

MONTHLY HOLDING TO ACCOUNT MEETING- MEETING NOTES

Date: 11 April 2019
 Time 14:00
 Location Meeting room 1.38
 Chair: John Campion
 Note taker: Charity Pearce

Attendance:	Name	Capacity
	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)
	Martin Evans	Assistant Chief Constable (ACC)
	Geoff Wessell	Assistant Chief Constable (ACC)

Apologies

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

No.	Item	
1	<p>Outstanding Matters / matters arising:</p> <p>Action arising from the January 2019 meeting: Integrated Victim Management Within two weeks the CC to provide a plan of strategic delivery with timelines in line with the police and crime plan</p> <p>Update: Prior to the meeting the PCC was provided with copies of the Victim Plan and Victim Delivery plan.</p>	CC

	<p>The ACC wanted to ensure it captured all aspects of the policing priorities. He will be receiving updates on the plan at monthly meetings and updates will be provided at the PCC’s Victim Board.</p> <p>Outcomes have been captured alongside a timeline with stated ownership by specific individuals. Activities stated on the delivery plan are already underway and future activity is being worked through with clear governance systems in place.</p> <p>The PCC acknowledges elements of stretch in the plan but would like to see some more.</p> <p>The force would like to move to a position where victim satisfaction data can be interrogated in order to hold officers to account for their levels of victim satisfaction.</p> <p>The PCC would like to see victim satisfaction history reflected in the PDR process.</p> <p>Victim satisfaction requires a cultural change and become embedded in all aspects of policing.</p> <p>Discussion around Shropshire stretch target raised concerns around officer’s health and wellbeing due to the pressure they may be put under to reach target.</p> <p>The PCC asked for the victims plan is converted into plain English to ensure it is easily understood by officers and staff.</p> <p>The CC said that victim satisfaction requires a cultural change and an officer mind-set that victims are important. This includes checking on fellow officers at the end of tour and a checklist has been implemented to ensure the victim element is part of the mind-set.</p>	
2	Holding to account	PCC
2.1	<p>Child Vulnerability</p> <p>1. Understanding child vulnerability</p> <p><u>Understanding the spectrum of child vulnerability threats from national to local</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PCC acknowledged that the force’s role in ROCU and commented on the benefits received from the unit and sought reassurance from the CC that the force fully utilise ROCU 	

	<p>capabilities to tackle the broad range of child vulnerability. In response the CC and ACC said;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work in the region is helping with understanding what child vulnerability is and how the force can help individuals. • More Intel is starting to be fed out of the ROCU but in the form of products as oppose to joint working. • County lines is swamping the ROCUs workload and some contentions around management of the process to make it better were raised. More needs to be done around recognising that the source of the problem is in the West Mids. ROCU work on where the offender is based as oppose to where the victim lives. • There has recently been a change of leadership in the ROCU and it is hoped that this will be useful to ensure a more joint up model to increase confidence. • There is an opportunity for the police to make decision making equal with public health and LA's and this is an area where the police could be more forthcoming in holding them to account. • The PCC said that anecdotally he understood that that terms of reference for local SOCJAG meetings still need clarifying. Although it was acknowledged that a recent visit from the Home Office highlighted that understanding of partnership meetings in place to tackle SOC have increased awareness. <p><u>Impact of Athena on data capture</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PCC queried whether there is sufficient supervision in place to ensure that existing officers are aware of and using the CSE key word. The CC and ACC response was: • The current system is not being used to its capacity, it has potential but is not being used to its advantage. Some work needs to be done to simplify the systems for officers during high demand. Understanding how to extract data from this system is a journey that has just started. • Once victim satisfaction data is extracted there is potential that it could be used to inform promotion boards and such. More needs to be done to celebrate those that use the system correctly. <p>2. Missing Children</p> <p><u>Understanding the demand associated with missing children</u></p>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PCC highlighted that reports of missing children have gone down and asked the CC if he was confident the force understood why. The CC and ACC responded that; • The force have in place a missing person’s coordinator in the north of the force and also one in the south. It is not understood whether reduced demand is as a result of the coordinators or not. <p><u>Looked after children / The resilient care homes project</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PCC asks for clarity around why there is no resilient care homes project in Worcester. The CC suggested that he wasn’t sure why and questioned if it was needed. The CC and ACC also responded; • It was not understood whether one was needed in Hereford even though there was one there. A change in Chief Superintendents has highlighted things that are happening in the north but aren’t in the south. • The PCC asks the CC how confident he would be in a years’ time that things would be different due to turnover and changing focus. The CC and ACC suggest that; • As a result of the alliance change we would now have a better chance to say we need to get better at this. The CC suggests that it is not good enough to have two different models in the north and south of the force and this accountability sits with Chief Officers. • The force are not confident they are taking away learning about different approaches to activity. • The PCC suggests that there may be some inconsistencies in the processes after an event. • Out of county children don’t receive a return home interview by their LA. From a policing perspective this is expensive. More needs to be done to push back against local authorities and ensure they do this. The PCC offers a helping hand in taking this issue to the right meetings. <p>3. CSE</p> <p><u>Evaluation of CSE related activity in Telford and force wide associated learning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PCC questioned the evaluation of activity around CSE in Telford and asked the CC for assurance around the process for pulling this information together to ensure learning. The CC and ACC respond; 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vulnerability unit has been capturing this information and descending it out to local commanders. • The force are aware that they should scrutinise and ensure other areas are putting learning into practice. • Each ACC is establishing a Board, Local Policing (ME) and Protective Services (GW) to allow for evaluation and audit of priorities. • The PCC raised concern around the use of Outcome 16 but the CC provided reassurance that there are justifiable reasons for it use. • There is a change to the investigative model and a need to get shift strength up. Part of the new establishment would backfill patrol and it would be useful to understand where new officers would be based. • The PCC would like to see where new officers are based publicised on social media to ensure public can be reassured that more officers will be located in their area. • The PCC sought reassurance from the CC that there was the capacity to identify and investigate the highest risk online CSE. The CC responded that; • The work that comes from CEOP is highest risk and is manageable but if all online CSE was to be investigated we wouldn't have the capacity. This finding would be the same nationally. <p>Actions arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACC to bring back a timeline to enable a sense check of where things are at in 3 months. • Clarity around where the first batch of 100 officers are based- to be provided in 2 weeks. <p>4. Support for vulnerable children and young people</p> <p>The PCC said anecdotal intelligence suggests that the force response to child vulnerability and exploitation may not strike the right balance between pursuing offenders and preventing victimisation and asked the CC for assurance. The CC and ACC responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent depends on working with other organisations and partners. The ACE's coordinator funded by the PCC is the start of bringing problem solving ethos to prevention and safeguarding. Detection of an offence is recognised as a failure as someone has already been abused. • Prevention work is led by SNT and involved working with partners. The PCC highlighted that the diversionary network 	<p>CC</p>
--	--	-----------

	<p>cannot necessarily be driven WM wide by the PCC and that it is more successful when driven by the force. He sought assurance from the CC how is Get Safe embedded in the force as there seems to be a lack of understanding around the services commissioned by the PCC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the north of the force there is a harm hub being developed that will encompass lots of different teams with the aim to reduce harm. • It is likely this model will be replicated in the South but will look different to the north and it is likely that there will be one in Worcester and one in Hereford. CO need to do some work around how this will look differently in the south. • Efficiency, effectiveness and information sharing with partners are key themes which should be considered throughout. <p>Actions arising The PCC asked for the harm hub business case to be shared with the OPCC.</p>	
2.2	<p>HMICFRS inspection programme / Matters arising from the Service Improvement Board (SIB)</p> <p>The CC reported that the work undertaken by the force to improve it's approach to serious and organised crime following HMICFRS's inadequate rating in last year's PEEL inspection meant that it would no longer be subject to closer scrutiny by the Home Office and HMICFRS.</p>	
3	AOB	ALL
4	<p>Confirmation of next meeting type / date / time / venue: Thematic on Roads Policing Tuesday 30 April 2019 at 10:00 am, Room 1.38</p>	