

Minutes



Stop & Search and Use of Force Internal Governance Meeting

Date: Friday 3rd November 2023 at 11:00hrs – 12:30hrs

Location: MS Teams (link in meeting planner)

Attendees

CC	Chris Colley	T/Chief Superintendent, Strategic Use of Force Lead
EN	Emma Newton	Sergeant, Operational Stop & Search Lead, Tactical Use of Force Lead
HB	Harry Biggs	T/Insp Ops Command, Deputy Departmental Lead
JD	Jim Dawborn	T/Insp NPT East, Deputy Divisional Lead
BD	Bert Dean	Insp SNT North, Deputy Divisional Lead
GP	Georgia Pankhurst	T/Sergeant NPT East, East Support
AJ	Anjali Jenkins	Sergeant L&PD, Deputy Departmental Lead
TP	Tim Pulleyn	Inspector DCU, Departmental Lead
SG	Simon Gibbs	PSD Officer Manager, PSD Support
LR	Laura Richards	Portfolio Holder S&S and UoF Corporate Communications Department
JS	Julian Sherlock	Stop & Search Performance Analyst
RH	Ria Holmes	Inspector PSD, Deputy Divisional Lead
DB	David Bentley	Chief Inspector West, Divisional Lead
DMC	Dallas Mcdermott	Chief Inspector North, Divisional Lead
DS	Danny Sayer	Sergeant Custody, Deputy Departmental Lead
MC	Mark Cunningham	Chair of the External Scrutiny Panel

Apologies

CD	Clive Davies	Chief Superintendent, Strategic Stop & Search Force Lead
-----------	--------------	--

	Notes	Owner
1	Introductions At 11:00 hours, CC opened the meeting. There were apologies from CD who is out of force for several months. Meeting attendees introduced themselves and their role.	CC
2	Previous Minutes & Action Tracker Minutes: The previous meeting minutes was for the meeting held in July 2023. Not all members had seen the minutes. Minutes approved by CC pending everyone's view and agreement. EN will circulate previous meeting minutes to all members. Action Tracker: Action 68 – To review strip search policy focused on taking young people to custody. EN advised we had discussed this in previous meetings about the force stop and search policy in respect of any under 18, if they are to be stripped searched, then to for that to be done in custody. There were some concerns raised about that procedure, about taking young people into a custody environment. EN has liaised with the Staff Officer to the National Stop & Search Lead in respect of what other forces are doing, he has set up a working group nationally on the matter which is in progress, and they are hoping to establish some national guidance for forces. So, for the time being, the policy stays as it is for all under 18 persons to go to custody for strip search. No questions or comments from any attendees. Action discharged. Action 72 – To explore further, the increase in data around active resistance category, with regards to Black subjects including Reigate & Banstead / Spelthorne areas. CC stated we know from the most recent External Scrutiny Panel that the disparity between Black and White subjects around active resistance has narrowed. CC stated that data has moved on in relation to this and proposes closing the action. No questions or comments from any attendees. Action discharged. Action 74 – To review stop and searches related to this female subject [W] BD advised that 'W' has a history of self-harm and is being managed under the SHIPP program. She is well known to carry blades and it's for those reasons that the searches are carried out. In most cases, she presents the item to police, she often has it concealed on her, so officers are completing a stop and search form just for the sake of saying that they've had that interaction with her. But in most cases on asking, 'do you have anything on you, that could harm you', she produces it, and they fill out a form. There's a 66% find rate too. The SHIPP program are to give her wider support, whether we're going to see those number of instances reduce it's yet to be seen. Action discharged.	CC

Action 75 – To review data to see if it is possible to separate the data for an Ops Command breakdown to see the highest users of search powers.

EN confirmed meetings held with HB and CT, looking at both the PowerBI to Stop & Search and Use of Force, and how it can be used for Ops Command. The spreadsheets compiled by EN already contain Ops Command data. HB confirmed it's been very helpful.

Action discharged.

Action 76 – To draft comms regarding the guidance on offers using Body Worn Video for Chief Insp Dan Gutierrez to circulate.

EN confirmed that comms was completed, and BWV compliance rates remains as a standing agenda item to be reviewed at these quarterly meetings.

CC added we've had advances in this technology, which means the battery reason is less of an issue than it might have been before, and requested for SPOCs to push at briefings to make sure that wherever possible BWV is used – we're not going to get 100% compliance rate because sometimes things happen spontaneously in front of us. But 88% is still too low.

DB stated on West, they had a slight issue in terms of our proactive teams previously not having the right equipment to carry body worn. So, for example, undercover harnesses. They have now bought a significant amount of kit for their undercover teams, which now have got the clips on for body worn to be worn. So, there shouldn't be any excuses in terms of that – they should have been circulated to other divisions proactive teams. And they've now got an agreed supplier for those, so that shouldn't stop them using it.

HB also added that BWV now plays back 30 seconds as well [on activation], so that's quite helpful for this for this topic. In Ops Command regarding battery life, if they are on a protracted SFI, for example, they sometimes get to the end of the job and when they do the stops it's been highlighted that the body worn cameras have all died.

CC said in the divisional context, where the volume sits and so certainly for NPT for example, the battery life is 10 hours and within that time frame it's unusual that they don't get back to a station to be able to put one in and out.

DMC stated on the North they've been doing briefings – don't just keep hold of that one for your whole shift. When you come back in for some refs or coming to custody, always swap it out and just get a fresh one.

Action discharged.

NEW Action 81 – Ensure all divisions/departments liaise with West re the undercover clips for BWV cameras, and ensure consistent comms regarding the use of BWV, and swapping cameras if returning to a station.

Action 77 – Dip Check 10 BWV per division.

EN confirmed that a minimum of 12 BWV is completed per division per quarter. And there's a new embedded process on both Ops Command and SCU to follow the same pattern.

Action discharged.

	Action 78 - Feedback via L&PD on inflammatory language not being appropriate. DE confirmed there has been a conversation between Laurence and Jess in regard to reinforcing de-escalation and the appropriate use of language, so that is that is currently ongoing. AJ confirmed she will liaise with Laurence today. CC asked if they could incorporate it into the next round of training in the next phase. The reason is that at the External Scrutiny Panel, HMIC were on the call before last. Bad language can have a place in policing, and sometimes effective communication can be some fairly direct language, albeit we've got to be careful that we're professional. So, it's one at briefings if we can really set the professional tone and also make sure that that de-escalation side of things is really understood as we've got to get better at it. HMIC have made reference of it within the PEEL inspection report and ultimately, it's the right thing for us to really push. DE confirmed that they'll make sure it's covered off in a time on task or within the scenario-based training for the next phase. They're currently doing it anyway, but they'll make sure that there's some kind of exercise put in. Action discharged. Action 79 – SPOC to update briefings about inflammatory language not being appropriate. CC: Covered above. Action discharged. Action 80 – SPOCS to reiterate need for quality forms and BWV compliance. CC: Covered this off above and will cover more in the Use of Force update. Action discharged.	
3	Stop & Search Performance Summary & Headlines, including Disproportionality, Qualitative Reviews, and Strip Search In relation to some of the key updates from the performance product that was uploaded to the MS Teams channel, this is rolling 12 months data leading up to and including the 30th of September. We've had just over 5000 stop and search forms compared to just over 4500 for the previous 12-month period. That's a percentage increase of just over 9% of stop and search forms. About 1000 or so of these forms took place at Thorpe Park. So, if we discount Thorpe Park, because it can skew the figures, then there was an overall percentage increase of 3.4%. There's a relatively even split across divisions, North the highest at 36%, East at 32% and West at 26%, which is consistent with what we've seen in previous quarters. Looking at the find rate, excluding Thorpe Park, the latest find rate is 35.1%, which has increased from 32.1% and that has been a steady and consistent increase over the last several quarters. A couple of years ago, we were in the mid to late 20s and now we are right up at 35.1%, which is really good. The find rate for White subjects is a 36% and for Black subjects is 44.5%, and Minority Ethnic as a combined group has a find rate of 41.3%.	EN

What this is telling us is that the searches that we're doing on Black subjects, almost half the time we are finding something.

Looking at different stop powers and ethnicities, for drugs, for White subjects, a find rate of 30%, for Black subjects 35%, and for Section 1 White subjects 26%, and for Black subjects 36%.

As usual, most of the stops are for drugs, so drugs stops accounted for 64% with a find rate of 32%, which is also good and about 70% of all drug stops are for possession with a find rate of 33%, and the majority of those are for cannabis with a find rate of 41%.

Section 60 searches: In the quarter that we're looking at, there were no Section 60 authorisations; there was a recent one on East which will discuss at the next quarter.

Strip Searches: Ever since the Child Q reviews, we now review all strip searches every quarter and that's to ensure that they've been recorded correctly and that the grounds are justified in appropriate in the circumstances. There's been an update to the stop and search policy to include strip searches, so also looking to see that the policies being adhered to, especially in under 18 cases.

We had 43 recorded strip searches for the last quarter. But over half of those either related to Custody Sergeant authorised strip searches in custody, post arrest, and so they're not stop and search strip searches, and quite a number of forms had boxes ticked in error, so they ticked no to strip search, but they've ticked yes to a more thorough search or to an exposure of intimate parts. So, it's still flags as a strip search.

The forms and the information have already been fed back to the divisional leads. **If I could just ask for further comms, in relation to recording Custody Sergeant authorised searches as stop and search strip searches and making sure we're ticking boxes correctly.**

There were 18 actual strip searches for the last quarter. One of those had really good, justifiable grounds for both the stop and search element and the strip search part of the search. That person was a Black subject. They were under 18 and it was really good to see that the policy and procedure was followed correctly in terms of the search being completed in custody. Contact was made with their parent or guardian and then the appropriate adult was present.

In respect of the other 17 forms, whilst the grounds of the forms covered the initial stop search and the grounds were good, there was then no further grounds to justify the strip search and bearing in mind this is a very intrusive power, officers do need to ensure that they include grounds for the strip search on the stop and search forms as well.

In respect to strip searching for this quarter, this has noted been noted before, but there were two forms that have been recorded where the subject had had an initial stop and search. One was a Section 1, and one was a Section 23. Items have been found and both subjects had been arrested. Both subjects were then taken to hospital prior to being conveyed to custody and at hospital there were then further grounds the officers had which justified them then conducting a strip search. Once they were all done the hospital, they then proceeded to custody.

So, this flagged a question of what power did the officers use to strip search those subjects under arrest? In their forms they highlighted it was the continuation of a Section 1 and Section 23 power. Having liaised with the force legislation team, they've spoken with PNLD, who highlighted that both Section 1 and Section 23 are pre-arrest powers only, and Section 54 didn't apply because they hadn't yet been into custody, so their detention wasn't yet authorised.

We have liaised with Weightmans to establish in these circumstances what legal the correct legal powers to use. We are still awaiting for the final advice, which will then be shared on receipt, but the verbal update has been a strip search can be conducted under Section 32. In those circumstances, if you've got a subject under arrest who hasn't yet been to custody and you need to do a strip search, it can be done under Section 32. The office has just need to ensure that they provide that full justification in their statements.

BD asked if that could be put in writing to be sent out to teams. EN advised that once the final advice was received in written form from Weightmans, comms would be drafted and disseminated.

NEW Action 82 – Send summary learning document re strip search to all teams via SPOCs.

RH highlighted the body worn issue in relation to complaints, where the general complaints relate to either body worn not being on and therefore there's a suggestion that we've been underhand because why wouldn't we have it on if it's there and available to us, or the officer is not telling the member of the public that it's on, which would be a breach of policy, so we're therefore left with the option of having to say that service isn't satisfactory.

The main message from the Complaint Manager is if BWV is not available, explain why, and if it is, tell the individual that that it is on and it's activated, and then we won't fall foul of that.

NEW Action 83 – Reinforce comms regarding BWV usage, that officers must declare that BWV is on and recording.

EN added that in relation to body worn compliance, the compliance rate for Stop & Search dipped quite a bit in the previous quarter, although there has been a significant increase in the latest quarter, but because we're looking at rolling year data overall for the rolling year, the compliance rate is still about 76%. That equates to about 1200 stop and search incidents that have not been recorded on body worn.

Each of the divisional leads has been given a list of those officers who have not had it on for three or more occasions. But there's still a huge list of those who haven't had it on for one or two occasions.

Looking at a disproportionality, this is a big focus at the moment, so 74% of all the stops were on White subjects, and 5% were on Black subjects, and Black to White disproportionality is currently at 5.1. When we look at different teams, the DCU and proactive teams have a much higher rate of disproportionality, it's more like 8, whereas response and neighbourhood it's more like between 2-3.

	Having spoken with DCU and Proactive Teams, we think that the reason they have high disproportionality is because both teams are used for force operations and they're used for things like Op Flight, which is at East Surrey College, and Op Launch at Thorpe Park where there's a high number of visitors including residents and non-residents. So, there's going to be a disproportionate number of people going to those locations. And with the way disproportionality works, Black people make up approximately 1% of Surrey's population. So, in order for there to be no disproportionality, we only be able to search one black person for every 100-white people. But of course, that's not what happens when you've got operations like at Thorpe Park. So, in order to ensure that these searches being conducted by probationers and DCU and proactive teams are lawful and justifiable, we've embedded a new process on DCU and in Ops Command where body worn video and stop search forms are now reviewed the same way that the divisions review them. The Cambridge University research that Chief Superintendent Davies has previously spoken about is continuing. There's a couple of working hypothesis and there's some looking at experimental designs to test the hypothesis, one of which being the use of virtual reality technology. There was a meeting with DDAT yesterday to look at how we can start to use virtual reality in our training to test unconscious bias and disproportionality. And then finally, the learning development of released a history of stop and search E Learning training package. Hopefully everybody's seen it and is aware of it and is pushing for completion on the divisions. It explores some key events in history, including Brixton Riots, Steven Lawrence, and Child Q to highlight topic areas such as disproportionality, nonconscious bias. This is again of particular importance, considering that we do have a young workforce, many of whom now won't have been alive in the times of Brixton Riots. But those events in history will be passed down through Black communities, so it's important that they are kept alive in the police as well and that we are aware of that history. NEW Action 84 – Updates from all leads about completion of the History of Stop & Search e-learning training package at next meeting, by division and department. CC highlighted the training package is useful and insightful and would like to ensure there is a high level of compliance around it, especially given some of the national challenges that facing policing at the moment. MC stated that although disproportionality is higher still for black people in the area, it was encouraging to see that the find rate had increased. CC added it was a key discussion point at the External Scrutiny Panel, and what we're largely seeing as MC just alluded to is an appropriate find rate. So, there is no evidence that we're inappropriately targeting, but actually what we're seeing at the moment is a fairly reassuring picture with some caveats, which will always be the case.	
4	Use of Force Performance Summary & Headlines, including Disproportionality & Qualitative Reviews	CC

CC advised that use of force forms is up just over 12% in the last 12 months. It's something this meeting has continued to push in terms of that recording level. Continue to brief into teams that we want forms to be completed on every occasion and regardless of who and where.

But the one thing that is still a real challenge for us is the quality of the forms. It's very variable and without exception the use of force that is used in all of the reviews we've done over so many years now is justified when we look at body worn and when we consider the officers statement. But all too often, the use of force form hasn't got sufficient detail to justify the use of force.

And when we are looking at HMRC based activity, they are going off the form it's so important under that key part of legitimacy that we're not copying and pasting statements which we've had previously, but we're in a succinct way, covering off PLANER and showing what the subject behaviour was, considering impact factors, and then what we did to tackle that subject behaviour.

Two other key areas to discuss which were noted rightly by the external panel: Our under 18 forms have increased by just over 15% with an increase broadly evenly split across the three divisions. We are going to be doing some dip checks with external panel members around under 18's.

CC confirmed there had been some dip checks by the external panel and it was agreed, albeit low numbers, what we're seeing is an example of a compliant under 18, which is the most concerning where we've got a compliant subject, but we're still using force on under 18.

The body worn that has been reviewed so far has been nothing more than grabbing hold of the subject's arm to give much needed control, and before then officers are speaking on an appropriate level to that child. But that said, we don't to be complacent.

So, the under 18 rise is of note and CC requested for all divisional/departmental leads to take that away and include in briefings to teams.

CC continued on with White subjects, where forms are fairly stable with a 4% increase, but when we compare that with Black subject forms, that's gone up by nearly 17.5%. It's Black subject forms that CC would like everyone to do some more work on.

There are three boroughs within the force that have the biggest proportion of Black subject forms, and they are Spelthorne at 19.3% of the overall total, Guildford at 13.9%, and Epsom at 10.4%, and again the [external] panel will be doing some dip checks on this and looking at body worn with EN's support, but that's something else for everyone to take away because we need to satisfy ourselves that the increase is totally legitimate, and that takes me on to the request of everyone as SPOCs, moving forward, could each rep dip check 12 use of force forms per quarter, and look at 4 body worn video clips per quarter, two of which should be for Black subjects, covering your relevant borough if that's relevant to you, of either Spelthorne, Guildford, or Epsom.

DMC highlighted that in the past where we've looked at numbers of Black people stopped and searched or had use of force, we've compared that to the Surrey

population, and it's important to note that we get a lot of cross border criminality coming across that don't live on us as well, which impacts on our figures, especially in Spelthorne.

CC confirmed he had raised that to the external panel, and we've [previously] had some independent academic work done. If we took our non-resident stops and use of force out, then our disproportionality would almost halve. The concerns around the Black increases, the county lines element to Spelthorne, could be a consideration based on some previous knowledge of that part of the county. And the same is true at Epsom, but there isn't a highly diverse populous outside of Surrey neighbouring Guildford apart from Woking which is a higher diverse in Asian population.

CC confirmed that on a quarterly basis we randomly select 35 White subject records for use of force and 35 Black subject records. We're seeing that the force used is justified regardless of ethnicity and that's a trend that goes back a long time now. So, what we've looked at today, we're reassured by, but that said, we have seen quite a significant increase in under 18 and Black subjects.

Taser is an ongoing issue for us. We have reviewed all 160 Taser usages in the last quarter and that's from drawing the Taser through to red dotting and ultimately firing. And we haven't seen any inappropriate use towards black subjects. We have identified 11 non compliances which is largely around recording, which has been sent out to divisional leads.

The final thing to cover off from the External Panel is that we looked at 4 body worn video clips earlier this week, and [the feedback] is relevant for you [divisional leads] to take away in terms of both stop and search and use of force in terms of what the panel found.

Clip 1: An interaction in Redhill involving a Black subject and two proactive officers. The view of the panel was that the initial approach and the stop was very aggressive towards the subject and unnecessarily so. And instead of de-escalating, causes the subject to behave in a heightened way. So, there's officer feedback that's going to be given in respect of that interaction.

Clip 2: A Roads Policing Stop whereby we had a suspicious vehicle that was driving around and doubling back. Subjects were compliant within the vehicle. They were handcuffed without any communication at all as to why were they being detained. One of the officers then threatens use of Taser if they become uncompliant. The external panel flagged that the handcuffing needed some communication to be put across. In particular, one of the passengers was a compliant female, and the panel felt that there was absolutely no justification for that. But there was no rationale given in any case, and clearly the threat of Taser was much discussion at that meeting and there was nothing to justify that verbal threat from the officers.

Clip 3: Strip search done very well on North Surrey, amazing communications, a contrast drawn with this one being so good and the Redhill interaction being the complete opposite, but that was really good and we're going to make sure that via the Northern SPOC that real and positive feedback is also shared in relation to that encounter.

	Clip 4: An officer trying to get compliance in the early hours from the male subject holding a tiny baby of six months. The subject runs from the officer and the officer is chasing the male with baby in arms with Taser drawn, making threats to Taser and then when we do get compliance from the subject, we're still making threats to Taser and the obvious there is if Taser was deployed, what would that do to the child. This has been fed back through organisational learning. But it's another one that really, we should be reiterating with our staff around Taser because in the four clips we've looked at just on this occasion, we've had a verbal threat to deploy Taser where it's not justified and then we're running down the road chasing someone holding a baby whereby and Taser could be deployed and be very harmful. MC added the thing that triggered his interest in why he wanted to see it was that it just seemed like the initial interaction, the very first thing from what we could see anyway, the first thing that the officer said to the person in the vehicles that they should stay put all they'll be tasered. So, you just seem like that was the first the initial interaction there could have been something prior to that, but it just seemed to be term, as you say, heavy handed. MC added the only other thing that's probably worth mentioning is concerns on the number of officers not using body worn. CC confirmed that was being addressed, and that for use of force, it's 88% compliant and each SPOC has taken it away to reiterate with their team, along with the language issue that we keep identifying and then finally the form standards as well improving. So, they have three key messages that the SPOCs will take back to brief into the teams directly.	
5	Divisional Report: East The number of stops was 213 the previous year increased to 334. Find rate has increased above the force average of 33.9% last quarter to now 38.3%, which equates to a 5.5% rate improvement. Supervisors checking forms on PRONTO and the number of outstanding forms that need to be checked and processed by Sergeant currently stands at 101. A week prior, it was 120, but following an email out to the sergeants, it has reduced by somewhat. There is a recent change from all the officers having to just send the forms to 1 dedicated supervisor for the for the division. Now that's the decision has been made to us for us to send them out to line managers. We have sent comms out via email, but this is something that's going to have to be on briefing slides to increase awareness, which leads on to the next part of the outstanding forms that have been returned to submitting officer for rework. That currently stands at 408 forms when checked two days ago and shockingly one or two of them are from 2018 into 2019. Most of the forms when I've gone through them are sent back for clearer grounds because they're simply not enough grounds or it was just the bare basics written on the forms. JD and EN have had discussions on how this can be improved, suggestions are a short presentation of slides for each stop search grounds to be presented by the duty officers, general comms to the division about the importance of checking and clearing PRONTO trays and outstanding tasks before each set of rest days. Give one month for officers to get their stop search forms completed. Anyone who doesn't have the	JD

anyone who doesn't complete this will have to see either myself or the Rep to explain why there hasn't been done.

CC stated that was noted and clearly not acceptable. It's a fundamental part of our legitimacy and we need a plan to crack down on that number.

NEW Action 85 – Number of PRONTO outstanding forms to be significantly reduced within 1 month.

EN added that the suggestion around the briefing was to create a very short briefing, two or three slides, share that across the force so that it's abundantly clear on what the expectation is in terms of stop and search forms and grounds and timeliness. And then the reason behind that, one line on the governance and the scrutiny because essentially that's 400 odd forms that have been sent back because the grounds weren't good enough and any one of those could be dip checked by HMIC at any point.

CC added furthermore it comes back to the standards and it should be included within focus and future focus conversations with our staff as well. Any briefing slide we do, it is about standards because if you've got a rework and you're not doing it and some of them going back to 2018, that that needs a robust conversation, and there needs to be accountability around it, and line managers need to grip it, and if they're not, we need to be gripping the line managers. It can't be 'when we get round to it, we'll have a look at that.' This is a key part of legitimacy and we've got to be all over it.

RH highlighted it seems a bit of a culture and a trend around the quality of documentation and the value of pocket notebook entries, particularly now we've moved across to MDT and a lot of officers are either doing a use of force form or a statement and relying on that or relying on their body worn and what they're not seeing, is investigations from our world in PSD.

BWV if it's not retained evidentially doesn't save, and it doesn't capture your thought process and what that immediate camera doesn't capture, is if there is a big build up to that incident that led the officers to being in front of an individual and using what seemed just on the face of the footage, quite excessive. You capture that either in a statement or a pocket notebook entry and it's the best thing you know.

It's selling it to them that we're not expecting it to be perfect, but you need to record something because if you don't and the suggestion is it's not legal, then an illegal application of force is an assault and then you're into a criminal defence territory. So, it is serious, and it is important without putting the fear of God into them, that as busy as they are, it's protection for themselves ultimately.

CC agreed and added that the overarching thing here is standards that I want us to take away from because the way we dressed, the way we act and that professionalism thing is, is a bit of a theme throughout this meeting and we've covered it off. There are two things: if it wasn't written down, it never happened, and the other thing is the College of Policing Risk Principle for a quality decision based on what was known. If you've got no record of it, then it can't be quality by definition, and it won't be tomorrow necessarily that we're held to account, it could be as many months or in some cases years, years later, so recording links directly to standards.

	EN added that the other thing to remember with Stop & Search, that we don't have as much with use of force is if find rates about 35%, that means about 65% of the time, it's no further action. If it's a no further action, then a lot of the time there's not going to be an occurrence and without an occurrence you don't have anywhere on NICE to upload body worn footage to. So, in the vast majority of cases, after 28 days you've not saved your body worn anywhere because there's no occurrence, so the body worn is gone from the system and it's lost forever. At least a lot of the time with use of force you do have that body worn as it's linked to a crime. So, if the Stop & Search forms aren't recorded in a good way, then that's it, that's all you've got to rely on. There won't be a statement, there won't be body worn and that's the message we've consistently tried to get across as to why stop and search grounds of the form are so important because if you are talking about months or years down the line that will be your only thing, you've got to refer to. NEW Action 86 – EN to create a short and punchy briefing slide. NEW Action 87 – JD to speak to AM re incorporating reviews into Sergeant MOTs on East.	
6	Divisional Report: West Stop searches on West have gone up 11.9% in the last quarter. Under 13 searches have also gone up. We had six, all of which 12 years old. We need to look into the reasons why. Those searched multiple times, so we've got top one as the label with a vulnerable female who suffers from mental health and will carry weapons. A male is well known to us for drugs and weapons. Overall, on West for the last quarter, 75 were under the age of 18 with only a find rate of 9.3%, which I think is quite significant for us. We need to be better at that. So actual top officers here, I looked at the top three. The first one is a proactive officer with a decent find rate mainly for drugs, but offensive weapons as well. There is nothing to suggest any kind of disproportionality. The second one is an NPIT officer, who's just moved over to our new model, so it would have been their previous work, six searches for drugs, no finds, but nothing to suggest disproportionality. The last one is an officer in our local proactive team, six stop searches this period, but this was the officer was identified as an outlier in terms of body worn video. BWV compliance has been addressed with the wider team. And, as mentioned earlier, we've got the kit now, so there should be no excuses. Key issues for us on Western, there are significant increases in both Guildford and Woking, but we've seen reduces in find rates in Guildford. Those are going to be the two areas of focus, Guildford, and Woking. BR has completed the BWV reviews, the common themes are good professional behaviour, and robust action. There was one in his opinion which was over the top where they used Taser, and BR has gone back into the local SPOC around that. We've now got a nominated PS's in NPIT who is going to help us with more reviews. Key themes for Western are increase in use, which is great, but drop-in find rates and then in particular the lack of find rates on young people.	DB

	CC highlighted that the second highest user with six searches but no finds, was of note, and was there a training need, accepting there might not be disproportionality in it. DB will get someone to sit down and discuss with those opportunities with him and the circumstances around them. NEW Action 88 – Update next time for each division on PRONTO reworks and supervisor gaps.	
7	Divisional Report: North We've had an increase on stop and searches, but the positive which we've talked about is a find rate going up from 32% to 36.1%. Looking at PRONTO, the backlogs were forms that needed to be checked and processed by Sergeants, which was at an extremely high 929, the main reason for that was 699 which were sat with Mark Devlin to resolve. All supervisors have been emailed and we're now down to 276. Moving on to the outstanding forms that have been returned for reworks, there were 379 but of those 198 actually relate to officers on North Surrey. Emails have been sent out to all of those to ensure they are resolved. Op Launch obviously generates a lot. Having spoken to Mark about his challenge with getting these reviewed, he does make it very clear in the joining instructions and the briefings that officers must send their stop and search forms to their own supervisor, not to him. Stop & Search of Under 13's, we had six in total. The first incident relates to 5 youths being searched. Property was located on two of those males, all white males, parents were suitably informed which was good. The second one relates to a male seen to be with another group of teenagers making some sort of exchange, and they all ran and fled, discarding property. He was searched under the Misuse of Drugs Act, the only thing for feedback for the officer here, was the object of the search was ticked 'not known', which it should have been obviously drugs. That's been fed back to him and his Sergeant, again appropriate adult was notified of the stop and search. Subjects that are searched on more than one occasion, seven in total, but really good find rates. The total find rate is 78.6%, so again no concerns there. Number of subjects that were stopped and searched on three or more occasions. There was a 16-year-old male and 22-year-old female. No concerns or issues. Officers who have conducted 12 or more stop searches in the quarter, two of our most proactive officers on the division, one SNT officer, one NPT officer and again, no concerns, really good find rates for both of those proactive officers. Body worn video reviews, there were three with the same theme where the full GO WISELY wasn't captured or wasn't said, feedback has gone back to those individuals and their supervisors to ensure that full GO WISELY is given. What are we proud of? The interactions with the female we spoke about.	BD

	What are we working on? Compliance around our NCALT packages. I've got 50% compliance at the moment, but that's being pushed. What are we worried about? The PRONTO issues - when someone gets given an account on PRONTO, it is manually inputted. PRONTO isn't updated by the Active Directory, so we have a lot of people who are in some cases still shown as probationer on PRONTO, who are now an acting or temporary, or even a full substantive Sergeant. And yet no one has updated their role within PRONTO, which means that they never get to see the Stop & Search in tray. So, officers could be sending these to their supervisor, and the supervisor never sees them because they've not got the right access, so there's an issue there and it's going to work out how we get that result. NEW Action 89 – Divisional leads to feedback at a suitable divisional meeting and ensure PRONTO admin is addressed for any officer undertaking acting, temporary or substantive duties. NEW Action 90 – EN to liaise with PRONTO team, get a list of everyone's PRONTO status.	
8	Departmental Report: Ops Command HB highlighted that there can be an issue with them being a collaborative unit, where officers get a Sussex number as well as a Surrey number – potential impacts with PRONTO, and supervisors. There were no stop searches of under 13's. Numbers of those searched on more than one occasion, there was four and it was one dog handler just came to my attention and having looked at both stops, it was one of our proactive targets. As a matter of routine in Ops Command anyway, due to our number of stop searches being lower, we do a supervisor review on searches on any black male. One area we are just standardising at the moment is on the scoring system of 1 to 5 is what is a 5 – there are some newly promoted sergeants here who might be very different to a traffic sergeant. One other area of Ops is none of our data will ever show in terms of where it was accounted for so, for example, if we do lots of stops on East, it will just go into the Eastern data, so effectively we can't account for necessarily where all stops are taking place, but generally we obviously have crime targets across all three boroughs. So, around activity it's just about where the divisions need us. NEW Action 91 – Liaise with the Special Chief for a Special Representative at the Internal Governance Board.	HB
9	Departmental Updates: DCU, L&PD, PST No updates this quarter – updates from next quarter.	CC

10	Departmental Update: PSD – Complaints Data Overall complaints in relation to Stop & Search are just slightly up but still low. North: 4, West: 2, East: 0, Ops Command: 0. The majority were dealt with outside of Schedule 3, so resolved or low-level resolutions. Two complaints involved Non-White subjects, one is a live complaint, non-recent event from 2019, where a member of public said they were racially profiled, pulled out of their car, and stripped searched at a police station. The other one relates to an officer who's [allegedly] touched a complainant's penis whilst conducting a search, it was referred to the IOPC, and returned for a local investigation. That's still live as well. There are no real themes on vehicle stops, so there's no real themes coming out at all. Use of Force complaints are down about 9% on the last quarter. Highest figures are in the North, lowest in East, but they're all fairly equal numbers. No major disparities. As with Stop & Search, the majority are low level resolution, but third of their cases are still live and being investigated. There was an increase in Taser: linked to being pointed at someone, a deployment of where someone was branching sticks and bottles, there was a drunk male, but no mention from any of the attending officers or PCSO of the use of Taser, but that came from the complainant, so that's why it was flagged, and there was one linked to a serious injury where the complainant alleges her leg was fractured whilst in custody. This was referred to the IOPC but returned for local investigation. She was checked by HCP three times and didn't diagnose any serious injuries, so we're still trying to ascertain where and when this injury may have occurred and it's a live investigation at this time. We may have caused her injury or contributed to it, but it's in the course of a justifiable force, so there won't be any conduct as a result of it. It's just unfortunate, it was part of the takedown, but it's not an immediate concern. CC then summarised the key topics spoken about in this meeting: - Ensuring that BWV is on - Ensuring our language is appropriate and pushing standards of behaviour is really important. - PRONTO which centres around some admin but also some standards - Feedback from for this meeting that will include more use of force next time.	SG
11	A.O.B No A.O.B raised. Meeting closed.	CC
12	Next meeting	CC