



Hertfordshire Community Stop and Search Panel

23rd May 2024, 10am - 12.30pm

University of Hertfordshire

Minutes

Attendance:

Demitrius Nurse (Chair)	DN	Paulette Reed	PR
Andy Taylor	AT	Tara Bullworthy	TB
Jerry Rudd	JR	John Gillett	JGi
Jacqueline Gaffin	JGa	Ch Insp Ricky Bartlett	RB
Eddie McCarroll	EMc	Insp Clare Cray	CC
Mohammad Islam Ruman	MIR	James Coady, OPCC	JC
Penny Buckman	PB	Phoebe Allsopp, OPCC	PA
Lorraine Edwards	LE	Catherine Boon	CB
		Sue McNeill, OPCC (minutes)	SMc

Also present: C/Insp Hannah Treadwell, Det Sgt Samantha Casey (both North Herts CSP), A/PS Catherine Game, PC Brad Glover, PC Esa Kar, PS Greg Neath and Sagar Kumar (student - observing.)

1	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies
1.1	The Chair (DN) welcomed panel members, officers from the Constabulary and observers, particularly welcoming Insp Clare Cray, who recently joined the Operational Strategy Team and Sagar Kumar, studying Law at the university.
1.2	Apologies were noted from: Ch Supt Dean Patient, Supt Owen Pyle, David Reynolds, Dennis Elam, Bukola Efunshile, Phil Millard, Bob Lloyd, Valerie Shrimplin, Ben Platt, Jeffrey Burke, Linda Blake and Marian Mendez Da Costa.
1.3	DN advised the panel that PS Paul Pickett would no longer be attending meetings and asked for the panel’s thanks to be formally recorded.
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, detail was circulated prior to the meeting and CC presented on the individual concerns raised. Significant discussion followed including the need to record GOWISELY on TuServ but not in the body of the text.
2.3	The panel expressed concern that delayed responses potentially impacts the effectiveness of the panel's feedback. DN asked for context to be added to the presentation when no CSP response has been provided ahead of the meeting and to consider not using acronyms where possible.
2.4	AT highlighted errors in the presentation (mismatched records) and agreed to provide the detail outside of the meeting to allow the Constabulary to amend the slide deck before recirculation.
3	Disproportionality Report: Next steps
3.1	JC reminded the panel that the workshop feedback had been circulated to the panel focusing on two aspects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More targeted, data-influenced approach to scrutiny. - Strengthening feedback loop to Constabulary (tracking trends and monitoring.) <p>Data subgroup, meeting quarterly, to lead on identifying themes and proposing specific areas for scrutiny at future meetings.</p>
3.2	Additionally, several questions were asked of the Constabulary and written responses will be provided ahead of the June meeting.
3.3	JG asked if disproportionality figures were affected by certain groups featuring on a 'watch list.' DN stated that the panel role was to identify anomalies and the Constabulary to provide an explanation as they arise. The panel will have an opportunity to consider whether the response is justified or raises further concern.
4	Chair and Panel Updates
4.1	Chair activity: no significant update since the last meeting.
4.2	Diversity and Engagement Subgroup activity: <p>Mock Panel – 5th June 2024, 10am, West Herts College. Panel members invited to attend and, although focusing on stop & search, the invitation has been extended to the Chair of the Use of Force Panel to give an input. DN suggested this was a</p>

	marketing opportunity not to be missed (with student permissions.) He reminded that publicising the panel's existence to the general public was key in brokering trust in the police service.
5	Annual Report
5.1	JC shared a presentation (item 3) reminding that the draft Annual Report had been circulated to panel members. It provides a summary of the year's activities and makes recommendations for the year ahead in terms of development and improvement. The final report will be presented at the Police and Crime Panel on 20 th June 2024. Any comments on the draft to be received by OPCC no later than 28 th May.
5.2	Panel members asked why other constabularies appeared to be performing better, particularly in respect of positive outcomes and diverse panel recruitment. RB stated that the views of both HMICFRS and the College of Policing were key, and both considered Hertfordshire as well respected and a best practice model. MIR added that prior to the panel being set up in Essex, this panel was observed and the model followed.
5.3	JG commented on recent Home Office directions relating to executing stop/search and the quantity of records reviewed. RB stated that the quality of the stop/searches and positive outcomes was paramount. JG added that greater numbers of records were being reviewed each month as the quality had generally improved, which made the assessment easier. He suggested that the Constabulary should be congratulated in this respect. AT and JR added that there had been a noticeable improvement during their membership on the panel.
5.4	RB stated that the learning and subsequent improvement in the records was in no small part due to panel feedback. HT echoed this point, stating that when sergeants have attended panel, they have come to understand the panel's role and appreciate why certain concerns are raised.
6	Panel Feedback – North Herts
6.1	The scrutiny took place between 11.10 and 12.15. 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.

Group no.	Checked	Green 1 Excellent	Green 2 Satisfactory	Amber 3 Not confident	Red 4 Serious concerns
Grp 1 BWV	3 (3)	2 (3)	1	0	0
Grp 2 U18 strip search	0	0	0	0	0
Grp 2 standard searches	15	13	1	1	0
Grp 3 standard searches	9	3	2	1	3
Grp 4 standard searches	11	5	3	3	0
Grp 5 standard searches	8 **2 ungraded	2	2	2	0
TOTAL	**46	25	9	7	3

6.3 **General feedback:** ** Group 5 left two records ungraded as these related to Section 17 searches. Panel comments included: reports need to be more concise; no timescales given for 'recent intelligence'; cut and paste of a poorly written record. Concern was expressed relating to a record where four white females were subject of a report to police but ultimately three black males were searched, without clear explanation.

7 Any Other Business

7.1 All officers found joining the panel to be very positive and useful in terms of learning. SK stated that he was studying a master's degree in law and found the scrutiny meeting very interesting.

7.2 No other items were raised and DN closed the meeting at 12.40pm

8 **Date of next meeting:** Tues 25 June 2024, 10:00 – 12:30, Co-op, London Colney