



**Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland**  
**Cleveland Police Headquarters**  
**Ladgate Lane**  
**Middlesbrough**  
**TS8 9EH**

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

Police and Crime Commissioner:	Barry Coppinger	Tel: 01642 301653
Chief of Staff (Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer)	Simon Dennis BA, Solicitor	Tel: 01642 301653
Chief Constable:	Mike Veale	Tel: 01642 301215

---

## **Report of the Police & Crime Commissioner to the Chair and Members of the Cleveland Police & Crime Panel**

**13 November 2018**

### **PCC's Scrutiny Programme and Performance Report**

#### **Purpose of Report**

1. To provide members of the Police and Crime Panel with an update on the PCC's scrutiny programme and to present the performance report of the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Police and Crime Plan.

#### **Police and Crime Plan**

2. The Commissioner's objectives are as follows:
  - Investing in our Police;
  - A Better Deal for Victims and Witnesses;
  - Tackling Re-offending;
  - Working Together to Make Cleveland Safer; and
  - Securing the Future of our Communities.
3. This report updates Panel members on performance associated with the delivery of the Commissioner's objectives, the wider aspects of the Police and Crime Plan and his statutory responsibilities.

#### **Holding the Police to Account**

4. Holding the Chief Constable to account is the key duty of the Police & Crime Commissioner and must encompass all of the functions of the Chief Constable and functions of those who are under the Chief Constable's direction and control: this means, particularly
  - How the Chief Constable discharges his duty to have regard to the Police and Crime Plan;

- How the Chief Constable has regard to national and regional Strategic Policing Requirement (SPR);
- How the Chief Constable complies with the law generally and police codes of practice in particular;
- How the Chief Constable deals with his functions in relation to the handling of complaints against the police;
- The effectiveness and efficiency of Cleveland Police's work in relation to collaboration and partnership;
- How effective and efficient the police arrangements are for engagement with local people;
- How well Cleveland Police achieves value for money in all that it does;
- How Cleveland Police addresses its equality and diversity duties; and
- How Cleveland Police deals with its responsibilities, working in partners, in respect of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children.

### **Ensuring greater benefits from the scrutiny programme**

5. The scrutiny of the Force is one of the main responsibilities of the Commissioner as set out in the Police and Social Responsibility Act 2011. Delivered through the Commissioner's standards and scrutiny programme effective checks and balances are undertaken through a schedule of regular meetings.
6. Since the last Police and Crime Panel the PCC has held the following meeting

#### **Scrutiny, Performance and Delivery meetings**

- 12 September 2018

7. The minutes of the above meetings are attached at **appendix 1**.
8. Since the last update to the panel there has been a Working Together meetings on the
  - 26 September
9. The minutes are included at **appendix 2**.
10. In addition to the meetings above, the Commissioner continues to attend the following to complement his scrutiny programme:
  - Daily review of the Control Room and Serious Incident Logs;
  - Weekly accountability meetings with the Chief Constable;
  - Monthly crime performance monitoring;
  - Attendance at the Force's monthly Force Performance Group; and
  - Attend at least one local area meeting in each of Cleveland's neighbourhood police team areas.

### **Performance**

11. The report, **attached at appendix 3**, is the overview of the current performance information from the Police and Crime Plan.

#### **Finance**

12. There are no further financial implications arising from this report.

#### **Risk**

13. There are no further risk implications arising from this report.

#### **Diversity and Equal Opportunities**

14. There are no further diversity or equal opportunities implications arising from this report.

#### **Recommendations**

15. That this performance report is noted.

**Barry Coppinger**  
**Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland**



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

12 September 2018

1300 - 1600

Marina Room – Community Safety Hub

---

### **DRAFT MINUTES – TO BE APPROVED AT THE SCRUTINY, DELIVERY AND PERFORMANCE MEETING ON 30 NOVEMBER**

#### **Present**

Barry Coppinger - Police and Crime Commissioner  
Simon Dennis - Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer, OPCC  
Brian Thomas - Assistant Chief Officer  
Jo Gleeson – Chief Finance Officer, Cleveland Police  
Joanne Hodgkinson – Deputy Chief Executive  
Judith Nellist – Commissioner’s Officer for Policy and Scrutiny, OPCC  
Elise Pout, Standards and Scrutiny Manager, OPCC  
Jason Harwin – by telephone for item 5  
Steven Bell – for item 11 – Proceeds of Crime Act  
Jon Green – for item 4  
Maria Hopper – for item 6

#### **Item 1 - Apologies for absence**

1. Simon Nickless, Deputy Chief Constable, Cleveland Police

#### **Item 2 - Declarations of Conflict of Interest/Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.**

2. None declared.

#### **Item 3 - Notes of the Previous Meeting**

3. The notes of the following meeting were approved for publication.

- i. 20 June 2018 – approved
- ii. 23 July 2018 – approved

#### **Item 4 - Audits and Inspections – Joint Targeted Area Inspection – Multi Agency Response to the Abuse and Neglect in Stockton on Tees – Update**

4. Between 20 and 24 November 2017 Ofsted, the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) and HMI Probation undertook a joint inspection of the multi-agency response to abuse and neglect in Stockton-on-Tees. A number of key strengths were identified as well as a number of Areas for Improvement (AFIs).

5. At the Scrutiny, Delivery and Performance meeting on 11 April the PCC was updated on the Force's response to the AFIs. Included in that was a discussion regarding the demand tool that was being used to assist in managing the demand. It was proving positive at the time of writing but the overall outcome was still to be seen.
6. The corporate team were also looking at the Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment (STRA) in order to gain a further understating of demand, abstractions and staffing. Processes were also being considered in order to establish the effect on workloads. Given that projected demand was set to increase the PCC requested that a further update should be provided in three months' time to allow for the results of the work to understand and manage demand to be concluded.
7. The PCC sought details on the following for the meeting:
  - An in-depth update on the current levels of demand in PVP.
  - The results of the work that has been undertaken to manage demand
8. Jon Green was in attendance to take the PCC through the headline information with regard to the 2 areas above.
9. Within PVP and the child abuse team, there had been a task and finish group established to consider how to mitigate risk and alleviate demand. It was outlined that current staffing levels were adequate and proportionate; some inefficiencies had been identified and addressed and it was noted that the department had moved in a positive direction over the last 6 months. One pressure on the team was identified as attendance at partnership meetings. This had been an area that the HMICFRS had recommended for improvement; attendance at such meetings had improved from about 30 per cent to 90 per cent, which in turn, had created an additional demand on the team, but it was hoped that the potential use of video conferencing would help with that. Discussions were held on the use of E-cins and how that could reduce the need for information sharing meetings, although it was also noted that HMICFRS request that it is preferable that people 'sit round the table'. Work was being undertaken to plan time saving methods but co-location was seen as the way forward.
10. Discussion took place about the National Enabling Programme and the specifications that were being awaited. It was noted that Cleveland were one of the first forces to move towards encryption to the CPS and 'smart' interventions were being developed with partners to improve the use of digitally enabled solutions. Discussion took place about the inclusion of this into the Police and Crime Plan.
11. Regarding the demand in the Child Abuse team, it was noted that child abuse referrals had seen 10% increase year upon year until July 2018, which had led an increase in workload for the team, due to the significant amount of time needed assess each form received.
12. In the Domestic Abuse (DA) team officers were dealing with approximately 11 crimes each which was manageable and not untypical. Demand across the team was high due to the uplift in historic investigation unit, for which all teams across the force had felt the pressure. That had led to recruitment to backfill the roles and training for new members of the team. The team were working hard on proportionality, ensuring that investigations were right from the outset and not under or over investigated. The team were ensuring they were addressing risk effectively which involved more intrusive supervision, specific to DA. It was identified

that the shift pattern was not conducive to the work life balance approach and that the shift pattern had impacted on recruitment and retention within the team. Temporary shift patterns had been established to alleviate the burden but it was recognised that more coverage was needed on weekends and afternoon and evening.

13. It was also noted that the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) processes was time consuming for the team and consideration was being given to who were the most appropriate people to attend and how the significant preparation that was needed should be managed.
14. Within the Vulnerable, Exploited, Missing and Trafficked (VEMT) team the average crime per office had remained relatively static. There were some large investigations being managed by the team including Operation Cotton. It was noted that the team was relatively new and that the intelligence assessed by the VEMT team on an individual basis had created a significant demand on staff time and resources. What was noted was that the vulnerable adults' team was a small team of 5 DCs which created a lack of resilience and would perhaps be better being absorbed into a bigger team. Although there was a small workload, investigations were long and complex and daily referrals created a significant demand? Within the Sex Offender Management Unit (SOMU) demand was consistent with last year. The PCC asked what the 'management' of SO involved and it was explained that the work was based on risk and working with key partners. Work with offenders could range from a daily to an annual visit. The PC agreed to raise the issue of sentencing at the Local Criminal Justice Partnership (LCJP) to discuss the thresholds for offenders being added to the Sex Offenders Register.
15. Discussion took place about the increase in online offending, the force were improving detection and gaining an increased understanding of the technology being used and that had led to an increase in workload.
16. The Support Hub was near to full establishment and the aim was to develop omni-competent officers. However it was agreed that a more strategic view was needed in this area to develop performance framework and find a level where workload was manageable. Discussion took place about the merits of omni-competent officers and that an appropriate way forward was needed.
17. In summary it was noted that with recent demand and abstraction rates that it was a balancing act and that PVP faced a significant pressure, which was not isolated to that department. The Corporate Team were retesting the model and it was noted that if didn't work with the staffing in place that it needed to be reconsidered.

(Jo Gleeson attended the meeting from item 4).

**Action** – that the information was noted and that the PCC would raise the issue of the Sex Offender Register thresholds at the next LCJP.

#### **Item 5 - Audits and Inspections – HMICFRS – Crime Data Integrity August 2018**

18. In advance of the publication of the HMICFRS Crime Data Integrity inspection report the PCC considered the areas for improvement that emerged from the recent HMICFRS debrief at

the Scrutiny, Delivery and Performance meeting on 11 April. The PCC sought assurance that any safeguarding issues had been addressed and what steps had been taken to address the areas of improvement that had been identified in the inspection. It was noted at that time, that an action plan had been produced and positive benefits were being seen.

19. The report was subsequently published in August 2018 and the Force was graded as 'Inadequate'. Despite the advances the Force's compliance with national crime recording standards were unacceptable in the following areas:
- The Force was currently under-recording violent crimes.
  - The process for identifying domestic violence incidents as crimes and assessing the correct closure of such incidents within the force control room does not support accurate crime recording.
  - The force was not recording crimes within the 24 hours permitted.
  - The force must improve the extent to which it collects information regarding the effect of criminality on identifiable groups within communities. In particular groups with identifiable protected characteristics (e.g. gender, sexuality or ethnicity).
  - It was noted that the failings were a consequence of officers and staff not always understanding their responsibilities for crime recording, compounded by deficiencies in the process for crime recording within the force and inconsistent and limited supervision of crime-recording decisions.
20. Recommendations were made that involved three and six month deadlines. Within the report were the following gradings:

**How effective is the force at recording reported crime?**

Inadequate - Overall crime-recording rate – 83.4% of reported crimes were recorded

**How efficiently do the systems and processes in the force support accurate crime recording?**

Good

**How well does the force demonstrate the leadership and culture necessary to meet the national standards for crime recording?**

Good

21. The PCC sought information on the progress on the action plan and the implementation of the recommendations that were required to be completed within 3 months, which were as follows

Within three months, the force should take steps to identify and address gaps in its systems and processes within its control room for identifying and recording all reports of crime. This work should include a review of:

- i. the process for the supervision of the closure of incident records, ensuring that this includes a check of compliance with the crime-recording rules and that sufficient supervisory knowledge and capacity exists to do so;
- ii. the grading process for incidents; and
- iii. the procedure for arranging and managing appointments.

22. And details of the plans for dealing with the recommendations within six months, which were as follows: the force should design and provide training for relevant staff in regard to:
- i. the importance of the **first** account of the victim when making crime-recording decisions, particularly in cases of domestic abuse;
  - ii. offences involving malicious communications, harassment and public order;
  - iii. recording as full an account as possible from callers within the incident record and making it clear when the incident amounts to a crime; and
  - iv. fully communicating all available information to officers deployed to incidents.
23. Specifically with regard to the Impact on Victims, the PCC sought details on the following:
- How are you ensuring that the needs of those reporting domestic abuse are considered and offered specialist support services?
  - Can you provide assurance that incidents recorded by Cleveland Police and relating to domestic abuse take into account any repeat victimisation? (regardless of its classification as an incident or a crime)
  - Can you confirm that stalking and harassment is taken into account following recording incidences of harassment or domestic abuse and can the Force confirm the arrangements for dealing with such cases (including those that fall out of a domestic setting i.e. stranger stalking )
  - How are victims informed if their report will be classified as 'not crimed'? What support is offered to them given they fall outside of VCOP?
24. The Force noted that they had developed a CDI action plan which had included the wider implications and way it dealt with demand.
25. For the 3 month improvements it was noted that the Force had increased its work around the grading of incidents, in line with national strategies and protocols, work had taken place with team leaders. An Incident Response Team (IRT) sergeant had been brought in to work closely with control room and improve communication with IRT. Longer term solutions, agreed with the support of the Chief Constable, was that the force incident manager should be the overall person responsible for an incident, supported by a team to ensure that the responsible person did not have to operate in isolation.
26. It was acknowledged that the quality of closure and knowledge base had created inconsistencies but Sopra Steria were looking at the performance of individuals which would be used to create meaningful development plans.
27. For the 6 month improvements, the Force were moving to a new system which would ensure that demand was picked up at the right levels. A gold group was undertaking close scrutiny to ensure that demand was dealt with by the most appropriate officer/department.

**Actions** - That the information is noted and further updates are provided in due course. That the OPCC were invited to attend the Gold Group.

That the Assistant Chief Officer to send further information to the PCC regarding the impact on victims.

## **Item 6 - Information Management – Update**



28. The PCC called a scrutiny meeting on 23 July 2018 to seek assurance from the Force about the plans that had been put in place to manage a recent data breach. The PCC received information about the immediate actions that had taken place and the on-going and future work in this area.
29. The PCC was assured by the proactive work that was taking place but wanted to be kept abreast of the work as it developed.
30. The PCC sought information on the following:
  - a) Progress on the work that was outlined to him at the meeting in July.
  - b) A fully costed and detailed action plan with relevant timescales, to cover all the potential areas of questioning that might be asked as part of the ICO investigation.
  - c) Following on from details given at the last meeting - Assurance on the specific work that was taking place to secure information from people leaving the organisation and those that had already left to ensure that the information belonging to the Force was recovered and preserved.
31. Maria Hopper attended to provide information to the PCC. She outlined that the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) sought an update and that information was being gathered based on questions asked at a previous breach. She reiterated the work undertaken to date and outlined the information strategy which stated how the Force adhered to authorised practice from the College of Policing and Data Protection guidelines, and used national guidance and legislation. An aide memoir for all staff linked to GDPR was being developed to reduce the reliance on training alone. There had been a big focus within the force to get the appropriate training completed by all staff, with priority given to high risk areas within the force.
32. Self-assessment had taken place against the ICO audit which can be used to identify gaps in GDPR compliance, it was sent out to teams in all areas of the force to do the assessment personally, the assessments had been returned and an action plan had been produced to address the gaps identified.
33. The PCC asked about the process for officers and staff that enter the Force and it was explained that information management and data protection was covered with new staff in their induction, the NCALT packages were mandatory and that training courses that involved access to data were 'front ended' by data protection information. Improvements had been made to the level of compliance in the mandatory training, in July, across all areas of business there were 660 people still to complete in the Force and 16 in the PCC's office. At 27 August this stood at 193 and 0 in PCC's office.
34. An action plan was in place, the information management unit was being restructured in order to provide the capacity to ensure that the Data Protection manager had the time to ensure the Force was GDPR compliant.
35. Superintendent Mark Thornton was leading on the collection of information from officers/staff that had left the force, although there was no evidence officers had taken blue books home, some were received in the blue book amnesty.

36. The PCC was supportive of the work that had been undertaken and wished to include a supporting letter with the information submitted to the ICO by the Force.

**Action** - That further updates are provided as appropriate and that the PCC provide a supporting letter to be given to the Force in support of the ICO information.

#### **Item 7 - Force Preparations from Brexit**

37. The APCC held a Policy Deep Dive on Brexit on the 17 July. There were a number of questions that were raised by National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) and National Crime Agency (NCA) that it was agreed would be prudent for PCCs to raise with their respective Forces.

38. The PCC asked the force for information on the following:

- a) Does the Force understand the risk impact of Brexit?;
- b) What does the Force's local resourcing model look like regarding Brexit?;
- c) Who, in the Force, is leading on Brexit preparations?; and
- d) What are your Force's plans for organisation readiness?

39. It was noted that the 7 Force Collaboration (NETIC) were looking at the issue and its impact across the 7 forces and a meeting was due to take place on 17 September with all chief constables to enable them to consider the impact of the issues facing police forces .

**Action** – That the information was noted and that further information is submitted at the next meeting.

#### **Item 8 - Update on the RIPA Review**

40. Following the judgement of the Investigatory Powers Tribunal in December 2016 the Force and the PCC jointly commissioned Weightmans LLP to conduct an in depth and independent review of the Force's use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000. (RIPA). The PCC sought an update on the current status regarding the review.

41. In addition to the information required above, it is noted that the revised Codes of Practice for Covert Surveillance and Property Interference and Covert Human Intelligence Sources had been published in August 2018. The PCC sought assurances on the Force's readiness to apply the new regimes with anticipated timescales for completion.

42. It was noted that a mature draft of the final report had been received from Weightmans, a pre-meet to discuss the report would take place on 20 September with a finished product expected by 24 September.

**Actions** - That the information is noted and further details be provided in due course.

#### **Item 9 - Appropriate Authority Liaison Meetings – Quarterly Update**

43. To update the PCC on the Appropriate Authorities Liaison Meeting. The Chief Executive of the OPCC has general delegation of respective Appropriate Authority matters and as such regular meetings take place with the Chief Executive, the Head of the Directorate of Standards and Ethics, the Head of Legal Services and the OPCC's Standards and Scrutiny Manager in order to discharge the Terms of Reference (attached at Appendix 1). The meetings take place to discuss matters of common interest and as a forum for the Force to

notify the OPCC (and vice versa) of any conduct matters arising from litigation in accordance with the Schedule 3 of the Police Reform Act 2002 and the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012

44. For information purposes, it was the intention to periodically update the PCC through the Scrutiny, Delivery and Performance meetings and provide a copy of the most recent minutes. It may be necessary to withhold the minutes from the public domain due to the nature of the subject matter however for the purposes of transparency minutes will be attached where possible.

**Actions** - That the information is noted.

### **Item 10 - Defibrillators**

45. At the Police and Crime Panel meeting in July the Chair of the Panel brought to Members' attention that there had been an issue with a defibrillator in Stockton. The PCC agreed to take up the issue and progress with the Force.

46. The current list of defibrillators was listed as follows

<b>Building</b>	<b>Number in Building</b>
M8	3 (2 in Custody, 1 front desk)
Hartlepool	1 (in custody)
Urlay Nook	1
Guisborough	1
CDSOU	12 (in ARV response cars)
LDC	1

47. The update from the Strategic Contracts Manager for the OPCC was as follows - For the future (est. by the end of August/early September) the above list would be amended, the Procurement Team were in the process of buying replacement Defibrillators (to be rolled out and located at the 5 main front desks (Stockton, Hartlepool, Kirkleatham, Middlesbrough and CSH), Custody, Urlay Nook, the LDC and finally the CDSOU ARV response cars. Any other defibrillators aside from these locations will be removed from use. The maintenance and monitoring of the new devices will be managed centrally by the Estates team (excluding those located in custody, which would be managed by the medical staff based within). All police officers and PCSO's are first aid trained, and have the ability to carry out CPR in the first instance.

48. The sought details on the following:

- An update on the Force's review of the locations of defibrillators and any replacement programme.
- How details could be provided on the Force and PCC websites to provide links to an update list of defibrillators in Cleveland (including those in locations held by other community safety partners).

49. New and updated defibrillators have been purchased in line with procurement rules, 6 had been purchased to be installed throughout the force and CDSOU vehicles. Work was taking place with other statutory agencies to ensure that the list of operational defibrillators that was kept on the Force website was maintained.

**Actions** - That the information was noted and one of the defibrillators was to be displayed at the next Police and Crime Panel meeting for Members' information.

### **Item 11 - PCC Questions**

#### **Proceeds of Crime Act**

50. Could the Force provide details of how much money has been received as a result of the Proceeds of Crime Act in 2017/18 and 2018 to date and details of where that funding has been spent?

51. Inspector Steve Bell gave an update. The PCC was reassured about the way it was managed and passed his thanks to all regarding the work that had taken place.

**Action** – that the information was noted.

#### **Monitoring AFIs from HMICFRS Inspections**

52. The PCC was familiar with the work of the Audit Committee regarding the oversight of the implementation of Areas for Improvement (AFIs), however the PCC sought information from Force regarding the practical steps that were taking place within the Force to ensure that progress was maintained and that AFIs were actioned in a timely manner.

53. It was outlined that every AFI was identified with an owner, and that tactical lead reported into the system for monitoring purposes. The HMICFRS monitoring board, chaired by the Assistant Chief Officer, and supported by 2 ACCs as operational leads, monitored actions and problem solved barriers to their completion.

54. Due to the performance exceptions and the HMICFRS actions 'cross over' the monitoring board was merged together with the performance group to incorporate AFI delivery section, which had since been replaced by the Decision and Accountability Board, chaired by the Chief Constable.

55. It was noted that the HMICFRS were developing a register for all recommendations which would be available to assist PCCs in holding the force to account for their implementation. A basic version of this would also be available to the public.

**Action** – that the information was noted.

#### **Property Store Capacity**

56. It had been brought to the PCC's attention that the property store had reached its capacity. There were items within the store that were associated with jobs that were closed and therefore there was no requirement to retain those some of the items. The PCC sought information from the Force on their plans to rationalise the items to release capacity?

57. Superintendent Dave Sutherland had been tasked to ensure that the property store was cleared of items that were no longer necessary to sort. Initially this would involve the removal of bulky item where no person has been charged and this would be disposed of automatically by October. A reassessment will then take place along with a performance management system and the exploration of longer term ICT solutions.

**Action** – that the information was noted

**Any other Business**

58. No other business was discussed.

**Date of Next meeting**

59. The next meeting will take place on 30 November 2018 at the Community Safety Hub.



## Working Together Meeting

Wednesday 26 September 2018

10am – 11.30am

Cleveland Room 1 – Cleveland Community Safety Hub, Hemlington

---

### **DRAFT MINUTES – TO BE APPROVED AT THE WORKING TOGETHER MEETING ON 13 DECEMBER**

#### **Present**

R Beard, Middlesbrough Council

N Bernal, Chief Inspector, Cleveland Police

T Evans, Stockton Youth Offending Team

J Feakes, Redcar & Cleveland Council

B Gill, Chief Inspector, Cleveland Police

S Hume, Stockton Council

J Nellist, Commissioner's Officer for Scrutiny and Policy, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

L Oldroyd, Commissioner's Officer for Reducing Reoffending, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

R Parker,

E Pout, Standards & Scrutiny Manager, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (Chair)

M Reeves, Inspector, Cleveland Police

C Sills, Stockton Council

S Smart, Divert Project Manager, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

D Sutherland, Chief Inspector, Cleveland Police

S Wilson, Commissioner's Officer for Consultation and Engagement, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

#### **1. Apologies for absence**

B Coppinger, Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland

J Hill, Middlesbrough Council

J Hodgkinson, Assistant Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

#### **2. Declarations of interests**

None.

#### **3. Notes of the previous meeting**

Notes from the previous meeting were accepted as an accurate record.

#### **4. Actions from previous meeting**

There were no outstanding actions of note.

#### **5. Neighbourhood Policing Update**

B Gill briefed representatives on Neighbourhood Policing. It was noted that Cleveland Police is undergoing a restructure of its officers which will impact the delivery of neighbourhood policing. Although no details were provided on programme timescales or changes expected, assurances were provided of the Force's continuing commitment to neighbourhood and community policing and the integrated/collaborative working models.

It was noted that integrated/co-location has been working successfully in Stockton for the last 15 years. The model is well established and S Hume offered to provide advice to those areas that are currently developing this model. It was agreed that S Hume be invited to a scheduled workshop in Redcar & Cleveland.

E-Cins the information sharing tool was felt to be a critical component for integrated working. Although it was recognised that there are some barriers to the smooth implementation (adoption) of the system. Members were concerned that there was too much duplication of data from existing/legacy systems into E-Cins which placed additional administrative burdens on local services. There was concern that duplication across systems may lead to incorrect information being shared, although there was no evidence that this was the case. It was agreed to invite the E-Cins project manager to the next meeting of this group.

Representatives requested that the PCC re-affirms the Neighbourhood/Community Policing to partners and members of the public to help raise public confidence.

B Gill reported that Operation Raptor has been re-designed to encourage retailers to take more responsibility/accountability in preventing shop-lifting on their premises. A pilot of the re-designed operation is being piloted in Middlesbrough. No performance figures or analysis are available to date to show proof of concept.

#### Actions

To invite the E-Cins project manager to future meetings.

To request that the PCC re-affirms the commitment to Neighbourhood Policing.

#### 6. **Night Time Economy issues**

D Sutherland reported that Cleveland Police capacity to pro-actively manage the night-time economy is under stress. The Force is developing models that help build capacity to support the night-time economy during core times in local authority areas. This includes pooling response officers and neighbourhood policing officers as well as making more use of Special Constables for initiatives such as Operation Payday.

#### 7. **Serious Violence Strategy – Implications for Community Safety Partnerships**

L Oldroyd informed representatives that the PCC's office is preparing bids for funding as follows:

- Support for female offenders
- Early interventions for young people
- Supporting children affected by domestic violence.

#### 8. **Any Other Business**

##### Divert Project

S Smart briefed the meeting that the PCC's Divert project has launched. This focusses on low level offenders who are given an opportunity to work with CRCs for a period of time to avoid being given a criminal record if they successfully complete a rehabilitation programme.

Work is underway with Cleveland Police and partners to develop initiatives and activities. It was noted that a pilot to manage/prevent shoplifters from offending.

9. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled to take place on 7 December 2018.