



**Hertfordshire Community Stop and Search Panel**

**Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> June 2024, 10am – 12.30pm**

**Boardroom, The Co-Op, London Colney.**

**Minutes**

**Attendance:**

Demitrius Nurse (Chair)	DN	Paulette Reed	PR
Andy Taylor	AT	David Reynolds	DR
Dennis Elam	DE	Megan Holland	MH
Jerry Rudd	JR	Robert Lloyd	RL
Jeffrey Burke	JB	Tara Bullworthy	TB
Jacqueline Gaffin	JGa	John Gillett	JGi
Valerie Shrimplin	VS	Ch Insp Ricky Bartlett	RB
Eddie McCarroll	EMc	Insp Clare Cray	CC
Ben Platt	BP	PS Adrian Pikett	AP
Penny Buckman	PB	James Coady, OPCC	JC
Lorraine Edwards	LE	Phoebe Allsopp, OPCC	PA
Godfrey Minsky	GM	Catherine Boon, OPCC	CB
		Sue McNeill, OPCC (minutes)	SMc

Also present: PC Morris, PC Howlett-Bolton, PC Bainbridge-Price and PC Hitchcock.

<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome, Introductions and Apologies</b>
1.1	The Chair (DN) welcomed panel members, officers from the Constabulary and observers, particularly Godfrey Minsky (new to the panel) and PS Adrian Pikett (new to the Operational Strategy Team.)
1.2	Apologies were noted from: Ch Supt Dean Patient, Supt Owen Pyle, Phil Millard, Marian Mendez Da Costa, Mohammad Islam Ruman and Linda Blake.
<b>2</b>	<b>Minutes of the Previous Meeting, Actions and Matters Arising.</b>
2.1	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed (see pack item 1) and the action tracker was updated (item 2.)
2.1.1	VS noted that, at the previous meeting, all red grades were issued by the same group, whilst another awarded a significant number of Green 1 grades. She questioned whether in the group selection, the views of one group were more

	<p>lenient than another. JGa advised that the reds were issued to several reports relating to the same incident. The poor quality of the reports explained the high number, not the apparent harsh / lenient views in the group make-up. PA reminded that the groups were selected only to ensure all members have the opportunity to review BWV and Under 18 strip searches, as well as standard stop/search records. No pre-judgement of the members' view is made by the OPCC.</p>
2.2	<p>In respect of Constabulary feedback, the information was circulated prior to the meeting. CC shared the presentation on the individual concerns raised including some items outstanding from the previous meeting. (Item 3).</p>
2.2.1	<p>Panel members raised several issues relating to the responses and presentation of information including the placement of the logo, page numbers and deletion/retention of BWV footage. CC acknowledged the comments, stating that the presentation format would be reviewed. In respect of the BWV footage, it is standard practice that the footage will automatically be deleted after 30 days unless flagged as evidential. She added that the retention policy is subject to national guidelines but would check in respect of the audit and inspection rules and whether footage can be retained beyond 30 days if flagged by the panel.</p> <p><b>Action: CC to refer to BWV Retention Policy regarding retention and deletion guidelines.</b></p>
2.2.2	<p>AT specifically questioned a response (slide 18) provided by the Constabulary, which appeared to be dismissive of both the panel's initial feedback and OST's subsequent review. RB stated that he would progress this matter with the officers concerned.</p>
2.2.3	<p>DE noted that the red grades related to process and not behaviour/professionalism and suggested the topic is covered in training. CC stated that refresher training including writing search grounds and rationale, and highlighting positive themes, would be rolled out by OST between August and October. DE expressed an interest in attending training sessions to assist with officers' understanding of the panel role. This was welcomed by OST who will publish details once course development is complete.</p>

2.2.4	AT suggested that a mock panel video could form part of the comms strategy for informing frontline officers of the panel’s role and processes. JC agreed this was a good idea and would consider if / how this could be created.
<b>3</b>	<b>Disproportionality Research Report – Constabulary Response</b>
3.1	JC reminded the panel that a subgroup met to discuss the report and raised several questions. These were responded to by Supt Owen Pyle by letter (circulated prior to the meeting – pack item 4). AT noted that the Constabulary accepts disproportionality is an issue but had highlighted data concerns. He asked if these were being addressed, particularly location issues. The panel was advised that TuServ has GPS but adds location detail when docked. BWV cameras have GPS (and several other unused) capabilities, but use of these functions drains the battery.
3.2	<p>DR asked for clarification regarding the following paragraph: <i>‘Across the Constabulary, we have already undertaken a number of pieces of work to address disproportionality in our use of police powers, including reviewing the intelligence and information that the Central Intelligence Bureau provide officers so as to ensure that they are reflective of offenders and offence types, rather than leaning heavily towards one ethnicity. This seeks to broadly address officer perception of offenders and help to influence their decision making. Work around this will continue.’</i></p> <p>DN also asked if this suggested the way in which police responded to intelligence provided and wider unconscious bias amongst the reporting public. RB stated that he would check with OP, as the author, for clarification.</p> <p><b>Action: RB to seek clarification on the paragraph.</b></p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Chair, Engagement and OPCC Updates</b>
4.1	<p>DN updated the panel on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PCC meeting: the new Commissioner [Jonathan Ash-Edwards] met with the chairs of each panel and has been invited to attend once he has settled in the role.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HMICFRS Extraordinary Scrutiny: DN thanked those panel members who took part. JG explained that the Constabulary had provided a selection of records as part of the inspection process, but several concerns were flagged by HMICFRS. These were checked against their criteria (similar to the panel's) and of the 16 reports in question, the group agreed with 10, suggesting the remaining six were satisfactory.</li> </ul> <p>The panel asked if the HMICFRS criteria and findings could be circulated to the wider panel. As the criteria information and findings report are owned by HMICFRS, neither the Constabulary nor OPCC can circulate without permission.</p> <p><b>Action: RB to seek HMICFRS permission to share the criteria and findings of the Extraordinary Scrutiny meeting.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DN advised that he, JC and RB had discussed a requirement to scrutinise vehicle stops. RB advised that S.163 Road Traffic Act stops are to be recorded for rationale and ethnicity of occupant. Cambs have a separate panel to scrutinise these incidents, which is BWV-intensive, however for Herts this is still a work in progress. Consideration must be given to the impact on volunteers, preparation workload and PCC's desire to take on the function. DN suggested that he was comfortable that the scrutiny sits within the remit of the current Stop and Search Panel. RB reminded that a simple vehicle stop can escalate to full engagement and potential use of force and therefore much wider scrutiny is required.</li> </ul>
4.2	<p>TB reported that the Mock Panel was delivered on 5<sup>th</sup> June at West Herts College. Several panel members attended. The panel process was recreated in a classroom environment with 15 students in attendance. Subgroups were led by panel members, and the outcomes were interesting. TB noted that in one instance two groups had rated the report red and two had graded green – the difference being, those awarding green had certain aspects and wording explained, giving the clarity needed to accept the report. This demonstrated that officer support is very important at the mock panel. MH echoed TB's view of her group and its engagement. DE was impressed how open-minded the students were and had</p>

	<p>expected more negativity but they were very open-minded and interested in the process.</p> <p>The presentation is to be further developed to represent the Use of Force and BWV panels and rolled out to other colleges and the university. West Herts College has invited the panel back in the new academic year.</p> <p>Attendees were studying relevant courses (forensics, etc.) and had an interest in the topic, although the panel agreed that there was a need to engage those young people with less interest in policing and more negative views and experiences. PC Howlett-Bolton suggested that Community Engagement Officers may be able to assist with future approaches.</p> <p>JG asked about the length of the course, compared to term on the panel. JC stated that the Terms of Reference could be amended to encourage student membership.</p>																								
4.3	<p>PA updated the panel on the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Annual Report has been signed off by the PCC. It was intended to be presented to the Police and Crime Panel on 20<sup>th</sup> June, but as this fell within the pre-election period, it has been rescheduled to 25<sup>th</sup> July (venue yet to be confirmed). As a public meeting, panel members may attend if interested.</li> <li>- Only panel-related expenses to be submitted to OPCC. Constabulary meetings (Ethics Committee, PSD, etc.) are payable by a separate budget holder.</li> </ul>																								
<b>5</b>	<b>Panel Feedback – Countywide</b>																								
5.1	<p>The scrutiny took place between 11.15am – 12.25pm. 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.</p>																								
5.2	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Group no.</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Checked</th> <th style="background-color: #c8e6c9;">Green 1 Excellent</th> <th style="background-color: #c8e6c9;">Green 2 Satisfactory</th> <th style="background-color: #fff9c4;">Amber 3 Not confident</th> <th style="background-color: #ffcdd2;">Red 4 Serious concerns</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;">Grp 1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;">BWV</td> <td style="text-align: center;">(4)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">(4)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;">Grp 2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">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)	(4)				Grp 2	0	0	0	0	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)	(4)																							
Grp 2	0	0	0	0	0																				

	U18 strip search					
	Grp 2 standard searches	21** (4 ungraded)	7	5	3	2
	Grp 3 standard searches	13	6	2	5	0
	Grp 4 standard searches	9	4	1	3	1
	Grp 5 standard searches	13	8	5	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>60</b> (4 ungraded)	<b>27</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>
5.3	General feedback: ** four records were ungraded as the searches were conducted outside of Section 1 PACE (warrant execution, post-arrest, etc.) Group One noted that the actual engagement as recorded on the BWV footage was better than the written reports would suggest. Copy and paste is still being used in group stops.					
5.4	Significant discussion followed regarding the use of ‘markers.’ The panel was advised that the marker may provide a reason to speak to an individual but the grounds for a search must be built on intelligence and suspicion – marker alone is not enough. Markers can only be removed by the host force; the Herts Force Control Room (FCR) will consider relevance when advising officers.					
5.5	RB advised that, during the scrutiny, one group had asked whether reports can be amended once uploaded to TuServ. He confirmed that, once reviewed by a supervisor, additional detail can be added however a separate box will be created. EMc expressed concern that the reports may be amended to better justify the stop/search rather than simply add descriptive detail previously omitted. It was noted that this second box (if any) is not provided to the OPCC when preparing the records. This will be investigated with the Data Engineering Team who create the spreadsheet for panel use.  <b>Action: OPCC to check with Data Engineering regarding location of additional information (second box.)</b>					
5.6	In respect of record allocation, TB asked if group stops were allocated to one subgroup to review. PA advised that this was not the case, as the records are divided equally amongst the subgroups. RB reminded that when the feedback is					

	reviewed, the group records will be evident, adding that it was helpful to have the view of two groups conducting such a review.
<b>6</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>
6.1	No other items were raised and DN closed the meeting.
6.2	<p><b>Date of next meeting:</b> 31<sup>st</sup> July 2024. University Of Hertfordshire (Mosquito Way, De Havilland Campus, Hatfield, Hatfield, England, AL10 9EU)</p> <p><i><b>Please note: all attendees are asked to download the HOZAH.COM app as we can no longer guarantee free parking. Payment will only be taken if free parking is not available. Fees paid will be reimbursed by this office with proof of payment.</b></i></p>