



Part 1
POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR BEDFORDSHIRE
STRATEGIC BOARD MINUTES

01 July 2021

Confirmed with	Festus Akinbusoye, Police and Crime Commissioner (FA)
	Clare Kelly, Chief Executive, OPCC (CK)
	Gavin Chambers, CFO for the OPCC (GC)
	Garry Forsyth, Chief Constable (GF)
	Sharn Basra, Assistant Chief Constable (SB)
	Phil Wells, ACO for the Force (PW)
	Madelyn Doggrell, Staff Officer DCC (MD)
	Katie Beaumont, Transparency Manager (KB) – Official Log
	Gemma McCormack, PA to PCC and Chief Executive (GMc)

<u>PART 1 – RECORDING NOT TO BE PUBLISHED</u>
<u>ITEM 1 - WELCOME & MINUTES OF MEETING HELD AND FOR AGREEMENT AND MATTERS ARISING</u>
<p>CK welcomed the board members to the June Strategic Board meeting (held on the 1st July 2021), the second strategic board meeting with FA as PCC.</p> <p>CK informed all that the PCC will be approximately 30 minutes before he joins as a last minute meeting was added to his diary by the APCC to discuss portfolio leads for areas in policing so it is important that he does attend this meeting. CK informed that the Agenda will be a little out of sync today due to the PCC wanting to cover certain aspects himself when he joins the meeting.</p> <p>Minutes were agreed as accurate with some typos which will be amended before recirculation.</p>
<u>ITEM 2 – PCC QUESTIONS OR ITEMS TO RAISE</u>
2.1 Actions from previous meetings
<p>Actions were reviewed and log updated accordingly.</p>
2.3 Info schedule agreement
<p>CK stated that she will leave 2.2 for the PCC to cover when he joins the meeting.</p> <p>2.3 Information schedule and agreement.</p> <p>At the last two strategic boards we have spoken about the information which the OPCC is now requesting and with the new PCC being in post there is a focus on transparency and making information more accessible. CK stated that the document which has been shared also included the National Changes (Specified Information Order) which have been</p>



put into one document for the Exec to review and for the OPCC to seek agreement on the information and time frames. CK asked if the Exec would be happy to agree or are there any concerns which need to be discussed?

CC stated that everything appears fine, however he asked whether or not individuals have been consulted with to the products that are already available, so it isn't a new tasking element which needs to be sourced. CK stated that the OPCC met with [REDACTED] and Phil Wells a few weeks ago and discussed the majority of the aspects which have been shown in this paper, however it was not in this state at that point in time. It did not incorporate the national asks which have been included in the paper.

CC raised a concern surrounding the aspect of publishing this national data with a regression to the prospect of targets to some of these key areas, which doesn't excite the CC, he informed us there is a separate piece which is being worked through nationally through Chiefs Council in regards to this, but he does not believe there are any concerns with the Force being able to supply that as you are talking about reductions and disruptions etc not targets. The CC stated the one bit which he was not sure on how he could represent with an infographic, data and percentages etc would be around tackling cyber-crime. CK stated that there have been ongoing discussions about what they want to present, CK is aware that [REDACTED] was trying to seek clarification on an inspection point of view. CK asked KB if any update has been received.

KB stated that she has liaised with [REDACTED] with the National statements which have been published and information has been provided, KB sought authorisation before publishing information to ensure that no sensitive data was released. However if the scope of the national needs grows this will need to be looked into by the Force and the OPCC. KB informed all the other aspects were discussed in the initial meeting with [REDACTED] however, [REDACTED] did state that she would take it away and review.

CC thanked KB, however noted as it is a National Priority, this will probably result in National Reporting, the Force can certainly give information on what we are doing, but not sure how to present that we are tackling that and national clarification will be required on that otherwise, we will all start measuring and publishing different things, in different ways.

KB explained that this does need to go up as soon as possible and as it evolves we need to review how it is published. The guidance received advises info graphics and percentages to make it more accessible and understood by members of the public. CK asked for an action to be logged.

ACTION: CK and KB to have a meeting with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to discuss the Information schedule and whether the information can be provided and if there is going to be any concerns.

ACTION: KB to make the one change raised by Phil Wells (document on information management states quarterly and should be monthly) and then draft a decision paper to note the agreement from Force and OPCC to making this information available and ensuring it is published make sure this published on our website to ensure compliance against the Specified Information Order.

The CC asked for the OPCC to fix a date each month for this information to be published as the Force has different intakes throughout the month.



<p>2.4 Terms of Reference (annual agreement)</p>
<p>CK informed all that the OPCC hasn't changed anything however annually this document must be reviewed but the Board for signoff.</p> <p>CK asked the Force if there was anything they wanted the OPCC to consider in regards to the T.O.R. The CC stated his only comment/observation was to whether or not the OPCC wanted to make specific reference to the Public Element of the meeting, in terms of questions from the public. CK agreed as this was the T.O.R as it was, not as it is now with the two parts.</p> <p>ACTION: CK and KB to review T.O.R and make suggested amendments in regards to Public Element of the meeting and redistribute.</p>
<p>5. Leadership and Culture</p>
<p>5.1: Chief Constable Complaints</p>
<p>CK stated that no new CC Complaints have been received by the OPCC.</p>
<p>5.2: Reviews</p>
<p>Five reviews received by the OPCC in the last month. 3 have been finalised and not upheld, two are still being reviewed and considered.</p> <p>Just on the topic of complaints, we had the Stop and Search Meeting a couple of weeks ago and it was highlighted that the process of ensuring the OPCC know when a Stop and Search complaint has been received is not there yet, as we were informed that complaints had been made, but the OPCC has not been informed of them. However CK has been assured that the teams will be briefed again on the process of letting us know, as CK is aware of numbers increasing in that area.</p>
<p>8. AOB – Information Management</p>
<p>PCC Akinbusoye joined the meeting. CK informed him that the agenda has been moved around slightly, so we didn't cover any aspects surrounding performance without him being present.</p>
<p>2.2 Security Assessment of Luton Airport</p>
<p>The CC provided the following update to the Commissioner.</p> <p>The Force has been in negotiation about moving the location of the base for probably since just after the CC arrived at Bedfordshire as DCC in 2017. In recognition on not just that factor, but that as one as a number of factors that doesn't make it an ideal location.</p> <p>The PCC asked when was the last time this situation was actively reviewed? The CC stated this has been recently reviewed since the tragic events a few weeks ago, because we have expressed a desire to accelerate our move out of that location now in the wake of that because that building will have associated connections for all of those officers that continue to work there and we would like to be in a position to have it resolved as soon as possible.</p>



ITEM 3 – PERFORMANCE FOCUS

3.1 Crime performance figures with restricted detail

SB stated that this paper is not just on Crime performance, its wider than that in terms of the organisation, and this information feeds into FEB so he will give the highlights and then address questions.

At this time the overall picture for the Force sits at 46 live OCGs, 19 gangs and 23 County Lines which is disproportionate for our Force and size, especially within our region. There is active work ongoing surrounding this is Op Costello. 50 arrests have been completed over 100 warrants for Op Costello, Operation Detroit is one of those investigations that involves four individuals with the conspiracy to supply drugs. It is about to be our first and finish investigation, four pleaded guilty and this will conclude on the 19th July 2020.

Crime Performance the current position is that we are experiencing 139 crimes on average per day, Year To Date, to the 129 last year, so 10 more on average per day. SB explained this time last year we were in a different space – rewind to 2019, that sore us at 151 crimes per day. Although we can see crimes per day are starting creep up, we are still lower than the levels pre-Covid. What the Force have seen in particular, in the last two weeks, is an increase in demand, which SB will discuss in a short while, but the Force has also seen an increase in productivity.

So in the last two weeks (seven days and seven days), we have seen 193 arrests in one week and 177 arrests with the following week, which has been the highest throughout this pandemic period, since April 2020. This shows the proactivity of our cops. SB stated the solved rate still needs work and needs to be improved, currently sits at 11.2%, against 13.6% the year before. That is a particular focus, with proactive arrests, let's make sure we have the appropriate turn around in terms of justice throughout.

SB stated that he will pick out some thematic areas and will continue to look for hands and comments throughout.

SB that this board has looked at this particular focus previously, Rape and the RAZZO team. The paper shows exceptional performance there and a really strong solved rate, which shows us ranked fifth nationally and again within the rape figures, our conviction rate is strong as well. There has been a lot of National Scrutiny around rape and sexual abuse and in particular conviction rates, within Bedfordshire we sit at 87.5%, which sees us placed seventh nationally and we are having other forces visit to see how our RAZZO team is working.

SB stated we have not seen the DA figures go up as we thought we would, we are actually down from last year, by 9%, but what we have seen is gaps within our emerald team, the demand by case load by officer, are probably disproportionate and that is a particular focus in relation to our wellbeing of our staff. We have seen a success stories for our arrests and daily DA focus and our detection rates and the solved rate for DA is also improving. Similarly conviction rates for DA, is above the national average, in Beds its 79.8% at court and that sees us at eighteenth nationally and again that is significant progress form previous years. SB stated that he is fully aware that the Force has lots more to do in this space, but to counter some of that national scrutiny, we have always had a suspect focus and we always prioritise victim care in that area.

SB stated one area that the Force has seen a decrease, which again is going to be a particular focus following the last performance board is Hate Crime. SB stated traditionally we have been very strong in this area, what we have seen is a significant increase in the turn of the year, which has taken us up 50%, but this has taken us back up to normal levels in



relation to pre-Covid. The key elements within there are violence without injury and public order, so lower level elements of crime, a particular focus on racial and sexual orientation within the Bedford area specifically. When you see that through, the hate crime conviction rate, which previously has been really strong has seen a reduction, so that is going to be a Focus area for this month and will be revisited at Performance Board in July.

The solved rate for residential burglary is still positive and we sit fourteenth nationally, however despite further reductions in the number of burglaries we have seen 49 fewer victims, we still do sit thirty-fourth nationally, which could attract negative headlines.

Personal robbery, theft from person and vehicle crime, SB explained that he has picked these out as these seem to be a focus nationally, we have seen reductions in terms of this criminality, however when you compare us nationally, we still are very low in terms of that national ranking. For Personal robbery, theft from person and vehicle crime, we sit between 36th and 39th Nationally, both in recorded levels and solved crime.

SB stated we have seen county wide reductions in Serious Youth Violence, although this evident in both Bedford and Luton, we have seen a slight increase in Central Beds, however the concern is the severity, and as you are aware, we suffered the tragic incident of sixteen year old Humza Hussain, who was stabbed. Despite the obvious devastation this causes the family, the strengths of the partners and our community work has really shone, in the sense there hasn't been any raised tension and if anything, the collective spirit has raised the profile with such as campaigns as, 'Bin your blade' and 'BAVEX'. SB stated that the Force continue to deploy the Sparkler patrols, and following our Stop and Search training and messages, we have seen an increase of stop search use which SB will cover in due course.

SB stated that the other area of particular demand that we are seeing is with the FCC. We have seen increase calls for service, and we have had days, where we have had over 1200 calls for Service, that is both 999s and 101s, this also includes webchats. SB stated that he will just cover the two middle weeks of June, which shows the recent increases of demand, the two seven day periods (mid-June), we had in one week, 4469 calls and in the other we had 4251 calls. If you look at pre-covid averages, are about 4100 calls, so that shows the amount of calls which are coming in to the FCC. That obviously increases the number of Cads, which is the number of incidents recorded, and that reached 3041 over a seven day period, against an average of 2562. SB informed the board that this will be the second area of focus for performance board in July, to look at how we stem that demand and how we manage it better. Especially with a Focus on our staff that work in that area, and the implications on those in response.

SB stated there is some good news surrounding file quality, showing that it is improving. In terms of failures, we have seen two months in succession now an improvement. We previously had a 30% failure rate and that has gone down into April 22% and May 11%. So that is consistent, still again there is a lot of work that needs to be done, but heading in the right direction.

In terms of victim care and victim satisfaction, again as mentioned in part of the actions, we are still working at the long term fix, to manage our victim satisfaction in a more consistent manner, and in the interim what we haven't done is we haven't stood still, we do utilise our customer support team in terms of completing surveys, however we have to be cognisant of the capacity and the other demands placed on them. In May, we attempted to contact 454 victims, and were only able to complete 113 surveys. SB stated if he picks out a few positives and some for improvement. Positive comments and responses were in, especially in initial contact, people were listening and offering practical support and there after people felt safer, and felt as though the organisation cared. Some of the areas requiring improvement is managing expectations, timeliness and update. SB explained that this is not necessarily reflective of VCOP, because



our VCOP compliance, for last month, again saw a month on month improvement, but again we do know that it is a snap shot in time and it's the qualitative base behind it, in terms of, what do those updates actually look like and feel like.

SB stated that there is Stop and Search data within the pack, would CK want this to be covered now or later in the Agenda where it is listed. CK confirmed to wait until it is discussed later on in the Agenda.

The CC asked to come in at this point as there are some bits that will want to be discussed outside of Strategic Board, as he would like to share the deep dive report with the OPCC outside of this meeting that has taken place for Stop and Search in the first instance and then look at the aspects that can break out into this and the public meeting. The CC stated it is fair to say, that he believes it to be a pretty excellent product actually and gives us a level of insight that we have not had previously and just some of the headlines from it, which he will cover just quickly now.

The CC explained that the Force has done a deep dive into all things Stop and Search, looking at records from 2020 to 2021 which totals 4059 Stop and Search records. The Force have looked to see if the Stop and Search was proactive or reactive, if the member of public that was stopped was a member of a gang or OCG. If the Stop and Search is a part of multiple searches at a single event and if the Stop and Search was for drugs, what type of drug was found on that person. We have also broken that down into individual levels of Stop and Search by officers.

CK stated that this has been presented already at the Stop and Search Board by Rachael that showed 10% were doing the highest volume of the searches. The CC stated that we had the initial cut of it and now we have the detailed cut of it, to go into the top 40 officers which account to the 42.6% of searches and the Force can break down the disparity for those officers and the outcomes for each of those officers as well, which gives us a really helpful insight to all of those things. CK stated that she is aware that is helpful and she stated at the Stop and Search Panel, that if we know that and we know the amount of people, then if you do an intervention with those people with the Force explaining, then she would expect that the figures for the next month will go right down. The CC stated it depends to whether or not the Force want to do an intervention, its quite interesting when you look at where some of the highest usage of Stop and Search are, for example, neighbourhood south, which shows a really high level of disproportionality, in terms of Asian Stop and searches, when actually that is exactly what the CC would expect it to be.

The PCC stated he understands that there is a high level of disproportionality in Central Beds, the CC stated that is the next cut of the data which is currently being reviewed and we don't know the outcome yet, in what is driving the disproportionality of Central Beds and we are looking at this. The CC stated that he would share the entire product with the PCC and his office, outside of this environment and then we can break out into this meeting and the public meeting.

Action: CC to share the Stop and Search Deep Dive report with the PCC and his office.

The CC stated that he wanted to share a fascinating number with the PCC, of all the Stop and Searches we do, 57.7% were classed as multiple stop and searches. So that is where we stop and search more than one individual at the same time, which the CC believes is a really interesting number, indicating that individuals being searched in single events constitute a high number – 2343 people are multi people stop and search events. The CC stated that we will break that out into more detail outside of here.

SB stated the only other thing that he could cover if the OPCC wishes is the Covid picture for the County. CK thanked SB however this information is received elsewhere.

CK raised the VCOP concerns and the number which has been shared today. That is one of the OPCCs major concerns, CK can see that it is at 22% non-compliance which is still quite high and CK believes there is something there we really need to still look at, in terms of join up and speed. CK believes this is where this product we have been looking



at in terms of self service, if people could get their own updates and CK would advise the Force to alter slightly on policy to allow for self-service, if the individual has chosen to do that and that the individual can access that information then this could feed into VCOP compliance and believes this would help overall. But at the minute that rate is just nowhere near where we want it.

CK stated that she would move onto her next point. CK stated that she is aware that SB mentioned Customer Support doing the surveys, CK stated she thinks the OPCC and Force still need to review and see the risk around that, we have had Signpost staff be called down to CS team a couple of times to help them with calls, where it has gone horribly wrong and CK believes that training is everything and CK is not sure that CS team have been offered the training to do that element, as we all know that people can disclose more things when they have been asked to go over a crime, so you may want to consider that element and the risk.

CK also stated Control Room, the figures from December onwards, we are never meeting the standard numbers that we would want for pick up, CK understands the increase in the webchat and it didn't move demand, it just increased it, but every time we go in there, there really is such despair over staffing and she understands the bigger picture around it, but CK wonders where this sits on the risk register and control strategy.

SB stated to give reassurance with this, we have got [REDACTED], is spending the day in FCC on Wednesday. What we have found is that there may be 'things', that we are not using or using greatest benefit of, like Cambs and Herts are. So Jon a few members of his team will be spending time in there, to review how we are operating and what we can do differently in terms of technology.

CK stated that is great news as the number of double striking she observed was concerning as she believed this was solved a decade and a half ago, but they were still doing it. The CC informed CK that this is one of the most critical considerations that the Force has at this time, in terms of critical operations and business function. The Force have put five police officers in there at the moment, we do have staffing issues that the OPCC will be aware of, some of the increase in work load is exacerbating issues, leading to people going off sick, so we are looking to increase it critically, we have done already but we will probably look to increase it further to. The Force are also looking at the options they have in terms of augmenting staffing, the extreme piece would be those people that have joined the organisation recently from the control room but still have those skills, possibly reposting them back in there for a period of time to alleviate some of that pressure. But there is a range of things we can do practically and tactically over and above, including the fixes that are being looked at with IT as well are being addressed, there will be a GOLD group for it, its just that we need to look at the frequency of that GOLD group and how that runs for in the first instance.

The PCC stated there seems to be concerns surrounding the omnicompetence thing and how it is working, is that going to stay or is that going to be scrapped by the Force? The CC stated that he does not think it will survive, we end up training people for such a long period of time that they actually go into a role, they become deskilled in the role and then expect them to know everything in that role. It never really works, that cause significant dissatisfaction, it creates delays in our throughout from training into operational capability. There is a problem with that, that if we do end up scrapping it, we have put in place a pay scale now which rates people at a level that acknowledges they can do both jobs, that will be difficult to downgrade people, actually it will be impossible to down grade people, we will have to do it for new entrants. But that would cause us issues when negotiating with UNISON, when we do that, if we do that. However the CC believes that this will be one of the fundamental actions which comes out of the FQIP review.

The PCC stated that he believes he is much more relaxed with learning the lessons from something that we have tried, it will be a painful you turn in whichever way you look at it, but it will be for the better of the organisation and in the long term. The PCC stated he agrees with the CC fully and despite the challenges that will no doubt come along the way, so I



think we will move in the right direction. The CC stated that he was not going to pre-empt the outcome of the FQIP review, however he envisages this will be the case.

CK stated she notes that with DA you have stated that it is not going up, but we have that monthly data from organisations that we commission, they are asking for more money all the time, because their reports are going up, so CK believes there is still this disparity regarding where people are comfortable to report to etc.

CK stated that RUI data no longer features anywhere within the report and she asked is that because it no longer goes to performance board. SB stated that it shouldn't as the vehicle should bring that straight into Criminal Justice Board. CK stated that we have just the Criminal Justice Board and we didn't go into RUI. When the data previously came to Strat Board, CK noted that it was dramatically starting to creep up, CK understands that it is a tool and it can be used, however CK worries around the risk assessments of offender management, and CK wondered where that level was?

SB stated it is not part of the performance framework for performance board it, its picked up in thematic areas, for example, if a person leaves custody after an incident of DA, there has to be some articulation as to why they have been subject to RUI as opposed to Bail and this is discussed for all thematic areas and discussed in the local performance.

CK said ok but where does that go?

SB stated because of this month and staff updates and moves as you know previously we have received a separate custody performance pack and that whole pack feeds in the Force performance board, we didn't get that this month, but that is the mechanism how it comes in to Force data.

CK stated so normally it is there, its just a one off. SB stated that this was the case. CK will look at the July paper next month.

The PCC asked for all to be mindful that not everybody knows what RUI is – Released under investigation – SB explained the process. If someone is being investigated whilst being in Custody, there are two options open to the Force for release, one would be released under investigation (released out of a police environment with very little control) and the second is Bail, which is released with conditions (more control over the individual – stating do not contact X or do not go to Y). CK stated that the risk is higher with RUI but it is easier to do. The CC stated that it would be worth while the PCC knowing the back story of Bail and RUI, approximately five/six years ago, there were a number of high level celebrities that were released on Bail, for a period of in excess of two years, there was a legislation change put forward and accepted by the Government, driven by the Home Secretary at the time, Teresa May, to remove police use of Bail other than in exceptional circumstances. It was originally brought in that extensions to police bail had to be granted by a senior officer and ultimately a judge. This resulted in a lot of people being RUI, which was a new way of releasing people and then there was a number of offences committed by people who were released under RUI, which meant the government recognised the need to row back. We informed them at the time it would not work, along with the probation office previously and we have done recently surrounding the DG6 recommendations around disclosure, informing them that it wont work, but they have done it none the less.

The PCC asked a question surrounding the solved rates, 11.2% which has gone down slightly from what it was, what are the critical factors that affect the solved rate for crimes and what is the national average if there is one?

The CC stated that he will give some information surrounding solved rates, showing some caution, whilst SB tries to get the figure. The CC stated that solved rates he would just caveat are interesting and useful but without any difference in



the solved rate, you can see a difference in the solved rate, if that makes sense, so bear with him. If you record more crime and detect the same numbers of crime then your solved rate goes down as you are recording more proportion, so he always likes to look at the number as well as the rate in terms of output of productivity. So just a word of caution on that which you may already be sighted on and forgive if you were.

SB stated that he was going to raise the number also as the rate may have fluctuated, but also we may have solved more crimes, and also we may have had fewer victims of crimes, so it is important to put that all into to context, SB stated he does not have the national level to date but again, you could link this in terms of safety and safeguarding for victims and the victim experience, and justice for a victim. In terms of there may have been a suspect that has been identified, and it is to ensure that the suspect is dealt with appropriately for that victim, so if we are only solving or detecting one out of ten of those crimes, by default nine victims out of ten hasn't seen justice regarding that perpetrator. That is one of the risks and considerations that the Force must consider. It's a lot more complicated than that, but happy to discuss in our upcoming one to one Commissioner. The PCC stated if he doesn't have the figure now, he can get it for another time but rest assured I was not planning on making any value judgement on whatever the figure is, its just nice to have a headline figure, to compare to and then track overtime.

5.3 Welfare Support Update

CK stated that the OPCC are due an update on Welfare Support, the last time that this was discussed in full was September 2020, when the OPCC raised this. The OPCC was funding an organisation – Counselling Foundation – an organisation that were working with victims of crime. The organisation contacted the OPCC to see if the money which was being funded by the OPCC could be funded to help police officers, that were going to them directly, as the numbers were going up. The OPCC suggested to the Force that this may have been something they wanted and did they want us to consider doing this, at the time the OPCC were asked not to do anything. CK has added to agenda as a significant amount of time has passed and she was wondering what the update is, as we would like to continue to aid support in this area. As officers are telling the OPCC that this is the only service they would go to instead of something internal or seen as internal.

The CC stated that he can provide an update, at the time in September his understanding was that five individuals approached the OPCC. CK stated at the time, yes we had only received a few however now we are aware of twelve, that have actually gone through without us actually allocating the funding (we have done this after) and we are about to go out again and open it up with the availability of 54 and the foundation have asked for the OPCC not to do any press straight away, as they received a lot of calls last time and they are not sure if they will be able to manage, they will do the 54, however they believe they will receive more calls than this.

The CC stated this is really interesting that people see this as an independent route and do it through that route rather than the Force because there is a stigma associated. The CC stated that with whatever the Force does, he does not believe that will alleviate the stigma and give people the reassurance of mind that they can do that in confidence. So, the main point for the CC is, that we want to have an offer which is available and accessible for people, without stigma and without fear and hopefully is clear as possible to understand that, so the Force has been working on this since September 2020. As well as a bit of gap that we had in signposting provision, with the capacity of OH (Occupational



Health) throughout the collaborated function. The Force now have a dedicated well being team in place, such as Nick Reeves that do the 'Brew Monday' piece and a number of other things, we spoke at the September meeting about the impending appointment of the two wellbeing coordinators, which we now have got, who are Jane and Sammi. They are in place, albeit they are still going through their induction programme. CK stated she is aware of this and they have just started and this was quite a while ago that it was raised.

The CC stated that we had the funding for them back in September, we only recruited them approximately eight weeks ago now, but that has taken up to this point to go through external recruitment and appointment, but they are here and they are landed. We have a number of people referring to them already, as well as being referred by Line Management and that is a good mix of officers and staff going into them. The overall simplicity and ensuring people know where they need to go, is hopefully covered by the 'You Matter' branding which is linked to the culture piece as well. So we are promoting that and trying to promote that as a one stop, so people only have to remember one email and one contact, so they are not unsure where they need to go. So we can ensure that the service they are given is appropriate. We do believe this is having some success surrounding awareness. We probably were not convinced of the success of the wellbeing champions, and we probably didn't have enough capacity in that space as well. So we have changed the nationally recognised Oscar Kilo Peer Supporters and put some more people into that, and again that has generated more people reaching out to that. We are going to continue to increase the numbers coming into that over the next few months as well. But in terms of recent events we have found that to be a positive addition, in terms of recognised branding piece.

TRIM has seen a bit of an increase, however the CC recognises that TRIM does carry a stigma, which we are trying to desperately overcome, as we think that is an enormously helpful product. We have really good third party relationships, like Bedford Suicide Bereavement Service, CHUMS have been great and that has Cruise. The other relationship the Force does have is NHS BLMK, who have commissioned a new service, working with NHS, Education and Emergency Services, which fast tracks individuals into support and self-referral. They do that via text, phone and appointments. So, again through the 'You Matter' branding, it's a one stop into there and then get access to services, which are best for the needs of the individual.

CK asked what the evaluation was going to be for the two new posts, as to is that the right mechanism in response to what people needed or wanted? The CC stated there is one element of that in terms of the counselling bit, we will be able to see if there is an increase in referrals for those and if it meets that. But their remit is much wider than that, in terms of creating that breathing space and that opportunity to decompress and have a conversation with somebody as well, we will be doing some evaluation in the success of their roles that won't be for a little while yet as they only landed eight weeks ago.

PW stated that an evaluation criteria has not been set yet, the idea is to let them land, let them get some appointments, and the first bit around their evaluation is that they are actually busy because we want them to talk to people, that is the first aspect. Then we can understand what they actually need to provide, that's when we will start to look at the evaluation programme.

CK stated that she would suggest that evaluation is built in and the problem with evaluation is, if you design it after they have already been up for a few weeks, you wont be able to go back and get that data, so CK thinks its worth doing



something and then it can be compared to the 54 spaces that we have with the Counselling Foundation to look at, as they have formal evaluation, around what it is people need and that will help us allocate resource in the future.

CK asked another question surrounding individuals that are going through a PSD investigation, she asked a few weeks ago for the Force to consider reaching out to those individuals, to do an assessment on each individual. Has this evaluation been done? Has there been any further incidents?

The CC stated this was considered through the GOLD group, on existing PSD investigations, but not completed. There have been a number of individuals that have intimated that it something they may choose to do, that has been picked up appropriately, when those have arisen. Those are from people that are better known in that space, than the case that resulted in suicide. But this was certainly a consideration in the GOLD group. So CK stated it has been done and everyone has been spoken to, who currently is under investigation?

The CC stated that he does not know if they all have been spoken to, but it has been considered through the GOLD group, and if an intervention was required through that, he does not know if they have all been spoken to. CK stated has there been any other incidents with anyone under investigation? The CC confirmed yes there has been.

CK stated so maybe it is worth doing and speaking to individuals under investigation if we are starting to see a pattern? There have been two incidents with a possible connection, do we need to do an evaluation on anyone else to check they have the right support and those individuals that are providing support, are they being supported, because it is a lot to take on?

The CC stated that he does not believe that the Force has engaged with everybody under investigation, in the context of if they are a suicide risk, it has been considered if there are any other suicide risks, and for those cases where a suicide risk is identified, then we have significant wrap around activity and I can think of two immediately where that has happened. The CC stated that if he is being completely frank and blunt, I think those people have probably done that as trying to gain attention, in light of recent events, rather than being a genuine risk, albeit they have long standing psychological problems which makes them a risk anyway. For those people engaging with them, I think we have accessed the risk and we should do that and we have done that through GOLD group. But I think where it is appropriate to engage with people where a heightened risk has been identified, we have done that and we will make sure we continue to do that, and appropriate welfare support as well.

The PCC asked if the welfare officers were going to be proactively or reactively reaching out to people or are they going to be sat waiting for referrals only and is this resource going to be available for staff as well or just to Police Officers? The CC confirmed that it is available to staff and officers, available to everybody and they will be reaching out proactively. The welfare officers will be getting mental health first aid training as well, so they will be well equipped to reach out to the provision.

The CC also stated they have three volunteer councillors within occupational health which is a joint piece of work that we have set up with OH. They will service all of BCH, this will be monitored and if it is a success then we will expand it further. Trauma Impact Process Techniques or TIPT, we are training this and incorporating this into the Student Officer training and looking to expand this also. The EAP service has seen an increase of usage, if I'm honest, I have spoken to



individuals that have used the EAP and pretty unimpressed with the service they are getting at the moment. The CC stated that he does not believe this is a part of the solution moving forward, but will see how that develops.

The Force have got supervisor wellbeing workshops in development, its going to be a part of the leadership workshops, as well as the Oscar Kilo work/ training as well. The CC stated coming back to CK's point about having that external provision there, which gives people confidence, we need to have the confidence that individuals won't have an adverse impact whilst going through there, but if we could signpost it separately through the 'You Matter' banner, to make people aware of it and how they can access it, but have a separation from the organisation, I think that would be a really helpful addition. As the CC does not believe that we will ever be in the position where we will have too much of that. CK stated that she does not believe it sits under the 'You Matter', she thinks you can evaluate the external and internal process, we have spoken about the strategic risk but on a tactical, it might be worth to have some signage on the two doors where they are based as people not be aware of where the wellbeing officer are.

SB stated to give two examples to reassure the PCC, in terms of that support, Nick Reeve has been attending briefings with response officers, Nick leads on the wellbeing agenda for us and the support network. SB has received direct feedback from student officers, with my responsibilities in extending their probation, where they have taken up the support that is being proactive and second element in regards to the availability to our staff and not just ours cops, we have offered support in the FCC due to the demand we have seen and spoken about, recently, we took advantage of the Oscar Kilo vans to support our response officers and we will be doing that again specifically for our control room, to make sure they have that care and support available to them.

The PCC stated that he is reassured about the consideration given to the Control Room, that is a very pressurised environment and he is glad to hear that.

6. Quarterly Reporting Efficiency – NOTHING TO REPORT THIS MONTH

7. Collaboration

7.1 Risks and any key updates from the Force to OPCC if any

CK stated that the normal process is that the OPCC ask for an update from the Force, but for today's meeting she has two which she would like to discuss.

CK stated that the Dep couldn't Chair the Strategic Roads Group the other day, so it was the Chief Inspector for the area, and he mentioned being down 25 people in roads policing and five of those were due to Mental Health related reasons and twenty was the vacancy factor, I don't remember it being so high in such a long time so I wonder if that is something we should be having a look at. The second one was around the firing range, the Chief Execs were afforded a briefing on the plans from the ACC and within that meeting it was brought to our attention that Bedfordshire Police Estates Manager, had suggested the Kempston estate instead of going with the Cambridgeshire option, because it would be better to use our existing estate instead of buying somewhere else. I would suggest the value of our land is very different, to the cost of the Cambridgeshire land, which is in the middle of nowhere, already a gun club. CK stated she is all for collaboration and being a team player but there is something there about looking after our own and we do need that money we have planned for, so in terms of risk, CK would of rather that didn't happen, but it has and we are where we are. However CK thinks we need to monitor this as those business cases progress.



The CC stated just to come back on that briefly, there are some real attractions to having a range on site here at HQ, but if it was going to use the land that is currently allocated as the field, that has the potential to be sold as housing land, then there would have to be a commercial recovery from our commercial partners that enables that to go forward. CK stated that it leads to difficult conversations about cost and payment, and strategically we should not go anywhere near it. The CC stated that he doesn't believe the business case would stack up for it anyway. The CC stated that he believes the Cambridgeshire option is the most likely anyway, albeit the difficulties around where our current assets are around the actual staff that would populate it. CK stated that she really hopes so.

The CC also stated that he has seen something recently on the vacancy factor for RPU, it has been quite high for a little while now, the CC is not aware of the exact numbers but he believes there is either 13 or 18 due to go into RPU from Cambridgeshire, but they haven't been released. He believes we have five due to go in which have not been released. The CC asked not to be quoted on those figures as he does not have them to hand, but that is being progressed through the Deps meeting because we know the pressure is on for ERSOU and that we meet the SOCO lift in there, but that cant remove the fact that we need to populate to the model with have agreed because we took out the vacancy factor, in terms of savings when we set the service levels, so we need to deliver on those numbers in there and that is very clear conversation with all Chiefs around that, so we are pressing on it.

CK stated that is what she thought, so someone may want to tell the Chief Inspector.

The CC stated he has one other update, that he believes the PCC is already aware about, but he believes its worth formally recording in here, which is around the NPAS discussion. This discussion is currently ongoing and in terms of a collaborated risk, then that is an obvious one for us. The newly appointed Mayor and Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime in West Yorkshire have given 12 months' notice to state they will cease to host NPAS and we are currently now looking for a new lead organisation and 12 months will fly by. The CC is aware of some discussion going on within the APCC around this gives us an opportunity to look at new operating models etc. The CC stated that he does not believe that we have time to look at new operating models, we have 12 months, what we need to do is find some way of accommodating that somewhere and once it has lifted and shifted, then we can explore the operating models. The CC stated that will be a risk to the viability of that, as an organisation if we then resolve that, so, its worth at this stage to note, and in no way is the CC making a move to say it should be us or associated to us.

The PCC stated that he and the CC have discussed this previously and he believes they are both on the same page that but Bedfordshire won't be taking this on.

8. AOB

CK stated she has one thing she would like to raise. CK raised that within the Forces risk register there were a couple of points on it that she would like to discuss. Under strategic risk four, CK is aware that the Force was trying to move away from the term of 'BAME'. It is throughout the Strategic Risk Register, so CK doesn't believe this has filtered out, all the way across the Force.

CK also raised within Strategic Risk Seven, is around partnerships, and the way the risk is written as if they need to manage the risk around the OPCC partnership, as in who we do business with. CK stated that if the Force believes that is a risk then they need to come and have a conversation, as no one has brought that to CK previously and this leads CK to her third point on that one, is information in strategic board, so we have been sharing over the last couple of meetings, the police and crime plan, the milestone plan and the projects we are and will be working on, that isn't filtering out. CK explained that she completed a long brief with SSID to take them through all the projects to ensure there is no



issues, but CK is aware she has said this a few times now, where information is shared at strategic Board but no further but she believes we need to find a way of getting information to the Force, as it doesn't happen through Strategic Board.

ACTION: The CC stated that the Force will invite CK to F.E.B

The CC asked when this last update surrounding the strategic risk register was done. CK informed him that it was last Thursday. The CC stated that he has not seen the most recent updated SRR. The CC stated that we have agreed to remove the word BAME, that clearly needs rewording in documents.

PW stated in regards to SR7, is that something new or is that something that has always been there? CK stated that it is new as it is blue text, and she believes the Force is like the OPCC, any recent updates are highlighted in a different colour. CK stated that she is not judging the Forces risk, its just that if they believe it is a risk then a conversation is to be had. The CC stated that the board has not seen the SRR, so it is not a final version of the SRR. CK stated that it was presented to Joint Audit Committee (J.A.C) last Thursday. PW stated that he has seen it as it has gone to JAC but he didn't recognise that. PW stated he can understand it in terms of changing from one PCC to another PCC there is some risk around if they are on the same pathway etc. PW doesn't believe this is something that will stay there for very long, so anticipates this will be removed next time around. CK stated she is not disagreeing with the risk, just to mitigate it, have a conversation. PW stated what he is stating that as an organisation that is a risk, the change in leadership of an organisation, work hand in glove with each other, so that is initial risk. The mitigation factor is the relationship between the PCC and CC which is really strong and therefore the risk doesn't exist anymore. CK stated that the risk doesn't sit between those, the risk states that it is about who the OPCC might work with and if the OPCC stops working with them this causes a risk to Force, CK believes that's the way it has been written and is open to a conversation about mitigation.

ACTION: PW confirmed he would review the SRR surrounding SR07 and the wording around the OPCC risk.

GC raised that he would like a report to come to the next Strat Board meeting if the PCC agrees. This year based on the chancellors announcement most of the public sector didn't budget for a pay award this year, it seems to be unless PW has received a further update there is going to be 1.5% pay award. So GC believes it will be useful for a paper at the next Strat, highlighting the potential overspend and what that would be, I know that we have already probably got mitigations in place already, for example the Costello grant has allocated towards this unbudgeted pay award. The main reason why GC is flagging this, we have already had a tight medium term four year budget, and I know things may change when the CSR comes out in November, but already having a very tight four year budget, building in 1.5% base into every year, which we didn't budget for, will create a very significant financial pressure across the whole four years. So wanted to flag that a very early stage, GC is sure that PW will reassure us in due course.

PW informed the PCC that he will be receiving a MTP (Medium Term Plan) at the next Strategic Board, all of our MTP apart from 21-22 is based on 2% pay award, so there will be an issue if there is a pay award in September 21 and that will be incorporated in that MTP when it comes next month. PW confirmed that nothing in policing has been confirmed yet for September 21, but there is in the public sector so far. PW stated that consideration has to be given as if local authority workers are being paid then it will be difficult to defend if the payment is not given to Police Officers.

ACTION: CK to ensure the MTP is on Julys Agenda.

All exited the restricted meeting and joined the Public Meeting.

Next Meeting: 29 July 2021 at 10am.

