

29<sup>th</sup> October, 2020



## Minutes

### Hertfordshire Community Scrutiny Stop and Search Panel:

Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> October, 2020

**Panel Members Present:** Jeffrey Burke (JB), Caroline Malcolm (CM), Ben Platt (BP), Mohammed Islam-Ruman (MI-R), Marianne Murphy (MM), Barbara Graham (BG), Robert Lloyd (RL), Bukola Efunshile (BE), Roger Bosley (RB), Kristina Dimitrova (KD)

#### Hertfordshire OPCC/Constabulary

- Nicola Dean (Hertfordshire Constabulary, Inspector Crime Reduction and Community Safety) (ND)
- Sara Miles (OPCC CJ Policy and Research Manager) (SM)

**Apologies:** Marian Langley, Alexander Allen, Demetrius Nurse

The meeting was chaired by JB

#### 1) Welcome, introductions and apologies

Welcome to Inspector Nicki Dean.

Welcome to new members – Robert Lloyd & Bukola Efunshile.

Apologies noted and thanks expressed to Sharan Farquhar who has resigned from the panel after a number of years.

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

The minutes of the meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> September were agreed.

At the September meeting there were some questions from the panel regarding data for North Herts and Stevenage. Responses were gathered from Chief Inspectors of those Districts and included in the minutes from the September meeting.

Update on actions:

**Action 2: SM to identify 3-4 meetings for the Panel to present at in 2020, as part of the Panel's efforts to engage with the public.**

Update – This is currently on hold while there remain limited opportunities for public engagement. One area for consideration would be whether the panel would like to consider any form of virtual engagement next year.

**Action 4: Deep dive into data to be held by the Constabulary with those panel members interested.**

**Action 6: Constabulary to provide response for why positive disposal rate has decreased**

Update – These actions overlap each other and the Constabulary have agreed to run a session with the group to share the data and presentations shown at the coercive powers board.

CI Treadwell and Chris Pratt (Head of Thinking & Analysis) have agreed a TOR for the analytical project, reviewing the positive disposal rate – which include overlaying various sources of data to see if there is a correlation. This will then be looked at against significant milestones and a further detailed breakdown by search powers. The terms of reference will be discussed at the coercive powers board next week.

CI Treadwell is also looking at a piece of work with regards to disproportionality in Herts. ToR has been agreed and been shared with the coercive powers board – a timescale of 4 months been given to it.

**Action: Nicki Dean to find out if the ToR can be shared with the panel after the coercive powers board?**

There was a brief discussion about the national report published earlier in the week which gives statistics on stop and search in England & Wales for year ending 31 March 2020. The report noted that there has been an increase in Stop & Search nationally.

**3) Review of September Summary Data**

The data for September was reviewed with a couple of areas noted:

Watford:

15% positive disposal (6 month average = 19%). It was suggested that the panel focus on dip sampling for Watford at the next meeting.

St Albans:

32% positive disposal which is high compared to other CSP's

Stevenage:

14% positive disposal (6 month average is 18%). It was suggested that the panel focus a session on Stevenage

North Herts:

16% positive disposal (6 month average 28%)

**Add info on the articles found that are not connected:**

Prior to the meeting there was a question regarding the data and articles that are found that are not related to the objective of the search. This data was looked in to in more detail ahead of the meeting and more information shared with the group:

There were 58 cases where property was found that was not related to the objective of the search. In 38 of the instances objective property was also found on top of other property being found

There were 20 stops where no objective property was found but other property was found. Of these 20 stops 14 led to an arrest and 6 to another positive disposal.

Best use of stop and search explains the reasons for this: *The measure of the success of stop and search is not necessarily a 'hit', or positive outcome, as there may be occasions where the outcome of a stop and search is unconnected to the reasonable grounds for suspicion. Such an outcome is likely to represent a chance detection rather than professional judgement and the use of reasonable grounds by the officer in question. It is for this reason that it is important that the public has access to this information to assess how effectively the police are using their powers. Data must therefore be made available which show whether the object of the stop and search is connected to the outcome; this will encourage accountability in the police use of these powers.*

**4) Dip-sampling of Stop and Search Records and 5) Feedback**

Group one reviewed 20 records

Confident in 12, not confident in 8 records

1 should have been an arrest rather than S&S

Group two reviewed 22 records

Confident in 16 and not confident in 6 records.

Group three reviewed 36 records

Confident in 30 records, not confident in 2, and unsure in 4

Noted that there were a large number of cut and paste records

*Summary:*

Total records reviewed	78
Confident	58
Not confident	16
Not sure	4

**7) AOB:**

Inspector Nicki Dean noted that the trial starts on Monday with feedback being asked for through Echo from those who have been stopped and searched in Watford.

Constabulary continue to look at possibilities for sharing BWV footage remotely.

**Date of next meeting:**

Monday 30<sup>th</sup> November 10-12.30pm