

Monthly Assurance Meeting November 2018 – Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday 27 November @ 09:30
 Chair: John Campion
 Minutes: Jackie Irvin, Policy Officer, OPCC
 Venue Meeting Room 1.38 – Hindlip

	Name:	Capacity:
Attendance:	John Campion	Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)
	Tracey Onslow	Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC)
	Anthony Bangham	Chief Constable (CC))
	Amanda Blakeman	Deputy Chief Constable (DCC)
Apologies:	Andy Champness	Chief Executive for the Police and Crime Commissioner (CEX)

1.1	OUTSTANDING MATTERS / ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD	ACTION
	<p>Action arising from the May 2018 meeting:</p> <p>Hate crime satisfaction</p> <p>Update required in relation to: Action taken to address hate crime satisfaction performance and the impact of this activity.</p> <p>Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus on improving hate crime satisfaction had not led to an increase in performance. • North Worcestershire has introduced a ‘make it personal’ campaign, aiming to improve empathy between officers and victims, this has increased satisfaction and will be rolled out in South Worcestershire • Herefordshire and Telford remain the two areas with lesser performance. In both there are a greater number of people saying they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied when interviewed. • Performance is being looked at closely by area commanders on a monthly basis. <p>The PCC asked what the outcome of the reality testing referred to at the May’s meeting had been and was told that best practise had been sought from other forces and that officers were getting it right for more serious offences but less so on other lower level crimes.</p> <p>The PCC questioned what would be done to make satisfaction better</p>	

	<p>accepting the current performance is as it is and was told that this is about processes, challenging them and addressing the culture of some officers. The make it personal campaign had made a difference, and in Telford a focus on victims' needs has been introduced. The performance team have also been asked to look at the recording of the victims' survey to better understand those people whose response is that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their experience of the police.</p>	
1.2	<p>Action arising from the May 2018 meeting:</p> <p>Satisfaction</p> <p>Update required in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Action taken to address satisfaction performance and the impact of this activity. •Current survey methodology •Link between independent consultant review and ongoing recommissioning of Victim Support services. <p>Update</p> <p>There has been a dip in performance across all local policing areas, with Shropshire and Telford being the two areas of most concern. Some of this is as a result of the number of unresourced incidents over the summer. The resolution centre have been working to reduce the number of unresourced incidents and to reduce the number of diary appointments.</p> <p>The PCC asked if there was any evidence that the Incident Progression Team (IPT) was making a difference. The CC / DCC responded that the impact being assessed and that the expectation is that there will be an improvement in satisfaction. Anecdotally around 20% of demand is being addressed by the resolution team in Telford.</p> <p>The PCC asked if the changes to the victim survey questions in April had had any impact on the satisfaction rates. The DCC confirmed that there are now less questions in the survey, but that it is not possible to gauge if this has affected the survey results.</p> <p>The PCC asked for assurance that the independent consultants recently engaged by the force would not be duplicating the work being undertaken for VAL. The CC responded that the consultant had been engaged to carry out a peer review of force processes and provide a critical analysis. Their work would complement that of VAL and both the DPCC and VAL lead were attending a strategic satisfaction workshop where the review findings are to be presented.</p> <p>Actions arising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ACC's assessment into the impact of the IPT to be shared with the PCC when complete. 2. Hate crime satisfaction and satisfaction to be reviewed at the May 2019 meeting 	<p>CC</p> <p>PCC</p>
1.3	<p>Action arising from August 2018</p> <p>Integrated Victim Management (IVM)</p>	

	<p>The DCC will provide an update on the IVM performance framework and any identified gaps in commissioned services at the November 2018 holding to account meeting.</p> <p>Update</p> <p>The DCC explained that as the size of the IVM cohort was small, it had been assessed that there would be no benefit to putting a performance framework around it.</p> <p>The PCC questioned how the force would measure whether IVM had worked without any framework and was told that a monthly performance report tracks them. As many of the IVM cohort have chaotic lifestyles, often with mental health, alcohol or substance misuse issues it would be better to look at outcomes through case studies.</p> <p>The PCC said that anecdotally he had been told that the IVM approach has not been implemented in all areas. The DCC responded that it was in place, but that the teams would be working across the north and the south to ensure there is resilience and capacity. In addition the Chief Superintendents have been asked to look at whether it is a better role for specialist SNT officers to deal with locally. Governance is in place, via the harm assessment units to the head of vulnerability and onto West Mercia’s ACC.</p>	
<p>1.4</p>	<p>Action arising from August 2018</p> <p>Crime Data Integrity (CDI)</p> <p>The CC to provide an update on current compliance rates and timeliness.</p> <p>Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the latest audit compliance levels were around 94%, but timeliness was around 63% • Without an automated system it is unlikely that converting all incidents to crimes within 24 hours would be achievable; at present incidents are created on OIS and converted on Athena. Work is ongoing for the integration of the new SAAB system with Athena to provide an automated system. • The new automated system won’t be in place before HMICFRS return for an inspection, so it is important to influence and improve processes in the interim. Part of this is around quality assurance processes and identifying and addressing safeguarding issues. • None of the forces using Athena have been inspected yet. The Force Crime Registrar reviews all the force CDI inspection reports as they are published to understand the findings and take any learning. <p>Actions arising:</p> <p>The PCC to be provided with an assessment of grading and the recommendations from other forces with an indication of what the inspectorate have picked up on.</p>	<p>DCC</p>

2.	HOLDING TO ACCOUNT	
2.1	<p>Performance against the Safer West Mercia Plan:</p> <p>a. <u>Confidence</u></p> <p>The latest data (to June 18) shows that there has been a further reduction in public confidence and the force is now 8th in its family group.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the CC explain how the force is evaluating the effectiveness of the activities arising from the confidence strategy and using this to drive improvements? 2. We have jointly commissioned a confidence survey to better understand the views of our communities. How is the force intending to use the findings from this survey to help improve public confidence? <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The confidence strategy had been completed earlier in the year with good buy in from across the force at all levels. Sitting behind this are a number of action plans, the ‘red’ issues tend to be those with an IT influence. The effectiveness of the strategy now needs to be tested. • The ACC and local policing superintendents need to effect cultural change. The staff have been listened to and changes made, this now needs to be picked up by the staff and implemented. • It is important that officers and staff at all levels understand that while the force has to prioritise to manage demand there are strong positive policing messages to give to communities and local policing teams need better ways of putting these across in a positive way. • The findings from the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) have been looked at closely where the confidence survey is around policing rather than local policing. The local confidence survey asks about local policing and the difference needs to be better understood. 	
	<p>b. <u>Domestic abuse victim satisfaction</u></p> <p>Current performance shows that 83% of domestic abuse (DA) victims are satisfied with the whole experience. This is a reduction compared to the same period in 2017/18 (88%).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the CC’s response to the declining trends in domestic abuse victim satisfaction? 2. How is the force using the domestic abuse satisfaction data locally to drive performance? <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CC acknowledged that there has been a decline in DA victim 	

	<p>satisfaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only a small cohort of DA victims are surveyed, and the reduction in satisfaction needs to be better understood. <p>Actions arising</p> <p>DA satisfaction to be reviewed at the May 2019 meeting.</p>	CC
	<p>c. <u>Outcomes</u></p> <p>Over the last 12 months there has been a reduction in the proportion of offences assigned an outcome. Where offences have an outcome, a smaller proportion are being dealt with by way of formal 'action taken'.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What assurance can the CC give that the force is effectively using management information in relation to outcomes to drive service improvement? Can the CC provide assurance that the focus on outcome 16 has led to greater understanding of its use and will lead to improvements in recording and outcomes for victims? <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DCC chairs a crime data integrity (CDI) working group which has been working on outcomes. An initial audit report on the use of outcome 16 has been completed which shows that it has not been used inappropriately or disproportionately. The Head of Protective Services is finalising a further report on outcome 16. Generally there are outcomes around acquisitive crime and violent crime, and this is being pushed via the quarterly performance reports. This has led to a change in approach and response to burglaries. <p>Actions arising</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> PCC to be provided with a copy of the Outcome 16 reports A representative from the PCC's office is to attend the CDI working group 	DCC PCC
	<p>d. <u>Total recorded crime</u></p> <p>There has been a significant increase in recording of a range of high volume, low harm crime types including violence without injury, harassment and theft from person. Current projections suggest that these increases will continue across the financial year.</p> <p>What is the force's approach to mitigating and managing the considerable demand associated with this type of offending?</p>	

	<p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This links back to demand, expectations and satisfaction. • The incident resolution team will be launched in the next two week in the south and will make a difference. • Dealing with the low level, low harm crimes, will free up officer time to deal with ones that do need a response or more problem solving activity. In one area of Worcester an issue around rough sleepers and their drinking has been resolved through problem solving, and resulted in less police demand <p>The PCC questioned whether this type of success was down to individuals, and was told that most of the teams are starting to look strong, the positive message about problem solving need to continue.</p>	
	<p>e. <u>Police Response</u></p> <p>There has been a notable decrease in the proportion of emergency incidents attended within 20 minutes in 18/19 compared to previous years. It is acknowledged that the current demand-reduction activity underway by the force is expected to have a positive impact on performance.</p> <p>When does CC expect to see an improvement in response times?</p> <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factors affecting response have included high summer demand, changes to shift patterns and sickness. These are being addressed with the role out of the incident progression teams in the south and a reversal of the shift pattern change. • The PCC asked if projected performance data could be included in the performance report as it is for other measures. <p>Actions arising</p> <p>DCC to arrange for projected performance response times to be added to the chart in the performance report.</p>	<p>DCC</p>
	<p>f. <u>Child at risk / CSE</u></p> <p>At the Holding to Account meeting in August 2018, the DCC acknowledged that the CSE marker was not being used consistently across policing areas. It is apparent from the latest data that where efforts are made to manually review offences (e.g. Telford), there are improvements in recording.</p> <p>1. Is the CC confident that the force can reform current recording practices and implement a sustainable and consistent approach to improve data accuracy?</p>	

	<p>2. Can the CC provide assurance that this data issue does not impact the force's ability to identify and refer victims of CSE to the appropriate specialist units and support services?</p> <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an improving picture. When Athena was implemented there was an impact on markers, however the IMU are now doing this. • There are specialist officers working on CSE including a dedicated CSE team in Telford. They are well placed to identify any underlying themes which may suggest CSE is a factor. 	
2.2	<p>HMICFRS inspection programme / Matters arising from the Service Improvement Board (SIB)</p> <p>In July 2018 HMICFRS published a national thematic inspection report on hate crime which contained a number of recommendations for all Chief Constables to address within set time scales.</p> <p>What assurance can the CC give that the force will have adequately addressed these within the timescales given?</p> <p>Findings</p> <p>An update report on this is being submitted to the Strategic Diversity Group (SDG) in December. This group is chaired by the CC and attended by the DPCC.</p> <p>Action arising</p> <p>The DPCC / CC to review the report submitted to SDG and determine whether it needs to be brought back to a future holding to account meeting.</p>	DPCC
3	OPERATIONAL AND REPUTATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND RISKS	
4	<p>CHIEF OFFICER MEETING / EXECUTIVE BOARD – UPDATE</p> <p>It was agreed that items 3 and 4 should be removed from the agenda and that the papers from the Executive Board be shared with the PCC.</p> <p>Actions arising</p> <p>CC to share Executive Board meeting papers with the PCC.</p>	CC
5	<p>AOB</p> <p>None</p>	
6	<p>CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING TYPE / DATE / TIME / VENUE:</p> <p>Monday 10th December at Shirehall Hereford, public meeting on police budgets.</p>	