



Hertfordshire Community Stop and Search Panel

30th April 2024, 2pm – 4.30pm

Joint Emergency Services Academy, Stevenage

Minutes

Attendance:

Demitrius Nurse (Chair)	DN	Megan Holland	MH
Andy Taylor	AT	Robert Lloyd	RL
Dennis Elam	DE	Tara Bullworthy	TB
Jerry Rudd	JR	John Gillett	JG
Jeffrey Burke	JB	PS Paul Pickett	PP
Valerie Shrimplin	VS	Keeley Smyley, OPCC (CRT)	KS
Eddie McCarroll	EMc	James Coady, OPCC	JC
Lorraine Edwards	LE	Phoebe Allsopp, OPCC	PA
Marian Mendez Da Costa	MMdC	Catherine Boon, OPCC	CB
Paulette Reed	PR	Sue McNeill, OPCC (minutes)	SMc

Also present: PS Lisa Perks, PS Greg Neath, PC Aaron George, PC Andrew Amabilino, PC Mike Morris, PC Martin Barringer, PC Esa Kar.

1	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies
1.1	The Chair (DN) welcomed panel members, officers from the Constabulary and observers, particularly Keeley Smyley (Complaint Resolution Team) and new member Lorraine Edwards.
1.2	Apologies were noted from: Ch Supt Dean Patient, Supt Owen Pyle, Ch Insp Ricky Bartlett, Ben Platt, Mohammad Islam Ruman, Phil Millard, David Reynolds, Linda Blake, Bukola Efunshile, Penny Buckman and Jacqueline Gaffin.
2	Minutes of the Previous Meeting, Actions and Matters Arising.
2.1	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed (see pack item 1) and the action tracker was updated (item 2.)
2.2	In respect of Constabulary feedback, the presentation was circulated prior to the meeting (item 3.) Considerable discussion followed regarding the feedback/

	<p>response loop. It was agreed that a timetable allowing the panel to comment on CSP replies would benefit the process.</p> <p>Action: OPCC / Constabulary to develop and agree a feedback loop timetable.</p>
3	Complaints Resolution Team (CRT) Quarterly Update
3.1	<p>KS presented the data (item 4). In summary, of the 575 complaints made during the last quarter, only eight related to stop and search. Three of these related to the same incident. The context of the complaint and outcome explained for each incident. CRT deals with low level service recovery complaints. Serious cases are escalated to Professional Standards. Each of the eight cases was retained and resolved by OPCC CRT. After investigation, only one complaint was upheld.</p>
3.2	<p>Discussion followed regarding the records selection process in terms of complaints. If a complaint is received prior to a meeting, the relevant record is removed from the selection. This is to decrease duplication of effort, as those records are subject to scrutiny by others under the complaint resolution process.</p>
3.3	<p>Although relating to the same incident, as three complaints were received relating to North Herts CSP, PA advised that the next meeting would be a deep dive into that district.</p>
4	Data Subgroup Update
4.1	<p>DN advised the panel that EMc had agreed to become an active member of the data subgroup. EMc reminded that through PowerBI much data is available which can be overwhelming. The subgroup will filter data into the areas that the panel want and need to see. Distil for trends, and assist the wider panel to understand and challenge issues highlighted by data and examine the effectiveness of the stop/searches.</p>
4.2	<p>DN reminded that the data will be presented to the panel quarterly allowing for trends to be identified. If operational practices are raised as a concern, these will be fed back to the Constabulary.</p>
4.3	<p>JC was invited to update regarding the Disproportionality Report. A subgroup met in March. Two key actions were agreed: dedicating a portion of time to disproportionality through targeted, data-driven scrutiny, and strengthening and widening the Panel's feedback loops to comprise trends in stops. In addition, a</p>

	<p>set of questions were agreed to put to the Constabulary. The written record of the meeting and outcomes to be circulated.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: sent to panel by email on 1st May 24. Included in the circulation pack (item 5.)</i></p>																		
5	Chair and OPCC Update																		
5.1	No chair updates since the last meeting.																		
5.2	<p>PA updated the panel on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mock panel update: new date fixed as 5th June. Presentation will start with information about the Commissioner’s role and that of the OPCC. Explanation of the three scrutiny panels and work through examples in subgroups. OPCC will be supported by panel members to deliver the mock panel to approx. 30 students. Aimed at 16–19-year-olds. West Herts College is keen to repeat the model. - March meeting data upload error: as explained in the draft minutes of the previous meeting, an error was discovered post-meeting resulting in one group reviewing records from January 24 (not Feb 24 as standard.) The RAG rating was fed back to the Constabulary and the totals recorded regardless. - Annual report: part of the publication includes photos and permissions were secured prior to pictures being taken. 																		
5	Panel Feedback – Countywide																		
5.1	The scrutiny took place between 3pm- 4.10pm. The below grid represents the gradings as recorded by the panel. A registration sheet is cross-referenced with the individual records for accuracy. The figures in brackets relate to scores given for the BWV footage as this is also fed back to the Constabulary but separated so not to distort record review figures. Where the panel was split in its decision, the lowest grade has been recorded.																		
5.2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Group no.</th> <th>Checked</th> <th>Green 1 Excellent</th> <th>Green 2 Satisfactory</th> <th>Amber 3 Not confident</th> <th>Red 4 Serious concerns</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grp 1</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BWV</td> <td>(4)</td> <td>(2)</td> <td>(1)</td> <td>(1)</td> <td>(0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Group no.	Checked	Green 1 Excellent	Green 2 Satisfactory	Amber 3 Not confident	Red 4 Serious concerns	Grp 1	4	2	2	0	0	BWV	(4)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(0)
Group no.	Checked	Green 1 Excellent	Green 2 Satisfactory	Amber 3 Not confident	Red 4 Serious concerns														
Grp 1	4	2	2	0	0														
BWV	(4)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(0)														

Grp 2 U18 strip search	0	0	0	0	0
Grp 2 standard searches	9	4	3	0	2
Grp 3 standard searches	13	11	1	0	1
Grp 4 standard searches	13	9	2	1	1
Grp 5 standard searches	17	14	1	1	1
TOTAL	56	40	9	2	5

5.3	<p>General feedback: very professional engagement witnessed on BWV. Footage not always reflecting the report, on occasion failing to advise of the entitlement to a copy of the search record.</p>
	<p>A question of whether GOWISLEY should be recorded on the form was raised. It was explained that TuServ has a check box confirming information given. A structured response covering all the points may be beneficial. PS Perks advised that when the record is reviewed by team sergeants, GOWISELY is expressly looked for on the BWV footage.</p>
	<p>AT declared that he had been present at the scene for one incident reviewed by his group. For this reason, he did not contribute to the discussion or grading.</p>
6	Any Other Business
6.1	<p>DN invited the observing officers to comment. All found the process interesting and the experience useful. It was suggested that any officer flagged red should be specifically invited to attend panel. DN added that a specific number could trigger such an invite.</p>
6.2	<p>No other items were raised and DN closed the meeting.</p>
6.3	<p>Date of next meeting: Thursday 23rd May 2024, De Havilland Campus, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield.</p>