



PAPER AP18/1

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 15 December 2017 at 9.00am.

PRESENT:

Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner

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

Vanessa Scott (Policy Officer) for Items 1 and 2.

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

Suffolk Constabulary

Rachel Kearton (Assistant Chief Constable), Simon Megicks (Assistant Chief Constable) and Gareth Wilson (Chief Constable).

In attendance

Patricia O'Brien (Chair, Police and Crime Panel), Len Jacklin (Independent co-opted member, Police and Crime Panel), Paul Banjo (Suffolk County Council), Tom Potter (East Anglian Daily Times) and one member of the public for items 1-10.

Scott Cook (Contract Manager) Victim Support, for items 1 and 2.

Apologies

Steve Jupp (Temporary Deputy Chief Constable).

PUBLIC AGENDA

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (AP17/66)
 - 1.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2017 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the PCC.
 - 1.2 The PCC welcomed the latest report from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) on Legitimacy which had assessed Suffolk Constabulary as 'Good'.

- 1.3 The PCC said that the Home Office funding announcement for 2018-19 was expected on 19 December. He said he was grateful for all the support that had been given in setting out the case for a fairer settlement for Suffolk.
- 1.4 It was confirmed that the Constabulary had provided information to the PCC on the actions recorded in the minutes of the last meeting.
- 1.5 The PCC said that the website data provided had shown that an average of 400 crimes per month were being reported through the online reporting mechanism. However it looked like there was a 16% fall in visits to the Suffolk Constabulary Home Page.
- 1.6 The Chief Constable said that the website was promoted as an alternative to calling 101 for information and to report non-emergencies. Website users could go directly to the relevant web page, such as 'report a crime,' through social media links and this may have had an impact on Home Page visits. The Chief Constable said that the increased functionality of the website had improved the public's interaction and ability to find the information they were looking for. The Deputy Chief Executive said that the increase in online reporting was encouraging.
- 1.7 The PCC requested the next report on Public Access and contact should include a full report on website usage and how it was being promoted.
- 1.8 The Chief Constable said that the average call time to the non-emergency 101 number had improved. Calls to the switchboard were answered on average in 14 seconds. If the call was subsequently passed through to the Contact and Control Room, it was answered in an average of 3 minutes and 33 seconds. The Chief Constable said that it took an average of 1 minute and 39 seconds to complete the online form indicating that this was an efficient method for members of the public to report non-emergencies.
- 1.9 The PCC asked how much progress was being made on joint working to tackle domestic abuse. ACC Kearton said that D/Superintendent Eamonn Bridger was implementing the Constabulary strategy as well as working with Suffolk County Council to ensure they and other agencies were fully involved. The PCC said he would like to be kept informed of this particularly as it had an impact on commissioning services for victims.
- 1.10 The Deputy Chief Executive said that as well as the internal Constabulary Board there was a Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) Board that the OPCC were involved in. She was concerned that there were too many separate groups trying to address the same issues and the system seemed paralysed because of this. ACC Kearton agreed that progress was needed and also suggested that where agencies were tasked with an action they should be trusted to deliver. The PCC agreed there should be less duplication but said he was keen to see further progress.

2. PROVISION OF VICTIM SERVICES IN SUFFOLK (VICTIM ASSESSMENT AND REFERRAL CENTRE) (Paper AP17/54 deferred from October meeting).

- 2.1 Scott Cook said that he had been the Contract Manager for Victim Support in the East of England since October 2017.
- 2.2 The report provided an overview of the services provided by Victim Support in Suffolk through the Victim Assessment and Referral Centre (VARC) and delivery of local services.
- 2.3 Scott Cook outlined the provision of services to victims. The majority (98%) of referrals to the service were made from Suffolk Constabulary through an automatic data transfer (ADT) where a victim of crime had consented to their details being passed on. The VARC then made contact through telephone, SMS or letter and if the victim wanted further support they were seen by the local delivery team for free and confidential help or referred to a specialist service.

- 2.4 All staff and volunteers were training and accredited. The support provided was dependent on the crime type and impact on the victim.
- 2.5 The report provided data in relation to the second year of the 3 year contract. During 2016-17 the service received 33,244 crime referrals including 168 self-referrals and 2,356 from other agencies.
- 2.6 It was explained that the proportion of referrals the service was unable to contact was relatively high due to contact information being incomplete or incorrect. Some of the crimes were out of scope for the service, being high or medium risk domestic abuse cases (nearly 2,000) which were dealt with by the Independent Domestic Violence Advisor (IDVA) Service and the DA Outreach Service.
- 2.7 The Deputy Chief Executive said that she was interested in how the domestic abuse cases and referrals from other agencies were dealt with.
- 2.8 The Deputy Chief Executive said that the PCC was commencing a new commissioning process for high risk victims of domestic abuse (the IDVA service) in conjunction with Suffolk County Council who commissioned the Domestic Abuse Outreach service for medium risk victims. It was agreed that further conversations with Victim Support would be useful so that the three services for victims of domestic abuse could be joined up and referral pathways made clearer.
Action: Victim Support to provide more detailed information on the domestic abuse cases referred to them and referrals from other agencies. OPCC to discuss with Victim Support how they support victims of domestic abuse.
- 2.9 The service had sent over 19,000 emails, SMS (texts) or letters to victims. Contact had also been attempted with 2,467 'enhanced' victims through 2 telephone calls within 24 hours of the referral. If the attempted calls were unsuccessful the victim was contacted by letter, where it was safe to do so, although it was acknowledged that written contact tended to be less successful.
- 2.10 The Deputy Chief Executive asked for clarification between the number of successful calls to victims of crime (2,467) and the number of victims identified as entitled to an enhanced service (10,275) as these should receive a needs assessment. Scott Cook said that the number of calls were those where there had been successful contact and equated to just under 25%.
- 2.11 The Deputy Chief Executive said that the decrease in the volume from those referred to those receiving a service was concerning. Scott Cook said that the design of the new service was intended to lower the attrition rate.
- 2.12 Vanessa Scott agreed that the number of 'no contact' cases was concerning and suggested that Victim Support should liaise with the Constabulary in order to resolve the administrative issues with the ADT so that the flow of information was improved for the new service.
- 2.13 Section 3 of the report outlined the impact of the service measures through user surveys. Of those that had received a service and completed the survey (116) 98% were very satisfied or satisfied with the service received and 87% felt safer as a result. 100% reported that the service had helped them cope better.
- 2.14 The Chief Executive said that the data collated on satisfaction was positive and, while it only represented a small proportion of the referrals that had been made, the survey was completed by around one fifth of all those who had received support. The Chief Executive asked whether any complaints had been made about the service. Vanessa Scott said that it was a requirement for Victim Support to notify the PCC should a complaint be made and to date there had been none. Scott Cook said that he would verify that this was the case.
- 2.15 The Restorative Justice (RJ) service provided 138 victims with initial information on RJ and 27 had commenced preparation for an intervention. There had been 8 successful RJ interventions.

- 2.16 In response to the PCC, Scott Cook said that it was often difficult to get to a positive conclusion through the Restorative Justice process, as the nature of RJ meant that there were many factors and people involved. He said that this was also the case nationally.
- 2.17 The Deputy Chief Executive said she would like to see more detail on the proportion of victims from a Black or Minority Ethnic (BME) background being supported.
Action: Victim Support to provide data on the proportion of BME victims supported through the service.
- 2.18 The PCC asked whether the service had data on the increase of technology enabled crime and whether the service dealt with victims of Hate Crime. Scott Cook said that the new system should be able to provide the data on the type of crime and would provide this to the PCC. The figures for victims of Hate Crime, who were entitled to the enhanced service, were included in the report at section 2.1.
Action: Victim Support to provide information on the number of referrals relating to cyber or technology enabled crime.
- 2.19 The future of the service was being developed by Victim Support working with the Norfolk and Suffolk PCCs' offices. A pilot service, moving from a regional to joint Norfolk and Suffolk service would begin on 1 April 2018.
- 2.20 The Deputy Chief Executive welcomed the commitment from Victim Support to improving the service and said that she expected further efficiencies to be made.
- 2.21 The PCC asked how the new service would be promoted. Scott Cook said that Victim Support were intending to increase the volume of self-referrals to the service. There was a new website, communications materials and a marketing plan. The service would use volunteers to promote the service to partners and hard reach groups. He confirmed that the new logo and branding had been agreed.
- 2.22 The location of the administrative hub for the new service was yet to be determined however density mapping had provided evidence that an additional local centre in Suffolk was required. Consultation was underway with Victim Support staff.
- 2.23 The Chief Executive asked whether the transition to the new service from the current regional contract would be smooth. Scott Cook said that the transition process would begin in January 2018 whereby staff in the current VARC would be transferred to their local area. The conclusion of the current contract would affect all five counties in the region however a plan had been developed to deal with the impact on staff and the service to victims of crime and this could be shared with the OPCC.
- 2.24 Some risks had been identified but Victim Support were confident that local delivery would be largely unaffected.
- 2.25 Scott Cook said that the service would potentially underspend in Suffolk in 2017-18. He said would develop proposals for the re-investment of these funds.
- 2.26 The Deputy Chief Executive suggested that Victim Support return to the Panel to update the PCC on the progress with the new service in February and June 2018.
3. REVENUE AND CAPITAL MONITORING AS AT 31 OCTOBER 2017 (Paper AP17/67).
- 3.1 The Chief Finance Officer said that the report reflected the position at the end of October 2017 and forecast an overspend of £1.8m. This was an increase from the previously reported position of £800k and was due to a number of unforeseen factors including: the decision to further search the landfill (Op Phonetic); part-funding the police pay award; and the costs associated with the Ipswich Town Football Club (ITFC) case.

- 3.2 The CFO said that the forecast also included an assumption that the pay award for staff would be similar to that for police officers. The award had not yet been agreed but would be known by March 2018.
- 3.3 The Chief Constable said that the current forecast for the end of the financial year was 1.86% of the overall budget.
- 3.4 ACC Kearton gave an overview of the actions being taken to manage overtime. Overtime had been used in response to the increase in demand the Constabulary had experienced. The workforce model from 1 April 2018 would incorporate demand in a more sophisticated manner so that resource could be changed accordingly. This could be in response to seasons, weather and known events (sports events and festivals) so that the use of overtime could be minimised.
- 3.5 The PCC asked for a monthly summary of overtime and context to be provided to him. He was concerned that because the Constabulary did not have the budgeted number of officers or staff in place there was over reliance on overtime. The Chief Constable said that the flexibility that overtime offered was useful. In terms of the workforce he said that Suffolk Constabulary still faced a shortage of detectives as was the case nationally. These vacancies and increasing demand, placed a high workload on investigators and justified the use of overtime.

Action: Constabulary to provide a monthly summary of overtime.

- 3.6 In order to manage other areas of overspend, vacancies were being managed to ensure only business critical posts would be filled and a strong business case for any new training was required.
- 3.7 The CFO said that special grant funding was being sought from the Home Office for Op Phonetic and the ITFC case.
- 3.8 Section 5 of the report set out the likely requirements on reserves. The CFO said that a £2.6m transfer from reserves in support of capital programme was required.
- 3.9 The PCC said he expected to receive some assistance from the government in the form of special grant funding. He was reluctant to reduce reserves to the point where they were too low. The CFO said that it was his responsibility to advise the PCC on the adequacy of reserves and he would be in a position to do this in January 2018 when the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) was finalised. The CFO said that it was likely that the general level of reserves would need to be reduced.
- 3.10 The PCC said that the PCC commissioning forecast overspend had been planned and had been used for the Stay Safe Online fund. This would use grant underspend from previous years.
- 3.11 The CFO said that he was considering whether spend on the capital programme could be deferred as this would help the position.
- 3.12 The PCC asked for clarification on overspend of £230k noted at section 3.4 of the report. The Chief Constable said that had been a rise in the value of vehicle insurance claims against the Constabulary.

Action: The CFO said that he would provide further detail on vehicle insurance costs to the PCC.

- 3.13 The PCC asked for more detail on Appendix Bi and Bii (Capital Expenditure). He said that the appendix should have narrative with it so the context could be understood.
- 3.14 The PCC asked whether the spend on increased server storage at Halesworth had been agreed. The CFO said that this had been approved through delegated authority.
- 3.15 The PCC asked for more information on the ICT replacement network overspend.

Action: The CFO provide further information to the PCC on ICT replacement overspend.

- 3.16 The CFO said that the spend on Body Worn Video (BWV), originally budgeted for 2018-19, had been brought forward and therefore there was a forecast overspend.

The Chief Constable confirmed that the overall budget for BWV had not been exceeded. The PCC said that some narrative should be included in the financial report to provide context.

- 3.17 The CFO said that the working finance documents did have notes but to provide this for publication would involve a significant amount of work. The Chief Constable said that the amount of detail provided in the appendices could be reconsidered as whilst there was a need for transparency, to include relevant context for each line would be time-consuming.
- 3.18 The PCC asked for further detail on the costs set out in section 6.1 relating to downsizing at Leiston and Beccles. The CFO confirmed that the costs were not an overspend. The Chief Executive said that the summary did not include the capital receipt which would be received on the sale of the property. The CFO said that the financing of the capital programme was commercially sensitive.
- 3.19 The Deputy Chief Executive asked whether the Safecam Summary (Appendix Aiv) could be more clearly explained to indicate whether it provided good value for money. The CFO said that the forecast surplus from the driver retraining schemes was £610k which would be reinvested in road safety schemes.

4. PROGRESS AGAINST HMIC INSPECTION AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT (AFI) AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Paper AP17/68).

- 4.1 The Chief Constable said that there were a number of Areas for Improvement (AFI) from HMICFRS reports that had been dealt with. No recommendations were outstanding. The AFI schedule was being transferred to a database so they could be published online in 2018.
- 4.2 It was explained that the report was originally requested to provide the PCC with the Constabulary AFI progress. However because of the impending move to publish online, as required by HMICFRS, it had been agreed that the report should describe that process rather than include the current AFI list.
- 4.3 The Chief Constable confirmed that a list of all the recommendations from HMICFRS and other organisations was kept up to date by the Constabulary.
- 4.4 The Chief Executive said that the online register would show how the Constabulary had responded to the HMICFRS recommendations and AFI and be more transparent. However, as the PCC was required to hold the Chief Constable to account he would need a report to future Accountability and Performance meetings on Progress against HMICFRS Inspection Areas for Improvement and Recommendations.

5. VICTIM SATISFACTION AND CONFIDENCE (Paper AP17/69).

- 5.1 ACC Kearton said that Suffolk Constabulary was a middle ranking force for Victim Confidence. It was acknowledged there was room for improvement but ACC Kearton said that staff were generally delivering well to victims and the wider public.
- 5.2 The PCC was concerned with the proportion of the public that felt the Police were dealing with community priorities. ACC Kearton said that it was recognised there was work to do on enhancing engagement with the community and this was currently being considered.
- 5.3 The Deputy Chief Executive said that the national ranking for 'dealing with community priorities' was not satisfactory with Suffolk 30 out of 42 forces. She said that there appeared to be a disconnect between what the public perceived priorities to be and the nature of the work the Constabulary had to undertake. The public focus appeared to be on volume and visible crime with a lack of awareness of 'hidden harm'.
- 5.4 The PCC said that main issues raised by the public with him were drugs and violent crime, policing visibility, 101 waiting times, speeding, parking. However he said that there was recognition of the improvements in addressing domestic and sexual abuse.

- 5.5 The Chief Constable said that a focus on the smaller number of high risk crimes could be seen as not delivering on community priorities such as inconsiderate parking and speeding but he was confident that the SNT engagement officers would continue to build better relationships with the local communities. The Chief Constable reassured the PCC that feedback from the public meetings had been sent to the 2025 team.
- 5.6 The PCC said that the CCR 'Tweetathon' had been a great success in promoting appropriate use of the emergency and non-emergency numbers and highlighting calls which were the responsibility of other agencies.
- 5.7 ACC Kearton said that new arrangements for monitoring the satisfaction of victims of Domestic Abuse and Serious Sexual Offences were being developed. Significant work had been undertaken to ensure the safety of victims. The survey would be undertaken in-house and the cost implications of this had been included in the 2018/19 budget. It was expected that the surveys would be in place by April 2018 and early findings would be available in Autumn 2018.
- 5.8 The Deputy Chief Executive asked whether other Constabularies had made quicker progress with the domestic abuse satisfaction surveys. ACC Kearton said that a variety of methods were being undertaken and she was under the impression that Suffolk was neither at the front or back end of implementation.

6. USE OF STOP AND SEARCH IN SUFFOLK 1 OCTOBER 2016 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2017 (Paper AP17/70).

- 6.1 ACC Kearton provided a summary of the key messages from the report. There had been 1699 stop and searches recorded during the reporting period. Overall the number of Stop and Searches carried out had reduced since the Best Use of Stop and Search had been introduced.
- 6.2 The main reason for undertaking Stop and Search was intelligence relating to drugs.
- 6.3 There had been a slight reduction in the number of stop and searches of Black or Minority Ethnic (BME) people.
- 6.4 Responses had shown that 8 out of 10 people said that they understood the reason why they were searched and that they were treated with respect.
- 6.5 The PCC said he was interested in whether there was a comparison of the ethnicity of people who were stopped and searched and the population in Suffolk. He also asked what was undertaken in terms of local resolution. ACC Kearton confirmed she could provide further information on local resolution.

Action: ACC Kearton to provide the PCC with information on what action was taken under 'local resolution'.

- 6.6 ACC Kearton said that it was likely that the level of 'not recorded' outcomes in table 2.4 (Stop and Search Outcomes) was because there were issues with data quality.
- 6.7 The PCC said that the postal address analysis was important in understand the nature of County Lines and people travelling in to Suffolk to commit crimes. ACC Kearton confirmed that people who were stopped were not obliged to provide their address or other details however the officer would record that this information had been refused.
- 6.8 The PCC said he was pleased with the work on Stop and Search and he was keen to send out the message that drugs would not be tolerated in Suffolk. The Chief Constable confirmed there was a proactive drugs team.

7. COMPLAINTS AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS (Paper AP17/71).

- 7.1 The Chief Constable said that, having reviewed the increase in complaints of 26% reported in the paper, he could update the PCC with the following information:
- i. The overall number of complaints remained low;

- ii. No one incident had generated multiple complaints;
 - iii. No individual officers were attracting multiple complaints;
 - iv. There appeared to be a small number of complainants who were making a number of complaints and allegations;
 - v. The number of complaints had returned to normal levels in October and November;
 - vi. Having looked at the trends in complaints it was apparent that spikes in complaint numbers did occur with no discernible patterns.
- 7.2 The Chief Constable said that some analysis was being undertaken on the complaints categorised as “Other neglect or failure”. It was expected that this would highlight where additional measures could be put in place.
- 7.3 The Chief Constable said that in light of the analysis he was not unduly concerned about the increase in complaints shown in the report however it would be monitored.
- 7.4 The PCC said that the increase of 26% had raised concern. He requested sight of the analysis of the complaints when completed.
- Action: The Chief Constable to provide analysis of the ‘other neglect or failure in duty’ complaints for discussion at a future weekly conference. OPCC to add this item to the forward agenda.**
- 7.5 The Chief Constable said he would confirm this whether an appeal to the dismissal referenced on page 18 of Appendix 1, could be expected.
- Action: The Chief Constable to confirm whether an appeal to the dismissal referenced could be expected.**
8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
- 8.1 There was no other business.

PRIVATE AGENDA

[A detailed account of the discussions and decisions on the following items is contained in the confidential minutes.]

9. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (Paper AP17/72)
- 9.1 The confidential minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2017 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the PCC.
10. COMPLAINTS, MISCONDUCT AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS (Paper AP17/73).
- 10.1 ACC Megicks presented the report, the content of which was noted.
11. PROTECTIVE SERVICES COMMAND NATIONAL POLICING REQUIREMENT (Paper AP17/74).
- 11.1 ACC Megicks gave an overview of the report and provided the PCC with an update on the Emergency Services training exercise that had been undertaken in November 2017.
- 11.2 The PCC said that it was clear from the report that Suffolk Constabulary was contributing to the National Policing Requirement.

The meeting closed at 11.40am

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Item	Action	Owner
2.8	Victim Support to provide more detailed information on the domestic abuse cases referred to them and referrals from other agencies. OPCC to discuss with Victim Support how they support victims of domestic abuse.	Scott Cook / OPCC
2.17	Victim Support to provide data on the proportion of BME victims supported through the service.	Scott Cook
2.18	Victim Support to provide information on the number of referrals relating to cyber or technology enabled crime.	Scott Cook /
3.5	Constabulary to provide a monthly summary of overtime.	ACC Kearton
3.12	The CFO said that he would provide further detail on vehicle insurance costs to the PCC.	Chris Bland
3.15	The Chief Finance Officer to provide further information to the PCC on ICT replacement overspend.	Chris Bland
6.5	ACC Kearton to provide the PCC with information on what action was taken under 'local resolution'.	ACC Kearton
7.4	The Chief Constable to provide analysis of the 'other neglect or failure in duty' complaints for discussion at a future weekly conference. OPCC to add this item to the forward agenda.	Chief Constable
7.5	The Chief Constable to confirm whether an appeal to the dismissal referenced could be expected.	Chief Constable