



**PAPER AP16/53**

## **ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE PANEL**

A meeting of the Accountability and Performance Panel was held in the Strategic Co-ordination Centre, Police Headquarters, Martlesham on Friday 21 October at 9.30am.

PRESENT:

### **Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner**

Liz Hollingworth (Business Administration and Policy Officer), Christopher Jackson (Chief Executive), Tim Passmore (PCC) and Claire Swallow (Deputy Chief Executive).

Chris Bland (Chief Finance Officer for the PCC and Chief Constable).

### **Suffolk Constabulary**

Steve Jupp (Deputy Chief Constable), Louisa Pepper (T/Assistant Chief Constable), Lindsay Shankland (Director of Joint Human Resources) and Gareth Wilson (Chief Constable).

### **In attendance**

Manwar Ali (Police and Crime Panel) and Paul Banjo (Suffolk County Council).

Item 2: John Spitzer (Victim Support), Syd Brown, Molly Kirk, Vicky Linton and Sally Winston (Lighthouse Women's Aid).

Item 3: Sue Hadley Independent Chair, Local Children Safeguarding Board.

## **PUBLIC AGENDA**

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (AP16/42)
  - 1.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2016 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the PCC.
  - 1.2 Responses on the actions arising from the minutes had been provided and the following updates were received.
  - 1.3 The Chief Constable said that work on branding continued with the Constabulary's Senior Management Team. The Constabulary's 'Vision, Mission, Values' work would incorporate the recently released College of Policing values.
  - 1.4 The Head of Communications would discuss the approach used for the collaborative departments with the PCC.

- 1.5 The Director of Joint Human Resources gave an overview of gender and ethnicity in the Constabulary workforce. Females were particularly underrepresented in officers (29%) compared to PCSOs (45%) and the workforce generally (42%).
- 1.6 Overall 2% of the workforce was Black or Minority Ethnic (BME), including white minorities. The Constabulary was working towards 5% BME representation in the workforce, which would be more representative of the overall population in Suffolk.
- 1.7 Recruitment posters for PCSOs were being translated into different languages. Events and social media were being used to reach a wider audience.
- 1.8 A new Insight Course was aimed at members of the public with protected characteristics who may be interested in a career with the Constabulary. The HR department was tracking applicants so that mentoring or support could be offered at the appropriate time.
- 1.9 Fast track recruitment and direct entry into detective roles were also being considered.
- 1.10 The PCC asked whether recruitment was driven by nationally set standards. The Director of HR said that national processes were used but 'pass marks' were set locally.
- 1.11 The Director of HR said that links with cadets, youth organisations and education establishments were being developed to support recruitment in the longer term. She said she would explore recruitment from the armed forces as suggested by the PCC.

## 2. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER VICTIM SERVICES GRANTS

### Provision of Victim Services in Suffolk (Victim Assessment and Referral Centre (Paper AP16/43))

- 2.1 John Spitzer, the Victim Support Contract Manager for Suffolk, outlined the extent of the service in Suffolk. Victim Support were halfway through the contract period. 53,000 referrals to the service had been made and Victim Support had made an offer of support to 45,000 victims of crime. 4,500 assessments of need and risk had been undertaken and there had been 1,100 face to face visits with 3,500 hours of direct support. The service works with over 30 partners to provide support to victims of crime in Suffolk.
- 2.2 John said he was now supported across the four counties in the East by two deputies who managed the core and specialist services. Victim Support had developed a model that they believed would be fit for delivery in 2018, when the current contract ended.
- 2.3 The current service had seen an increase in self-referrals and crimes that had not been reported to the police. In response to the increase in referrals from Action Fraud Victim Support were considering a specific service for victims of fraud.
- 2.4 The 'next generation' case management system would provide enhanced support to victims through auto-generation of support plans. There was flexibility for adjustment within the plans which would set a baseline for measurement, incorporate outcomes and monitor progression.
- 2.5 A Suffolk Victims Panel was under development and Victim Support would be consulting with Suffolk Constabulary to align with the Victim Strategy. John Spitzer said he would welcome PCC consultation with the panel.
- 2.6 The PCC asked whether levels of hate crime had returned to previous levels. John Spitzer said that the service had dealt with spikes in hate crime over the past 18 months. Overall self-reporting of hate crime to Victim Support had increased and in response they had increased their support in this area.

**Action: John Spitzer said he would provide detail of hate crime recorded by Victim Support by type and victim characteristics.**

- 2.7 The Chief Constable said that he was aware the level of hate crime was higher than that reported to the police. He was encouraged that people could report to Victim Support and asked whether there was more the Constabulary could do to encourage victims to report to the police. John Spitzer said that the increase in Hate Crime in Suffolk was replicated across the region although Bedfordshire had seen a higher spike. He suggested that a discussion with the Constabulary on why people reported to Victim Support would be useful. Anonymised data, including the reasons why people didn't report to the police, could be shared.
- 2.8 The Deputy Chief Executive said that discussions on hate crime continued with the Constabulary and Suffolk County Council. There was a requirement for proper governance and oversight of Hate Crime, an assessment of gaps and the need for organisations to come together.
- 2.9 The Chief Executive said that through the quarterly monitoring provided it was apparent that only a small number of Service User Surveys were completed. Although the responses were all positive the Chief Executive asked what Victim Support were doing to encourage more victims to respond to the surveys. John Spitzer said that all suitable victims were offered a survey to complete. These were automatically emailed to victims in Suffolk and would be followed up with a telephone call to increase response rates in future. The responses provided feedback on ease of access to the service and the impact the service had on the victim's ability to cope and recover. The reasons for non-completion were also being collated for the next monitoring report.
- 2.10 The Deputy Chief Executive said that the website True Vision ([www.report-it.org.uk](http://www.report-it.org.uk)) was a useful resource that Victim Support could refer on to. This also provided information on 3rd party reporting centres.
- 2.11 The Deputy Chief Executive suggested that Victim Support should meet with her and ACC Kearton to progress work with victims of crime.
- 2.12 The Deputy Chief Executive asked whether the issue of safe contact numbers for victims of domestic violence had been resolved. John Spitzer said that the difficulties arising from the move to the Athena system were now being addressed. Initially there had been a high level of concern with the level of risk associated with contacting these victims. The Constabulary had worked with the OPCC and Victim Support to develop a solution and Victim Support were now confident that the risk had dropped sufficiently.
- 2.13 The service was now providing a quicker response to victims of crime through using SMS texts which also generated a higher uptake of the service than letters. John Spitzer confirmed that an automatic text message was compliant with the requirement in the Victims' Code to provide a written offer of support and said that, where a text was not possible, a letter would still be sent.
- 2.14 John Spitzer confirmed that ethnicity was reported in detail on a quarterly basis.
- 2.15 He said that there were still issues with record indicators for vulnerability and persistently targeted victims (who were entitled to an enhanced service) but this was not specific to Suffolk.
- 2.16 Victim Support had been manually filtering anti-social behaviour (ASB) incidents, where victims could be persistently targeted, by looking at certain crime types (e.g. criminal damage) and also age group which again might indicate vulnerability or persistently targeted victims.
- 2.17 John Spitzer confirmed that the new system used the latest technology and there had been positive feedback from testing.
- 2.18 It was confirmed that the OPCC would attend the Victim Support conference on 22 November.

## Independent Domestic Violence Advisor (IDVA) Service (Paper AP16/44)

- 2.19 Sally Winston, the Chief Executive of Lighthouse Women's Aid, gave an overview of the Independent Domestic Violence Advisor (IDVA) Service which had been established for 18 months. The service had experienced an increasing number of referrals and was now dealing with around 150 cases a month. The service had received additional funding from the PCC in 2016 to recruit an additional 3 IDVAs to help manage the caseload. One IDVA was now also dealing with support to victims in court and other IDVAs were starting to develop specialisms in certain areas e.g. disabilities. Sally Winston said that a future development could be for IDVA support in hospitals.
- 2.20 Sally Winston said that the co-location with the Constabulary's Domestic Abuse Team had been a positive move and had improved the service's effectiveness and efficiency.
- 2.21 Sally Winston said that the Multi-agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs) were receiving too many referrals, many of which were complex. The MARACs were also struggling to deal with some cases effectively where key partners did not attend or there was a lack of research undertaken by attendees prior to the meeting. The Chief Constable said he understood that partners were meant to research cases and attend the meeting if they could provide input on that case.
- 2.22 The Deputy Chief Executive said that the support provided by the IDVA manager to the Constabulary Chair of the MARACs was helpful in the short term but obviously had an impact on the service itself. The Chief Constable said that he would look at resourcing and suggested that other agencies could contribute.
- 2.23 The Chair of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) said that the LSCB also considered the number and quality of referrals to MARAC was unmanageable. Some cases were not appropriate for MARAC and could be dealt with by the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH). A report to the LCSB was scheduled for December 2016.
- 2.24 Sally Winston said that the last MARAC steering group had been held in January 2016 but there had been no follow up on the issues.
- 2.25 The IDVA Manager, Vicky Linton, said that she was concerned that some high risk cases were closed inappropriately early by the MASH.
- 2.26 The Panel agreed that inappropriate referrals to the MARAC should be addressed. The Chief Constable proposed that the Constabulary should work with partners in the MASH to address: MARAC attendance issues and resourcing; information flow to inform risk assessment and the volume and quality of referrals.
- Action: The PCC requested an update on progress with MARAC at the Accountability and Performance Panel in December.**
- 2.27 Two IDVAs had been involved in the delivery of the 'Domestic Abuse Matters' training to Constabulary officers and staff. It was suggested that the impact of the training could be seen through the increase in cases and it was hoped that victim confidence in reporting to the police would rise. The IDVA service had provided data to inform the training evaluation.
- 2.28 The PCC said that the IDVA monitoring information and data provided was very thorough and useful.
- 2.29 Molly Kirk said the reasons why a victim did not engage/declined engagement with the IDVA service were recorded were captured by the MODUS data system but it was difficult to present this in the report.
- 2.30 The Deputy Chief Executive asked what changes had been made in response to the comments provided by service users. Molly Kirk said that as a direct response to one suggestion, the notes taken by the IDVA were now offered to the victim to take away.
- 2.31 There was some concern from Lighthouse Women's Aid about the impact of court closures in Bury St Edmunds and Lowestoft on victims. The PCC said that he had

held positive meetings on alternative court provision as he was also concerned about the impact, particularly in regards to travel by public transport and the impact of court delays and cancellations on victims and witnesses.

- 2.32 Sally Winston suggested that it may be too early to assess the impact on victims and witnesses however accessibility was likely to be an issue, for example in the north of Suffolk cases were now being heard in Great Yarmouth or Norwich.
- 2.33 The Chief Constable said that it would be useful to have a collective view of issues in the system so that the Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) could then influence changes. The Deputy Chief Executive said that the new Police and Crime Plan had a stronger focus on the victim's experience of the whole system and agreed that it would be helpful to have a more structured views from service providers for presentation to the LCJB.

**Action: Lighthouse Women's Aid to provide feedback on courts to the PCC.**

- 2.34 The IDVA service Finance Manager, Syd Brown, said that the expected underspend on the service in 2016/17 would support the cost of the Crisis Intervention Worker.

3. SUFFOLK LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD – ANNUAL REPORT 2015-2016 (Paper AP16/45).

- 3.1 The Independent Chair of the Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB), Sue Hadley, said that the Board was required to submit the draft annual report to Suffolk County Council, Health Services, the Constabulary and the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- 3.2 The report sought to reassure statutory partners that the LSCB is addressing its statutory responsibilities.
- 3.3 The report outlined the activity undertaken to deliver the LSCB priorities summarised on pages 7 to 11, and also the priorities for the future. Suffolk had been rated as 'good' in the Ofsted inspection. Ofsted had said that the LSCB based actions on intelligence and there was evidence that actions were followed up on until improvement was seen.
- 3.4 Significant pieces of work undertaken in 2015/16 included: improvements to the Multi-agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH); the Child Death Panel; Safe Sleep with Public Health; implementation of systems for safeguarding disabled children and working with children placed away from their home/out of county.
- 3.5 As had been discussed under item 2 of the agenda, concerns had been raised at the LSCB about MARAC capacity, risks to children and how MARAC processes linked with the MASH.
- 3.6 Progress had been made in raising awareness of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) with professionals. There was now better practitioner guidance and Sue Hadley said that the processes for dealing with persistently missing children had improved.
- 3.7 Significant areas the LSCB were intending to address had been identified as: domestic abuse and child neglect. The LSCB was also intending to fund the National Crime Agency 'County Lines' Assessment. This analysis would consider the extent to which offenders from outside of Suffolk were targeting young people in the county for drugs trafficking and exploitation. The Chief Constable said that police operations in Suffolk and nationally continued to address County Lines. The vulnerability assessment was the part of the work being funded by the LSCB.
- 3.8 Sue Hadley said that attendance at Child Protection Conferences and issuing timely reports to parents were priorities for the LSCB in 2017. The next report on progress, due in November, would be shared with the PCC to consider.
- 3.9 The PCC asked how the Board monitored the progress. Sue Hadley said that individual agencies were responsible for progressing the issues identified by the

LSCB. The Board asked for action to be taken and for a report back on progress. Progress was monitored quarterly to ensure performance improved. Despite not being able to instruct agencies to act, as the independent Chair of the Board, Sue Hadley said she was confident that issues identified were being resolved through the method of challenging, monitoring and holding to account.

- 3.10 Sue Hadley said that the new Children and Social Work Bill (2016-17) was seeking to replace the LSCBs with Local Strategic Safeguarding arrangements, potentially by April 2018.
- 3.11 The Deputy Chief Executive said an improved understanding of online safety had been set out as a priority for 2016/17 and asked how partners could work better in this area. Sue Hadley said that a lot of activity had been undertaken with young people so they understood the implications of internet use, however she considered that parents also needed to be influenced, particularly as online activity tended to exacerbate emotional and wellbeing problems that some vulnerable children had.
- 3.12 The Deputy Chief Executive asked what the Board was doing to consider risks to children from BME backgrounds. Sue Hadley said that not enough work had undertaken in this area and welcomed suggestions. The PCC suggested that the board could consider actions around the 'hidden harm' areas of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM), domestic servitude and trafficking.
- 3.13 The Deputy Chief Executive noted that page 27 of the report referenced the record of challenging partners including on MARAC and the lack of IDVAs. She said that the current IDVA service in Suffolk had been solely funded by the PCC in response to the lack of IDVAs, increasing the number to 9 in the first year of operation and to 12 ISVAs in 2016 due to the demand on the service rising to 150 referrals a month. Sue Hadley said that there had been a concern in early 2015 regarding the delay in filling all the IDVA posts however the Board members had not raised any concerns since then. As previously highlighted, Sue Hadley said that board members considered that the demand on the MARAC system was unsustainable and it was likely that some of the cases could be dealt with elsewhere.

#### 4. FINANCIAL MONITORING AS AT 31 AUGUST 2016 (PAPER AP16/46).

- 4.1 The Chief Finance Officer said that the forecast underspend at the end of August 2016 was £31k for the Constabulary and £81k for the OPCC.
- 4.2 The capital programme, as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) was expected to deliver as planned.
- 4.3 The CFO said that there had been some difficulties experienced earlier in the year in recruiting to vacant posts which meant that overtime and agency staff had been used. However he said overtime was expected to reduce following successful recruitment.
- 4.4 The PCC said he was keen to work on a case to influence the Police Funding Formula and asked the CFO for an indication of cost pressures and savings required for 2017/18. The CFO said that this would be difficult to quantify, particularly as the financial settlement from the Home Office was as yet unknown, but cost pressures such as the £400k Apprenticeship levy and £1.8m for the Single Tier pension would need to be taken into account. He said that he expected the savings target to be in the region of £2.5m.
- 4.5 The Chief Constable said that the findings of the internal resource review would also be taken into account.
- 4.6 The CFO confirmed that the MTFP had made provision for Body Worn Cameras. The PCC asked for an update on Body Worn Cameras in advance of the Police and Crime Panel on 31 January 2017.

5. COMMUNITY SAFETY AND JOINT WORKING (PAPER AP16/47).

- 5.1 The Constabulary had modernised its approach to Community Safety through the Suffolk Local Policing Review and the report outlined the approach being taken to joint working with partners, including the County Council, in Suffolk.
- 5.2 The Chief Constable confirmed that the lead on Domestic Abuse, from a community safety perspective only, was from Suffolk County Council. The Constabulary would be leading on Hate Crime. The changes had been made in order to deploy resources more effectively.
- 5.3 The Deputy Chief Executive said the OPCC had been aware of discussions but not the final details of the arrangements. The PCC asked to be kept informed of action undertaken on Domestic Abuse and other changes within the Community Safety Department so that he could provide his ongoing support.

6. SUFFOLK COLLABORATION (PAPER AP16/48).

- 6.1 The Chief Constable said that the report would be presented differently in future in order to incorporate the 7 Forces Strategic Collaboration.
- 6.2 The PCC said that at the last regional meeting the PCCs had agreed to support a 7 Forces procurement post which would help with standardisation across the region.

7. CUSTODY SERVICES SERVICE DELIVERY AND PERFORMANCE UPDATE (PAPER AP16/49).

- 7.1 T/ACC Pepper said that the report provided the annual overview of custody arrangements (comprising Custody and Detention and the Custody Investigation Unit). She said that the Constabulary delivered a safe, legal and effective service, underpinned by the Code of Ethics.
- 7.2 The report included data, as recommended by HMIC, that should be provided to the PCC. T/ACC Pepper said that data on the use of strip search was not currently available but would be passed to the PCC as soon as it was available.
- 7.3 The Constabulary had effective processes for vulnerable people including the Liaison and Diversion scheme. There had been a significant improvement in provision for those with mental health issues. T/ACC Pepper said that only three people who had been detained under Section 136 of the Mental Health Act had been placed into cell blocks. In all three incidents this was where violence was of concern to both the police and NHS staff.
- 7.4 T/ACC Pepper confirmed that the Constabulary processes were fully compliant with the Children's Concordat. Custody facilities were not routinely used for children but it was acknowledged that there was a lack local authority bed capacity for transfers. The Constabulary was addressing this with partners.
- 7.5 The T/DCC said that government proposals on bail management would be available in January 2017. It was likely that significant changes would be implemented through the Policing and Crime Bill, in particular to address lengthy bail periods. The expected changes were likely to place additional workload on Superintendents review every bail case.
- 7.6 There was also likely to be an impact on investigations (and pre-evidence gathering before charge), a financial cost and impact on the structure of the Constabulary. A Norfolk and Suffolk Gold Group was considering the issue.
- 7.7 The Chief Constable said that the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) had made the Minister aware of the potential impact of the proposed changes but, in the Chief Constable's opinion, it was unlikely the proposals would change.

- 7.8 The PCC said that PCCs could also raise the issues outlined to the Home Office. He said that whilst it was accepted that the public were not in favour of lengthy bail periods, any changes would need to be practical and workable for Constabularies.
- 7.9 The T/DCC said that that the issues with bail were not solely generated by the Constabulary but also driven by Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) budgetary constraints which lengthened the process.

**Action: The T/DCC said he would provide a briefing to the PCC on the issues arising from the Bill and potential solutions.**

8. CONSTABULARY RESPONSE TO HMIC PEEL EFFECTIVENESS INSPECTION (PAPER AP16/50).

- 8.1 The T/DCC said that he had oversight of the implementation of HMIC recommendations as well as other scrutiny and audit panels. A monthly meeting with Superintendents ensured that action points were being translated into everyday activity across the Constabulary. Actions were tracked to ensure there was a positive effective on performance.
- 8.2 The T/DCC confirmed that HMIC were due to assess the Constabulary again in November 2016.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 9.1 There was no other business.

PRIVATE AGENDA

10. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (Paper AP16/51)

- 10.1 The confidential minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2016 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the PCC.

11. CHIEF OFFICER RISK REPORT AND CONSTABULARY RISK REGISTER (Paper AP16/52)

- 11.1 The report was received and no questions were raised.

The meeting closed at 12.30pm.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Item	Action	Owner
2.6	John Spitzer said he would provide detail of hate crime recorded by Victim Support by type and victim characteristics.	Victim Support
2.26	The PCC requested an update on progress with MARAC at the Accountability and Performance Panel in December.	Chief Constable
2.33	Lighthouse Women's Aid to provide feedback on courts to the PCC.	Lighthouse Women's Aid
7.9	The T/DCC said he would provide a briefing to the PCC on the issues arising from the Bill and potential solutions.	T/Deputy Chief Constable