



**Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland**  
**c/o St Marks House**  
**St Marks Court**  
**Thornaby**  
**Stockton on Tees**  
**TS17 6QW**

Email: [pcc@cleveland.pnn.police.uk](mailto:pcc@cleveland.pnn.police.uk)  
Website: <http://www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk>

Police and Crime Commissioner  
A/Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer:

Steve Turner  
Lisa Oldroyd

Tel: 01642 301861  
Tel: 01642 301861

## **Police and Crime Commissioner - Scrutiny Meeting**

**Date:** 13 July 2021  
**Time:** 1530  
**Venue:** Cleveland Room

### **Agenda**

		<b>Presented by</b>
1.	Apologies For Absence	
2.	Notes of the previous meeting	Attached
3.	PCC Scrutiny Question – Police Officers in Support Roles	Cleveland Police
4.	Question/Topic for Next Meeting – Force Control Room	Police and Crime Commissioner
5.	Date of next meeting –11 August 2021	
6.	Any Other Business	



## **Scrutiny, Delivery & Performance Meeting**

29 April 2021

13:00

Teams

---

### **Present**

Lisa Oldroyd – Acting Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland (Chair)

Richard Lewis – Chief Constable, Cleveland Police

Elise Pout - Standards and Scrutiny Manager, OPCC

Rachelle Kipling – Interim Assistant Chief Executive, OPCC

Michael Porter – Chief Finance Officer, OPCC

Helen McMillan – Deputy Chief Constable, Cleveland Police

Lisa Orchard – Assistant Chief Constable, Cleveland Police

Jo Gleeson – Chief Finance Officer, Cleveland Police

Jon Morgan – Head of Crime, Cleveland Police

John Wrintmore – Chief Constable’s Staff Officer, Cleveland Police

Lynne Swift – Human Resources Director, Cleveland Police

Lisa Theaker – Chief of Staff, Cleveland Police

Jayne Harpe – Community Hub Advisor, Cleveland Police

### **Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from Louise Solomon – Head of Corporate Services, Cleveland Police, Ian Arundale, Deputy Chief Constable, Steve Graham – Assistant Chief Constable, Cleveland Police

### **Declarations of Conflict of Interest/Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.**

1. LOr stated that she was Gold for an ongoing operation and may need to give apologies during the meeting.

### **Notes of the Previous Meeting 17 March 2021**

2. The notes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record and seconded by RL.

### **Matters Arising**

3. RK and JM had not met specifically however, in relation to the Child Sexual Abuse Transformation Program, a PR actioner workshop had been held on 28 April 2021 in which Cleveland Police were involved with the wider partnership.
4. LOr informed the group that the force is working within the MASH framework, but challenges were raised during the further lockdown. People had been placed in locations and there had been a soft launch, but further comms will be issued.

### **Police and Crime Plan Objective – A Better Deal for Victims and Witnesses**

5. The Acting Police and Crime Commissioner presented a number of questions to the Force ahead of the meeting based on key themes. The questions raised are provided throughout the minutes in italics for information.

*Domestic Abuse Internal Audit Report;*

- I. *Can the Force provide an update on the position since the joint audit committee was undertaken?*
- II. *Can the Force confirm what processes are in place to ensure that the recommendations have been completed, and that they are assured that compliance with force policies related to domestic abuse are being adhered to?*

*Victims/VCOP;*

- I. *Can the force provide the Acting PCC with an update on VCOP compliance rates, how the force is ensuring the quality of the work in this area and confirmation that victims are receiving a better service?*
- II. *What is the force aiming for in terms of the target for the VCOP compliance figure?*
- III. *How is the force embedding lessons learnt from the VCAS Quality of Service Report?*

6. LO noted that Data quality and responses have improved; which was credit to the team. LO queried whether missing risk assessments, THRIVE and technical issues had been remedied. HM provided a brief overview of intermittent issues with IT. The current status of domestic abuse is monitored with regular debriefs, although there are some national challenges.

7. Body worn video footage is improving and it was queried what was in place to measure the IT solution. The data provided from software is not what was hoped for. An audit had been carried out on evidence led prosecutions; there is now policy and procedure, but it has not been fully embedded. Compliance will be monitored at the Governance and Scrutiny Board as there are still gaps. Storage issues on the cloud require rectifying. There have been no failures with the new equipment. Audits are completed by Inspectors at LPA level. Evidence led prosecutions have been raised nationally with CPS to incorporate in their national performance framework. Local solutions are in place and better oversight. RSM Auditors will be dip sampling but still some way to go.

8. The MASH Manager has a database in relation to MARAC, and a safety net is now in place. Supervisor training has been implemented in relation to risk assessments. RK noted a point of accuracy in relation to the MARAC screening process; this was handed back to the force on 16 April 2021 and was completed by the DASS team. Discussion took place regarding partnership working and it was noted that the Force are willing to engage and implement a process. A paper will be taken to the next Strategic MARAC meeting for consistency and partnership engagement. RK noted that the MARAC review was to conclude at the end of April. Due to delays in accessing information, the review will be presented to a special Strategic MARAC in early May where Safe Lives will present some of the findings and recommendations for a plan to be developed.

9. RK noted that a new process has been implemented in the DV policy (2<sup>nd</sup> para) requiring sign off at Inspector level seeking assurance around bail and released under investigation. LOr stated that DVPN is a last option. There has been a substantial increase in the use of conditional bail for DA perpetrators; a review will be undertaken to understand data.

Clare's Law/Sarah's Law

10. Statistics in February 2020 are correct. This is reviewed in MASH to ensure safeguarding. If an individual ended a relationship with their partner, the decision made was not to disclose. That gap has been plugged and information provided to manage the risk. RK requested clarity on who was responsible for completing Equality Impact Assessments. LOr was to discuss this further with LOr.

## Performance Update – Repeat Victims

*The Acting PCC requested a copy of the Force's strategy to address the repeat victim rate (for those victims not classed as Domestic Abuse). Assurance was sought due to the increased victim rate which was reported to the Strategic Performance Update Board in April.*

11. A risk assessment matrix and victim's first policy are used; RK sought clarity and assurance in relation to management of repeat victims from a partnership perspective. Proactive use of ECINS is encouraged. LOr stated that the usage is dependent on Local Authority buy-in and there was uncertainty around the type of IT solutions. Victim First Policy training has been given and work is ongoing to embed this.
12. Not all forces are identifying crimes for stalking and harassment. Repeat victims may be missed due to different rules. A process to be developed to look at problem solving approach and better scrutiny is needed. RK noted there were areas for development; what support can Local Authorities provide as there is a lack of strategic objectives. HM stated that significantly larger Neighbourhood Teams make this more effective for repeat victims and ASB. Partnership working in Hartlepool and Kirkleatham have seen good results. Templates have been improved during a recent Niche review.

## VCOP

13. Victims of Crime support booklet is now available on the website. LO queried how this was being monitored for digitally excluded victims. Chris Barker monitors performance indicators; written information is available and can be provided. A working group has been established to monitor national KPI's and progress is being made with new processes in place. Data will be available to extract when the systems are adapted. RK noted that very good progress has been made during the last 18 months. RK queried whether the report made reference to VCAS Officers or SPOCs (Single Point of Contact). LOr confirmed they were SPOCS and champions. It was requested that assurance around VCOP be brought to a future meeting when new processes were in place. LOr requested this be brought back in late summer when the force had time to embed the new process and the powerBi and audits had caught up and reassurance could be provided. LO queried the process regarding crimes older than 28 days where updates had not been provided to victims; this would be subject to ongoing scrutiny via the Delivery and Assurance Board and also Tactical Group meetings. Dip samples are bespoke to victim's needs and the force are awaiting an audit process to ensure this is in place.

## Force Control Room (FCR) – Update

- I. Can the force provide a report by exception of any issues the Acting PCC should be aware of?*
  - II. What is the key learning arising from the shift pattern change?*
14. LO noted that there had been good consultation with staff regarding a change to shift patterns and areas of improvement. LO queried whether there was enhanced wellbeing in FCR (Force Control Room). LS had carried out a review of absence in a concerted effort to reduce the absence level. Although there were some genuine cases, it was believed that some absence was due to protest absence and pressures from individuals not wanting change. An analysis of referrals to Occupational Health had shown a significant number of self-referrals; a peak in self-referrals (53 from May to the start of the shift change). Work is ongoing to accommodate flexible working.
  15. Vulnerability Desk - RK noted that rape victims had been referred to the Vulnerability Desk and queried whether staff had been upskilled regarding SARC and forensic windows. LOr was aware that some additionality had been done with staff but did not know the content of that. It was hoped that the number of referrals to SARC would increase and could data be obtained from SARC? RK also

queried where MARAC sat with Clare's and Sarah's Laws; and whether there was a streamlined process. It was noted that there is a mainstream triage system in place however the Vulnerability Desk manages these out of hours. RK is working with the intelligence team and agreed to provide data for additional referrals into SARC to LOr

16. EP queried whether the Primary Crime Investigation Unit (PCIU) was different from ICMT. HM stated that PCIU is temporary until ICMT is fully up and running. It will take work away from the front line but is not fully understood what FCR will look like. The establishment of multi-skilled operatives had not brought the benefits that were anticipated however, this approach will remain in place for six months until it is established how many staff were needed.
17. EP queried 101 call abandonment and when NETCALL will be introduced. HM stated NETCALL would be introduced over the next twelve months. Assurance was sought regarding the risk and welfare of bank staff – these staff worked overtime on top of their normal working week. HM stated that this would be via the Resource Unit Management and working time regulations. RL had also sought assurance.
18. LO sought assurance on retention planning regarding the increase in scale of the despatchers as it had been difficult to recruit. LS stated that retention would be considered later in the year. It had also affected staff working in ICT who had been in demand due to COVID. The Force were looking at attraction strategies to increase application numbers.

#### **Any Other Business**

19. RL thanked the Acting PCC and team for their recent work with the emphasis that it is important to support the new PCC.
20. RL provided details of the Cleveland and Durham Specialist Operations Unit (CDSOU) and the termination of the collaboration.
21. There was the opportunity for the PCC's office to use the Chief Constable as a conduit to the Home Secretary. Funding for serious violence had previously been unsuccessful but that further work on this area of business would continue.

#### **Time and Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting is to be announced.



## Scrutiny, Performance and Delivery Meeting

<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Staffing and Police Officers in Support Roles</b>
<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>13 July 2021</b>
<b>Deadline for submission to OPCC</b>	<b>9 July 2021</b>

<b>Question to the Force</b> <i>(Question(s) to be provided by OPCC)</i>
<p>With regard to the number of police officers in support roles, have the force given consideration to this figure and is 239.5 FTEs considered appropriate. For example, what consideration has been given to whether these roles need to be Police Officers? Why these roles are considered by the force as requiring warranted powers, and how often are they revisited / reviewed? Are they using warranted powers?</p> <p>Does the Force considered this as Value for Money?</p> <p>Why does Cleveland allocate the lowest level of resources, in the country, to Front Line visible areas?</p> <p>Why has there been such a shift from Visible to Non-Visible in terms of Front-Line resources?</p> <p>Are the level of resources allocated to Front Line support correct given how this compares across the country?</p> <p>Has there been any analysis of how this compares to Cleveland's most similar forces. What are the outputs of these functions, in comparison to other forces with predominate civilian led models in the same area?</p> <p>What percentage of these roles are due to restrictive duties / temporary assignments? What would be the impacts of a £1m investment be to the front line in tackling current demand?</p> <p>How are HR looking at this information strategically and what is the long term succession plan / pathway to improve?</p>
<b>Rationale for Question</b> <i>(Reason why the question has been asked, what is the PCC seeking assurance on etc)</i>
The PCC is seeking assurance from the Force that a robust process is in place for

allocation of staffing resources and that the force is undertaking sufficient analysis to ensure maximum staffing levels and ensuring the correct people are in the correct roles including work that could be undertaken by non-warranted staff.

**OPCC Background Information** (*OPCC will provide information they have, for example from public feedback, stakeholder engagement, OPCC work streams, scrutiny panel and joint audit committee information, any Force responses from previous scrutiny meetings, national findings/reports, HMICFRS, performance data etc*).

The analysis from the HMICFRS Value for Money profiles shows the number of Police Officers Cleveland have in 'Support Roles' as per the HMICFRS categories. This shows there were 239.5 FTE Police Officers in 'Support Roles' in Cleveland – the table at the bottom of this page breaks this down into each area.



Police%20officers%20in%20support%20rc

**Current Status** (*what is the Force doing and why*)

**Key Successes to Date** (*what is working well and why*)

**Areas for Development** (*what is not working so well and why, what planned work is due to take place*)

**Assurance from Force** (*where appropriate, what will be different and by when, which forum has oversight of this work*)

**Performance Information** (*Linked to Force Performance and Quality Framework - Key performance indicators related to subject area, commentary on past performance, current performance and future target performance – what does good look like?*)

**Risks** (*identified risks to future performance/delivery and how these will be mitigated against?*)

**Resource implications** (*are there any resource implications in terms of finance, staff, estates, IT etc?*)

<b>Timescales</b> ( <i>what are the timescales for delivery?</i> )
<b>Impact</b> (Where change has taken place what difference has it made, is this activity considered business as usual)

Author:

Date:



## Scrutiny Meeting Force Control Room

<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Force Control Room</b>
<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>11 August 2021</b>
<b>Deadline for submission to OPCC</b>	<b>27 July 2021</b>

### **Question to the Force** (*Question(s) to be provided by OPCC*)

#### **Question:**

- The Force Control Room has been back under the control of the Force, earlier than planned at the Force's request, for over a year now (since May 2019). In addition to this a significant amount of additional public money has been invested in this area. With this in mind it is recommended that the PCC requests a report from the Force covering the following:
  - Progress in delivering the additional resources
  - The impact on service delivery to the public of this additional investment
  - How the overall costs of the Force Control Room in Cleveland compare, in Value for Money terms, to others within the country.
  
- Given the additional investment of over £3m per year since 2018/19 what has been delivered in terms of improvements?
  - Call handling performance?
  - Reduced waiting times?
  - Lower abandonment rates?
  - More accurate assessment of calls?
  - Increased Resolution without Deployment?
  - Increased Public Satisfaction with FCR performance?
  - Increased Customer (both Internal and External) Satisfaction?
  
- 3. Is the volume of calls the reason why Costs are so much higher in Cleveland than elsewhere? If so why?

4. How does the average cost per call (of £30) compare with other Police Forces?
5. Analysis of the benefits brought by the Single On Line Home, what has been the impact and what are the future plans

**Rationale for Question** (*Reason why the question has been asked, what is the PCC seeking assurance on etc*)

The PCC is seeking assurances regarding the progress made within the Force Control Room following its return in house and in relation to the impact of the extra funding that was made available.

**OPCC Background Information** (*OPCC will provide information they have, for example from public feedback, stakeholder engagement, OPCC work streams, scrutiny panel and joint audit committee information, any Force responses from previous scrutiny meetings, national findings/reports, HMICFRS, performance data etc*).



FCR VfM analysis  
June 2021 v2.docx

**Current Status** (*what is the Force doing and why*)

**Key Successes to Date** (*what is working well and why*)

**Areas for Development** (*what is not working so well and why, what planned work is due to take place*)

**Assurance from Force** (*where appropriate, what will be different and by when, which forum has oversight of this work*)

**Performance Information** (*Linked to Force Performance and Quality Framework - Key performance indicators related to subject area, commentary on past performance, current performance and future target performance – what does good look like?*)

**Risks** (*identified risks to future performance/delivery and how these will be mitigated against?*)

<b>Resource implications</b> <i>(are there any resource implications in terms of finance, staff, estates, IT etc?)</i>
<b>Timescales</b> <i>( what are the timescales for delivery?)</i>
<b>Impact</b> <i>(Where change has taken place what difference has it made, is this activity considered business as usual)</i>

Author:

Date: