
- if agreed that attendance is not necessary, we will give you advice, answer your questions and/or put you in touch with someone who can help.

GOOD

### PLEDGE POINT 7

Arrange regular public meetings to agree your priorities at least once a month, giving you a chance to meet your local team with other members of your community. These will include opportunities such as surgeries, street briefings and mobile police station visits, which will be arranged to meet local needs and requirements.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 8

Provide monthly updates on progress, and on local crime and policing issues. This will include the provision of crime maps, information on specific crimes and what happened to those brought to justice, details of what action we and our partners are taking to make your neighbourhood safer, and information on how your force is performing.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 9

If you have been a victim of crime, agree with you how often you would like to be kept informed of progress in your case and for how long. You have the right to be kept informed at least every month if you wish, and for as long as is reasonable.

FAIR

### PLEDGE POINT 10

Acknowledge any dissatisfaction with the service you have received within 24 hours of reporting it to us. To help us fully resolve the matter, discuss with you how it will be handled, give you an opportunity to talk in person to someone about your concerns and agree with you what will be done about them and how quickly.

FAIR

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### PLEDGE POINT 1

The Chief Constable had personally briefed all staff about the Pledge and his expectation that the force would provide an excellent service. There was a clear focus on individuals' diverse needs and the force has received a national award for this. The number of incivility complaints had decreased significantly and the force had a system to learn from good and poor practice. **But** there had been no analysis of what training customer facing staff might need in order to deliver Pledge Point 1, and many staff had yet to receive the training that was available.

### PLEDGE POINT 2

Hampshire Constabulary refer to Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) as Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs). Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) websites were well laid out, contained contact information and were readily accessible to members of the public. Call Centre staff were able to identify who local officers were and put customers through to them. SNT public facing surgeries were frequent and well publicised. **But** police station front offices did not routinely display information about SNTs.

### PLEDGE POINT 3

The force had effective systems in place that ensured SNT staff remained in post long enough to develop good relationships with the community. There was some evidence that the force had plans to ensure Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) were visible for 80% of the time. **But** SNT staff were frequently given duties that took them away from their neighbourhoods and the force did not collect information to show what percentage of their time was spent visibly working in neighbourhoods. The force could not say whether the 80% level was being achieved.

### PLEDGE POINT 4

Calls and emails to SNT offices were generally responded to quickly and helpfully. All calls to the Contact Centre were put through to the correct office in an efficient manner. **But** emails sent to SNTs were not universally responded to within 24 hours and some messages left for SNTs at police station front offices were not responded to at all.

### PLEDGE POINT 5

The force maintained a multi-agency '101' number so that customers did not need to know whether the service they needed was delivered by the police or the local authority. Performance data was sufficiently accurate and indicated that the 15 and 20 minute response times were being met. Responding officers did not feel pressurised to drive at unsafe speeds. **But** estimated times of arrival (ETAs) were not being provided.

### PLEDGE POINT 6

An appointment system for non-emergency calls was in place across the force. Survey data indicated very high levels of satisfaction. The force aimed to be with callers who were 'vulnerable' or 'upset' and those who reported an issue relating to a community priority within 30 minutes rather than 60. **But** whilst staff used their common sense to identify who was 'vulnerable' or 'upset', they struggled to recall their training and some calls were not correctly identified as a neighbourhood priority.

### PLEDGE POINT 7

Regular surgeries across the force often used innovative methods to reach people and were well publicised. There was a “Your voice counts” system in place for the public to feed back comments and views on post cards. **But** meetings where members of the public were able to influence local policing priorities were infrequent and not well publicised. The force was not clear itself which meetings were used to agree local priorities with the public.

### PLEDGE POINT 8

SNT websites and community newsletters provided detailed information on the activity being taken to make neighbourhoods safer. Local crime mapping information was available on the website. **But** the crime mapping information was confusing and gave the impression that crime levels were higher than they actually were. Details of what happened to offenders were not provided.

### PLEDGE POINT 9

The force provided bespoke contracts for victims of serious crime and burglary. It employed a standardised approach to updating victims of other crimes. The force’s performance at implementing these standards was managed at a senior level. **But** the force did not ask all victims how they would like to be kept updated. Records to show whether victims had been kept informed were inconsistent.

### PLEDGE POINT 10

The Professional Standards Department within the force managed reports of dissatisfaction and was, in general, able to respond to customers within 24 hours. There was a force-wide system for measuring dissatisfaction and letters to dissatisfied customers had been checked and where necessary improved before being issued. **But** customer facing staff lacked an understanding of what dissatisfaction was and how to record and deal with it.

## WHAT THE FORCE WAS DOING TO IMPROVE ITS PERFORMANCE

As well as reporting on the force’s delivery of each Pledge standard, HMIC has also assessed and graded the efforts it was making to improve performance:

#### HMIC GRADING

Surveys and management meetings were being used to improve performance; public satisfaction and confidence data were taken into account.

FAIR

The force had identified deficiencies in its delivery of the Pledge and was taking action in those areas.

GOOD

Implementation was led by the force’s senior team, the Police Authority was involved, staff were being trained and the Pledge was communicated to staff and the public.

GOOD



**50% recycled**  
This publication is printed  
on 50% recycled paper

The report is available in alternative languages and formats on request.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary  
Ashley House  
2 Monck Street  
London SW1P 2BQ

This report is also available from the HMIC website  
<http://inspectors.justice.gov.uk/hmic>

Published in October 2009.

Printed by the Central Office of Information.

© Crown copyright 2009

ISBN: 978-1-84726-998-0

Ref: 297705