



## Minutes

### Hertfordshire Community Scrutiny Stop and Search Panel:

**Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> December, 2019**

**Panel Members Present:** Chris Cowdrey (CC), Marian Langley (ML), Caroline Malcolm (CM), Jeffrey Burke (JB), Michael Reeve (MR), Barbara Graham (BG), Roger Bosley (RB), Benjamin Platt (BP),

**Hertfordshire OPCC/Constabulary**

- Chris Treadwell (Hertfordshire Constabulary, Chief Inspector Crime Reduction and Community Safety) (CT)
- Matthew Pugh (OPCC, Policy and Project Officer) (MP)
- Dr. Amie Birkhamshaw (OPCC, Director of Strategy) (AB)

**Apologies:** Danielle Turner (DT), Sharon Farquhar (SF), Marianne Murphy (MM), Mohammed Islam-Ruman (MR),

The meeting was chaired by CC

#### 1) Welcome, introductions and apologies

#### 2) Approval of minutes and update on actions

The minutes of the meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2019 were agreed.

#### Update on actions:

Action one: MP to send letters to each member outlining the desired commitment of six meetings per year.

MP informed the Panel that this action had been discharged and all members should have received a letter in the post. Concern was raised that a requirement of six meetings may limit the panel's diversity by preventing those who work from becoming a part of the Panel. It was agreed that whilst this requirement should not be absolute and all members should have the choice to stay on the Panel if they choose, a minimum number is helpful to ensure everyone is kept up to date and can contribute to discussions.

Action two: MP to review data from months prior to the introduction of Athena (May 18) to determine the impact post-incident outcomes had on the positive disposal rate of historical data.

The data was reviewed, but no meaningful conclusions could be made, as both the total number of searches and the number of outcomes were increasing. Further review to be done by the constabulary to understand this change.

The meeting in March had not yet been scheduled and Panel members were asked to consider if they wanted a public meeting for 2020. It was agreed that the Public meeting had not been successful in recent years and that the March meeting would be a regular meeting.

**Action one: MP to find a suitable date and venue for the March meeting.**

### **3) Presentation of findings from the Constabulary's Stop and Search Equality Impact Assessment**

The Constabulary have produced an Equality Impact Assessment to help better understand the impact of stop and search on different communities across Hertfordshire. The Terms of Reference outline the aims of the project, which includes the drivers behind stop and search, the impact of county lines and levels of disproportionality between districts.

In partnership with the EIA the constabulary will conduct additional training for frontline officers based on some of the findings of this project.

**Action two: MP to review the feedback forms and compare if any correlation can be found between individuals ethnicity and cases where the Panel do not feel confident in an officers record.**

### **4) Review of November CSP Summary Data**

The Panel looked at additional data provided by the Constabulary comparing outcome rates across ethnic groups. The data appeared to highlight discrepancies between analysis undertaken by the Panel and the data provided by the Constabulary.

**Action three: CT to speak with the Learning and Insight Team to understand the discrepancies in the two data sets.**

### **5) Section 60 Review – Stevenage:**

- 00:01 08/11/2019 and 07:00 08/11/2019
- 19:30 08/11/2019 and 09:00 09/11/2019

The constabulary are currently looking at their use of Section 60, specifically around the use of named individuals and the size of the authorisations made.

The Panel were provided with an overview of the two Section 60s conducted. In these cases, there were two victims who suffered an attack on the evening of the 7<sup>th</sup> November. The attackers were identified but the police had reason to believe the victims would seek retribution. It was not clear when or where this would take place, and therefore it was deemed necessary to authorise a Section 60 for the protection of these individuals and the wider public.

It was raised that no rationale was given by the chief officers as to why a Section 60 was authorised for the entire town. CT stated that this would be feedback for future reference.

It was felt that more work can be done in partnership with corporate communications to standardise how the public are notified of when a Section 60 occurs.

Outcomes:

Six searches were conducted during the section 60. The offender of the original incident was subsequently arrested and has been charged.

## 6) Review of Complaints

MP provided a verbal update on complaints into the Professional Standards Department (PSD) over the past six months in the absence of Chief Inspector Tannis Perks.

Between 1<sup>st</sup> June and 31<sup>st</sup> November, Hertfordshire received three complaints.

Two complaints relate to allegations the grounds for search were not given and no record of the search was provided. One of these has been locally resolved and the other is ongoing.

One of the above cases has multiple additional allegation concerning discriminatory behaviour and other assault during the search.

The third related to the application of handcuffs during a search which the complainant feel was unnecessary. This is also on-going.

MP then presented the summary of all 'dissatisfactions' received into the Force Control Room (FCR) and the Customer Response Team (CRT) over the same time period.

- Five complaints were reported into the CRT in relation to the officer's behaviour (including impolite language) and breaches of police policies and procedures. Four of these were valid and one is still under consideration.
- 18 complaints were reported into the Force Control Room. One of these searches were classified as valid, nine as unknown and eight as not valid. These complaints were made predominantly for the officer's behaviour or a breach of procedure.

MP provided an explanation so to how complaints are determine valid, not valid or unknown;

- If the complaint is **valid**, learnings/trends/areas for improvement have been identified and feedback will be given to the officer as a result.
- If it is **not valid** it is because police have acted according to policy/procedures or as a result of BWV disproving the account given by the complainant
- The **unknown** are as a result of either not knowing the outcome as the incident log has not been updated by the Sergeant/Inspector or because it is one word over another and cannot be disproved/proved either way.

## 7) Dip-sampling of Stop and Search Records and 8) Feedback

Group one reviewed 10 records: The group felt confident in eight records reviewed. They did not feel confident in two records reviewed. In one case the officer only identified the smell of cannabis as the reason for the search and best practice asks that officers use this alongside other indicators.

In the other case, the group felt there was sufficient evidence to arrest the individual without requiring a search, as the subject had already admitted to the offence.

Group two reviewed 11 records: The group felt confident in all 11 records reviewed and highlighted four as examples of best practice.

Group three reviewed 12 records: The group felt confident in all 12 records reviewed.

*Summary:*

Total records reviewed	33
Confident	31
Not confident	2
Unsure	0

**9) AOB:**

**Date of next meeting:**

Monday 27<sup>th</sup> January, 2020 (1000 – 1230), Hertsmere Borough Council, Elstree Way, Borehamwood, WD6 1WA, Committee Room A