

## Monthly Assurance Meeting January 2020 – Meeting Notes

Date: Monday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2020 @ 14:30  
 Chair: John Campion  
 Minutes: Charity Pearce, Assistant 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	Chief Constable (CC)
	Julian Moss	Deputy Chief Constable (DCC)

**Apologies:** Tracey Onslow Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC)

1.	OUTSTANDING MATTERS / ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD	ACTION
1.1	<p>Action arising from the May 2019 meeting (and deferred in advance of the November 2019 meeting):</p> <p><b>Domestic abuse</b> Internal processes to be brought back to the November meeting</p> <p><b>Update:</b> Prior to the meeting the PCC was provided with a briefing note outlining how the force are avoiding victim duplication across departments and using VAL to support victims.</p> <p>The CC added that there is a great opportunity with the recent change of roles in the organisation to sense check and see if he is satisfied with the work. The new Head of Vulnerability wants to look again as there may still be duplication.</p> <p>The PCC commented that he often hears that in the future things will be improve but he wants to know what is being done to manage the risk now. The CC responded that the force are on a path to get to where they want and that changes will take time. They understand the need to move from making promises to showing the improvements that have been made.</p>	

<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b>Holding to account Investigations and Outcomes</b></p>	
<p><b>2.1</b></p>	<p><b>Investigative models</b></p> <p>The PCC sought reassurance that the crimes response officers are allocated are now appropriate for their role.</p> <p>The CC and DCC responded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The THRIVE process works well but at times of high demand the allocation process didn't work as well as it should. Following the considerable uplift he is satisfied it is getting better.</li> <li>• On LPA visits it appeared the numbers of crimes officers were carrying was much better.</li> <li>• Work currently being undertaken to improve the management information available will allow supervisors to spot where there is an error and remove inappropriate crimes from response officers.</li> </ul> <p>The PCC sought reassurance that Chief Officers and senior managers are sighted on the work undertaken around improving management information. The CC said that good information is available, the system just needs to be understood but they are confident that it is being acknowledged. The DCC added that he is hoping to implement a performance management framework, once the system is correctly used by officers and supervisors.</p> <p>The PCC wanted assurance that following the recent success of the demand reduction project that the lessons learnt have been adequately captured and embedded to inform future business planning. The CC responded that the Ch. Supt model has been changed and this work is now being taken on by a Ch. Supt based in the OCC who can work more closely with others.</p> <p>The PCC asked the CC how confident he is on a scale of 1-10 the demand reduction work has longevity. The CC responded that would rate his confidence at a 7. He is confident the levels of unresourced incidents are improving but not in response times.</p> <p>The PCC sought confirmation that the CC has chosen a preferred investigative model for the force to move to and that it was the right model for West Mercia.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> DCC to provide the correct name for the new model.</p> <p>The CC added that the current Pathfinder model was implemented during the alliance and was being rolled out, however he could see it wasn't working and put a stop on the process. Now that the alliance termination is taking place he can decide what is right for West Mercia. It is hoped the final piece of work being overseen by ACC Wessell will be finalised by the</p>	<p><b>DCC</b></p>

	<p>end of this month and then a decision will be made.</p> <p>The PCC requested sighting of the finalised business case outlining the reasons for change and the intended benefits for the public. The CC responded that the approach being proposed will have good well-staffed response teams, good SNT, good reactive CID and more specialist teams that can deal with complex vulnerability. The DCC added that the pathfinder investigative model is flawed with the lack of specialist roles also meaning relationships with partners are strained.</p> <p>The PCC asked if the CC was confident he could implement an effective investigative model given the shortfall between resources set out in the optimal model and the number of actual budgeted posts. The DCC said that using both the optimal model and professional judgement provides a number that the force are able to budget for. Current work around the budget will allow the force to determine a surplus in numbers.</p> <p>The PCC asked that his office are engaged in the process to ensure work aligns with his police and crime plan and the significant resources that himself and the government are attaching themselves to. He also sought clarity about where his recent investment in officers are situated.</p> <p>The PCC also asked for an update on the recruitment of the direct entry detectives and how they will be utilised in the new investigative model. The CC said that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Police Now programme attracts a broader pool of candidates, he is impressed with the current cohort’s willingness to challenge the process.</li> <li>• The force now need to look at specialist recruitment and offering attachments into specialist roles to allow officers to develop experience.</li> <li>• The new PEQF training model has attachments into CID as part of the core model but the current uplift received IPLDP and haven’t had the same opportunity.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2.2</b></p>	<p><b>Managing capacity and training</b></p> <p>The PCC welcomed the progress made by the force to improve the availability of management information but sought reassurance that it will be utilised at both local and strategic level. The CC and DCC said that on a larger scale this information is used to monitor where resources are to manage the organisation. However, there are unanswered questions as this information is difficult to extract. The DCC hopes to develop a wider performance framework with clear principles.</p> <p>The PCC asked whether new processes put into place will lead to improvements in the capacity and capability of supervisors and provide</p>	

	<p>front line investigators and their supervisors the support they need. The DCC said that the new supervisor’s dashboard will show basic metrics of which supervisors are carrying out reviews and who isn’t.</p> <p>The PCC asked the CC if he was satisfied that the current arrangement for the Incident Progression Teams (IPT) will provide the necessary oversight to ensure a consistency of service across the force area.</p> <p>The CC said that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The force have established the Public Contact Service Centre (PCSC) to centrally triage low level crimes and has provided greater consistency.</li> <li>• At local level they have tried resolution centres and IPT but they haven’t worked so no longer exist.</li> <li>• When officers are on restricted duties they can sometimes sit back from their normal duty to locally triage low level crimes.</li> <li>• He does not want this to be seen as a ‘redeployment’ as HMICFRS will see it as an inconsistency if each LPA doesn’t have the same arrangement.</li> </ul> <p>The PCC asked if this message was consistent from the centre. The DCC added that the general concept of setting up the PCSC is a good one but it sits uncomfortably that there are unofficial teams across LPA’s. The CC said that local command teams are empowered to develop and create their own model.</p>	
<p><b>2.3</b></p>	<p><b>Resolving Investigations</b></p> <p>The PCC highlighted that the use of kiosks for digital investigations has been raised at a number of previous Holding to Account meetings and although a large number of officers are trained to use them it appears they are still not being consistently used. The CC responded that every time it is raised the questions are asked but there isn’t a matchup between what he is being told and what is happening.</p> <p>The PCC said he was pleased to see that the force had developed a new process in relation to offenders released under investigation (RUI) performance but asked that if this were revisited in 3 or 4 months’ time what impact would this have in relation to local management of RUI and bail. The CC said this is the topic of national debate as the legislation isn’t fit for purpose and may be changed, currently no force could provide accurate data. The DCC added that it is important the force are not only using the new process but to ensure it is being used in the right way.</p>	
<p><b>2.4</b></p>	<p><b>Crime Outcomes</b></p> <p>The PCC said that outcome 16 performance had been an ongoing issue</p>	

for a number of years, he was aware a number of solutions had been proposed and asked for reassurance that the adopted approach would have the desired outcome. The CC said that the HTA process prevents people from understanding the purpose of an issue, nothing has changed with outcome 16 performance but it may be errors in the failure rate causing the force to be an outlier. It may just be errors being made rather than needing the change the whole process.

The PCC raised a contention that real victims are being let down by the organisation and asked how the outcomes are being improved for them. The CC and DCC said that:

- Response officers that get it wrong will continue to get it wrong unless you change the supervisory capability.
- They could get error rates right down but it wouldn't be sustainable.
- The force scored well in the recent CDI inspection but it can't be changed unless the people who are responsible for it change.
- They need to dip sample cases to learn what could have been done differently to support victims and get examples out to officers.

The PCC asked if in a years' time if the same question was asked whether there would be a change. The CC said that he doesn't know what could be changed to improve data but he doesn't think officers understand why this is important. The DCC wants confidence in the figures and hopes in a years' time the force will have a better understanding of why those victims were let down.

The PCC acknowledged that there is variation in the use of powers across policing areas. He asked how the pockets of good practice in the use of protection notices and orders are expanded to drive consistent utilisation of powers across the force and ensure a parity of service for victims. The CC said that the use of powers changes based on demographics of an area. He needs to be confident to explain away differences and ensure powers are being used promptly.

The PCC added that local command leaders have different views and priorities. He pointed out the difference between North and South Worcestershire. The DCC said that he wants to see consistency in the decision making and not in the output, not all variance can be attributed to leadership. The questions arise from looking at statistics but commanders need to be held to account for their decision making.

The PCC asked if the CC was confident that the force understand the victim experience and that the victim's voice remains central to crime investigations. The CC said the force have a good Victim Satisfaction Improvement Plan that no one talks about until asked. He is not confident that the plan and the Victim Advice Line (VAL) are being used.

	<p>The PCC asked for reassurance that progress is being made against the Victim Satisfaction Improvement Plan. The SOC delivery plan is more relevant and is better than the victims plan. The CC and DCC said that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The force are good at writing strategies and plans but not so good at following them through.</li> <li>• Recommendations were made to the force around changing the satisfaction survey but were not implemented due to the alliance.</li> <li>• The change in the survey structure would have prevented the force from comparing rates to previous years and they first want to improve what can be compared.</li> </ul> <p>The PCC raised that bureaucracy isn't a slick as it was to allow those to make changes against the plan. The CC said both ACC's have the power to make changes but don't share updates with the DCC and CC to keep their ownership. They need pressure to ensure continuous progress on their work. The DCC added that he wants to review and push forward a new confidence plan.</p>	
	<p><b>HMICFRS inspection programme / Matters arising from the Service Improvement Board (SIB)</b></p>	
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>AOB</b></p>	
	<p><b>CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING TYPE / DATE / TIME / VENUE:</b>  Public meeting on Budget and Resources  Monday 20th January 2020 at 19:00.</p>	