

## Monthly Assurance Meeting May2019 – Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> May 2019 @ 10:00  
 Chair: John Campion  
 Minutes: Jackie Irvin, Policy Officer, OPCC  
 Venue Meeting Room 1.38 – Hindlip

|                    | <b>Name:</b>    | <b>Capacity:</b>                            |
|--------------------|-----------------|---|
| <b>Attendance:</b> | John Campion    | Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)         |
|                    | Anthony Bangham | Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC) |
|                    | Amanda Blakeman | Chief Constable (CC))                       |
|                    |                 | Deputy Chief Constable (DCC)                |
| <b>Apologies:</b>  | Tracey Onslow   | Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC) |

| 1.  | <b>OUTSTANDING MATTERS / ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD</b>   | <b>ACTION</b> |
|-----|--|---------------|
| 1.1 | <b>Satisfaction (from November 2018)</b><br>Satisfaction to be reviewed at the May 2019 meeting.   |               |
| 1.2 | <b>Hate crime satisfaction (from November 2018)</b><br>Hate satisfaction to be reviewed at the May 2019 meeting.   |               |
| 1.3 | <b>DA satisfaction (from November 2018)</b><br>DA satisfaction to be reviewed at the May 2019 meeting<br><br>All the above items were discussed as part of agenda item 2.1.  |               |
| 2.  | <b>HOLDING TO ACCOUNT</b>  |               |
| 2.1 | <b>PERFORMANCE AGAINST THE SAFER WEST MERCIA PLAN:</b><br><br>The PCC began by acknowledging the considerable performance improvements seen in criminal justice (CJ) file quality and 999 call handling and firstly asked if the changes in CJ would benefit victims. The CC replied that a lot of work had been done centrally and with the wider workforce and it would make a difference.<br><br>The PCC acknowledged the the consistent 999 performance and said that the test would be if there was a sudden peak in demand. The CC replies that the previous weekend demand had not been high, but that a number of serious incidents had occurred without impacting on performance. |               |

**1. Confidence**

The PCC commented that confidence had been to holding to account before and asked that as the force's Confidence Strategy is now being delivered and monitored through the Local Policing Superintendents if the Chief Constable could provide reassurance that this approach will deliver the required improvements to public confidence. The CC responded that it is right for oversight be at Chief Superintendent level.

The DCC added that it had needed a cultural change and had taken a significant piece of work over the previous year to have an impact on internal confidence. How this now feeds into community interactions is important.

The public perception survey is helpful and is being used by local policing areas to drive results. North Worcestershire is an outlier, with visibility and communications perceived to be less than in other areas.

The DCC commented that she had been a resident of North Worcestershire and now as a resident of Herefordshire felt there is a different approach, feel and mentality to local policing.

The PCC questioned why there was a different approach and asked how it could be changed. The CC responded that it was wrong to see North Worcestershire as one 'mass', when in fact there are different towns and villages to be considered, especially along its borders. He wants the Chief Superintendents to address this and to work together across borders, with the ACC steering the approach.

The PCC asked what will have changed in 12 months from now and was told that it is there will be value in leadership at all levels and that the ACC recognises something different needs to be done in North Worcestershire. Chief officers also need to have a better understanding to ensure each local policing commander is delivery the same outcome.

The PCC commented that it was his contention that policing is different in different areas and gave the example of a rural property outside Kidderminster which had rung the police for help as people were on the property at night. No response came from the police so the property owner had posted on Facebook their dissatisfaction with their service. The force made no attempt at service recovery at the time and it was not until the PCC intervened that the local sergeant made contact. The CC replied that this should have been picked up and addressed by an Inspector or more senior officer and properly resolved.

The PCC commented that the OCC provides the same service to all local policing areas (LPA), whereas the policing areas are providing a different one. The DCC replied that OCC service had previously been impacted by the working environment and pressures, but this was now changing for the better.

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p><b>Actions arising:</b></p> <p><b>CC to share his briefing note for the meeting with the PCC.</b></p> <p><b>Confidence to be brought back to the November meeting after the first two quarters of the 19/20 perception survey have been received</b></p>   |  |
|  | <p><b>2. <u>Satisfaction</u></b></p> <p>The PCC said that little improvement has been seen in satisfaction since it was last reviewed at holding to account in November 2018 and asked if the CC understood why performance has plateaued at this lower level. The CC responded that there had been a small improvement, 2 percentage points up from February and three LPAs were over 80%. There is a target for the year and this will be followed through. Shropshire is an outlier and is showing a small decrease, despite the continued focus there.</p> <p>The PCC asked for reassurance that the Victim Satisfaction Delivery Plan will improve the service victims receive from the force over the next 12 months. The CC replied that it is a good plan, and needs to be followed through.</p> <p>The PC queried if ‘follow up’ was still going the wrong way and was told that overall it had been, but was now starting to go the right way. Holding to account didn’t spark the difference expected and people need to work as a team. The CC expects to see 4 LPAs with over 80% satisfaction levels next month.</p> <p>The PCC commented that although small numbers, there had been a notable reduction in hate crime satisfaction and asked if the force understood why. The CC replied that the previous month’s figures actually showed a further reduction. Telford in particular had reduced satisfaction, the small numbers should mean the incidents are known and understood. It was suggested that the activity around crime data integrity could be having an impact, but for hate crime there should be a detailed understanding and an ability to assess incidents and respond appropriately.</p> |  |
|  | <p><b>3. <u>Total Recorded Crime</u></b></p> <p>The PCC commented that there continues to be an increase in low harm, volume crime such as violence without injury and asked if the CC was confident that the investment in SNTs and problem-solving has been an effective tactic for reducing offending. The CC and DCC responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of violence without injury includes malicious communications and domestic abuse. As a result it is important to be clear on what is to be reduced and how.</li> </ul>  |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The problem solving model should be about reducing harm and reducing reoffending, the two need to be brought together. This needs to nuanced better with the workforce.</li> <li>• The ACC's needed to be more connected.</li> <li>• There will be a focus through Service Improvement Board and Performance Management Group.</li> <li>• There is a reduction target around total recorded crime, seeking to reduce the things the public would want to be reduced as some is more crime data integrity driven.</li> </ul> <p>The PCC said there has been an increase in recorded robbery, knife crime and possession of weapons offences and asked if the force understand whether this increase is the result of focused proactive policing or an actual increase in offending. The CC responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers should be stopping people carrying knives which is why stop and search is important.</li> <li>• There is more mapped gang related activity, particularly in Telford.</li> <li>• Increases maybe indicative of activity to address County Lines, particularly in Shropshire.</li> <li>• THRIVE needs to be applied flexibly.</li> </ul> |  |
|  | <p><b>4. <u>Criminal Justice Performance</u></b></p> <p>The PCC commented that West Mercia is currently ranked 35<sup>th</sup> out of 41 forces on charge to NFA and asked the CC where he would want the force to be. The CC responded that the force should be aiming to be top quartile, but it is not solely the responsibility of the police and the Criminal Justice Board needs to do more.</p> <p>The PCC asked if victims were being let down and was told there are some wider issues around courts and that police can't influence all the process. The force does have a good level of victims and witnesses attending court and has good victim care provision.</p>   |  |
|  | <p><b>5. <u>Outcome 16</u></b></p> <p>The PCC read an extract from the quarterly performance report on the use of outcome 16 and asked the CC to outline what activity sits behind the commitment to reduce the use of outcome 16 for domestic abuse cases. The CC and DCC responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The force remains an outlier.</li> <li>• Approximately 15% is down to incorrect application.</li> <li>• An indepth audit on the use of outcome 16 had identified a number of issues, but not the solutions.</li> <li>• The level of unresourced incidents can also have a negative impact. If</li> </ul>  |  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>there is a delay between the initial report and a police response a victim can change their mind, which is why domestic abuse victims have been prioritised as they maybe at greater risk.</p> <p>The PCC commented that the audit report had stated that some issues could be dealt with through supervision and timeliness. The CC responded that this would now be scrutinised under the Local Priorities Board attended by both ACC's and through Performance Management Group.</p> <p><b>Action arising: Use of outcome 16 to be brought back to the September meeting.</b></p>   |  |
|  | <p><b>6. <u>Domestic Abuse (DA)</u></b></p> <p>The PCC began by saying he was concerned by the underlying risk around domestic abuse. There had been a 19% increase in DA offences in 2018/19 and he asked the CC to provide assurance that the force had allocated adequate resources to meet the demand. The CC and DCC replied that it is important to think about where investigations sit in the model and that there is a good structure in relation to MARACs, DRIVE and IOM. Tackling perpetrator activity is powerful and that it needs to be moved forward and linked into support services.</p> <p>The PCC asked the CC if he was confident that there is a coherent approach to the risk management of repeat DA victims and was told that every multiple repeat victim in the report would have a wraparound service and support at the right level.</p> <p>The PCC commented that the DRIVE project in Worcestershire was a pilot, but there didn't seem to be a push from people asking for funding or support in other areas. The CC suggested the evaluation of DRIVE needs to be better understood first.</p> <p>The PCC asked the CC if he was reassured that the internal processes for the management and support of DA victims were aligned to avoid duplication and to provide a seamless pathway of support. The CC responded that the processes had subtly different roles, acknowledged there was a risk of duplication as each had been developed separately, but said that there should be an integrated pathway. Standard operating procedures need to be reviewed.</p> <p><b>Action arising: internal processes to be brought back to the November meeting.</b></p> |  |
|  | <p><b>7. <u>Serious and Organised Crime (SOC)</u></b></p> <p>The PCC said that the force was yet to provide him with the finished SOC report asked the CC to provide assurance that the force is able to measure and report on SOC activity locally, and in a timely manner. The</p>  |  |

|     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
|     | <p>PCC responded that he was comfortable with the level of SOC performance reporting.</p> <p><b>Actions arising: The CC to clarify the position with the SOC performance report</b></p> |  |
|     |   |  |
| 2.2 | <p><b>HMICFRS inspection programme / Matters arising from the Service Improvement Board (SIB)</b></p> <p>No items</p>   |  |
|     |   |  |
| 3   | <p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>No items</p>   |  |
| 4   | <p><b>CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING TYPE / DATE / TIME / VENUE:</b></p> <p>Public Facebook Live meeting on rural crime</p> <p>Monday 24<sup>th</sup> June at 19:00</p>                   |  |