

Public Document Pack

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

Members are hereby requested to attend the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel, to be held at **10.30 am** on **Friday, 5 October 2018** at **County Hall, Lewes**.

Tony Kershaw

Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel

27 September 2018

Webcasting Notice

Please note: This meeting will be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via East Sussex County Council's website on the internet – at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm that the meeting is to be filmed. Generally the public gallery is not filmed. However, by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. The webcast will be available via the link below: <http://www.eastsussex.public-i.tv/core/>.

Agenda

- 10.30 am 1. **Declarations of Interest**
- Members and officers must declare any pecuniary or personal interest in any business on the agenda. They should also make declarations at any stage such an interest becomes apparent during the meeting. Consideration should be given to leaving the meeting if the nature of the interest warrants it. If in doubt contact Democratic Services, West Sussex County Council, before the meeting.
- 10.35 am 2. **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 16)
- To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting on 29 June (cream paper).
- 10.40 am 3. **Urgent Matters**
- Items not on the agenda which the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
- 10.40 am 4. **Public Question Time** (Pages 17 - 20)
- Members of the public wishing to ask a question of the Commissioner or the Panel will need to submit their question no later than two weeks prior to the date of the meeting. Responses will tabled at the meeting.
- Any questioners wishing to attend the meeting and pose their question in person will be invited to ask a supplementary question, based on the response.

- 11.00 am 5. **The role of the Commissioner in ensuring Sussex Police provide an effective response to schools and other educational establishments** (Pages 21 - 28)
- Report by the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- The report provides an update in respect of the Sussex Police response to schools and other educational establishments and sets out the continued role of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner in ensuring that Sussex Police provides an effective policing response to schools and other educational establishments, and how the Chief Constable is held to account to ensure that the Sussex Police response is both efficient and effective.
- The Panel is asked to note the report.
- 11.40 am 6. **Quarterly Report of Complaints** (Pages 29 - 32)
- Report by the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel.
- The report provides details of the correspondence received and the action taken.
- The Panel is asked to consider the report and raise any issues or concerns.
- 11.50 am 7. **Policing and Crime Act 2017 - Police Complaints Reform** (Pages 33 - 36)
- Report by the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- The report report outlines the chosen model for handling policing complaints in Sussex.
- The Panel is asked to note the report.
- 12.20 pm 8. **Commissioner's Question Time**
- The Panel is asked to raise any issues or queries concerning crime and policing in Sussex with the Commissioner.
- There will be one question per member only and one supplementary question; further supplementary questions allowable only where time permits.
- The Chairman will seek to group together questions on the same topic.
- 12.35 pm 9. **Date of Next Meeting and Future Meeting Dates**
- The next meeting of the Panel will take place on 1 February 2019 at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Lewes.

To all members of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel

This page is intentionally left blank

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

29 June 2018 – At a meeting of the Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Lewes.

Present:

Cllr Bill Bentley	East Sussex County Council	Cllr Mike Clayden	Arun District Council
Cllr Claire Dowling	Wealden District Council	Cllr Eleanor Kirby -Green	Rother District Council
Cllr Carolyn Lambert	East Sussex County Council	Cllr Mo Marsh	Brighton & Hove City Council
Cllr Joe Miller	Brighton & Hove City Council	Cllr Christian Mitchell	West Sussex County Council
Cllr Tony Nicholson	Lewes District Council	Mr Peter Nightingale	Independent Member
Cllr Dave Simmons	Adur District Council	Cllr Brenda Smith	Crawley Borough Council
Cllr Val Turner	Worthing Borough Council	Cllr John Ungar	Eastbourne Borough Council
Cllr Norman Webster	Mid Sussex District Council	Cllr Tricia Youtan	Horsham District Council

Substitutes:

Cllr Andy Batsford, Hastings Borough Council (In place of Cllr Colin Fitzgerald)
Cllr Carol Purnell, Chichester District Council (In place of Cllr Eileen Lintill)

Apologies were received from Cllr Colin Fitzgerald (Hastings Borough Council), Cllr Eileen Lintill (Chichester District Council) and Miss Susan Scholefield (Independent member)

Also in attendance:

Part I

1. Appointment of Chairman and Vice Chairman

1.1 Cllr Purnell proposed Cllr Bentley as Chairman of the Panel for the forthcoming year. The proposal was seconded by Cllrs Nicholson and Simmons. The appointment was agreed by the Panel.

1.2 Resolved – that Cllr Bentley is elected Chairman of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.

1.3 Cllr Webster proposed Cllr Mitchell as Vice-Chairman of the Panel for the forthcoming year. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Purnell. The appointment was agreed by the Panel.

1.4 Resolved – that Cllr Mitchell is elected Vice-Chairman of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel for the ensuing year.

2. Declarations of Interests

2.1 In accordance with the code of conduct members of the Panel declared the personal interests contained in the table below.

Panel Member	Personal Interest
Bill Bentley	Chairman of East Sussex Safer Community Board Member of LGA Safer and Stronger Communities Board
Mike Clayden	Chairman of Safer Arun Partnership
Claire Dowling	Chairman of Safer Wealden Partnership
Colin Fitzgerald	Employed by Solace Women's Aid Charity Chairman of Safer Hastings Partnership
Eleanor Kirby-Green	Member of Safer Rother Partnership
Carolyn Lambert	Member of East Sussex Fire Authority
Eileen Lintill	Member of Chichester Community Safety Partnership
Mo Marsh	Lead Councillor for Community Safety (BHCC) Deputy Chair of the Neighbourhoods Inclusion Communities and Equalities Committee (BHCC)
Tony Nicholson	Co-Chairman of Eastbourne & Lewes Community Safety Partnership
Susan Scholefield	A serving Magistrate Chair of the Competition Appeal Tribunal and Competition Service
Dave Simmons	Chairman of Adur and Worthing Safer Communities Partnership
Val Turner	Member of Safer Communities Partnership, Adur and Worthing
John Ungar	Co-Chairman of Eastbourne & Lewes Community Safety Partnership
Norman Webster	Member of Mid Sussex Community Safety Partnership
Tricia Youtan	Member of Horsham Community Safety Partnership Cabinet Member for Community Safety at Horsham District Council

2.2 In addition, Cllr Purnell declared a personal interest as a member of the Chichester Community Safety Partnership, Cllr Simmons declared a personal interest in respect of the item on the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner's Annual Report as Senior Adviser on Education and Special

Educational Needs to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills at West Sussex County Council and Cllr Bentley declared a personal interest in respect of the item on the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner's Annual Report as a member of East Sussex County Council's Cabinet that took the decision to make cuts to its housing support services.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

3.1 Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 27 April 2018 be confirmed as a correct record.

4. Annual Review of Membership and Proportionality

4.1 The Panel considered a report by the Clerk to the Sussex Police & Crime Panel which set out the political makeup of the Panel's constituent authorities (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes).

4.2 Resolved – that the Panel: -

i. Renews the appointment of Mr Peter Nightingale, Independent Co-opted Member, to take effect immediately.

ii Renews the appointment of Miss Susan Scholefield, Independent Co-opted Member, to take effect immediately.

iii. Notes the appointment of Councillor Joe Miller as second representative for Brighton and Hove City Council.

iv. Agrees that either East or West Sussex county councils should be invited to appoint an additional local authority member (see para 2.10), for a one-year period of office; and

v. Appoints Councillor Carolyn Lambert from East Sussex County Council to take effect immediately.

5. Public Question Time

5.1 Mr Nixon asked the following Question of the Commissioner:-

Any person who has had any interaction with Sussex Police as a victim, witness or suspect of crime is entitled to make subject access request for all information held in police reports on themselves. Any police reports sent by the data protection department are redacted to remove information on any other people. Reports being received in 2018 are know redacting the names of police officers on grounds that police officer names are their personal information when police officers are public servants. While we would all agree redacting the name of police officers may be okay when they are working in sensitive police departments like armed police or special branch this process is being extended to redacting of names of police officers working in neighbourhood policing. Example of this new approach occurred when a DASH risk assessment was done with myself on 8th Nov 2017 by my family liaison officer based at Crawley Police Station where his name was redacted from the DASH despite me

knowing he had completed the DASH risk assessment with me as it had been recorded on body worn camera.

Secondly instead of providing police reports, DASH/HARA risk assessment with appropriate reactions of other peoples information they are know cutting and pasting information from a police report, DASH into word document to the extent that the applicant person does not know what information has been redacted and therefore is not in a position to apply for a disclosure order from a court for un-redaction if they do not know what information needs un-redacting as it is not being shown anymore.

Can the PCC please advise what she thinks about this new approach being taken by her data protection department and whether we should return to the old system of disclosing the names of police officers and disclosing redacted police reports?

5.2 The Commissioner gave the following response to Mr Nixon's question:-

5.3 These were the rules of the Information Commissioner's Office – Sussex Police wants to be transparent and act within the law. A police officer's name was personal information and there was no legal requirement for it to be supplied without the officer's permission.

5.4 The PCC offered to pass the question to the data protection department of the Chief Constable's office for a response to the questioner.

5.5 The Chairman encouraged more members of the public to either ask questions at Panel meetings or send them in by writing.

6. The Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner's Annual Report 2017/18

6.1 The Panel considered a report by the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (copy appended to the signed minutes) which was introduced by Katy Bourne, Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) , who told the Panel that the report was positive and that more graphics would be added to make it more user-friendly – a link to the new version would then be sent to the Panel. The PCC highlighted the following from the report: -

- The four policing and crime initiatives were: -
 1. Strengthen local policing
 2. Work with local communities and partners to keep Sussex safe
 - The PCC's Sussex Restorative Justice Partnership (SRJP) that brought together twenty organisations had won national recognition with all participating organisations seen as providing examples of good practice

- Over 28,000 victims and over 3,000 offenders had been offered a service from the SRJP in 2017/18 with 233 restorative outcomes delivered compared to 15 in the previous six years
- Funding for community safety partnerships had been protected for five years in a row

3. Protect our vulnerable and help victims cope and recover from crime and abuse

- The Drive Project was a three year initiative working with perpetrators to reduce incidents of domestic abuse in high risk cases
- In the first two years it had involved 169 perpetrators associated to 180 victims and 202 children with 71 cases being closed
- During this time there had been reductions in sexual abuse of 92%, physical abuse 84%, harassment 82% and jealous/controlling behaviour 59%
- Victim Support had contacted 45,000 people, 220% more than the previous year
- Over 3,450 victims were referred to the Local Support Service with nearly 3,000 getting face-to-face help and over 1,700 receiving specialist help
- The increase in precept meant that £1.25m could be invested in the Public Protection Unit so more officers and Crown Prosecution Services staff could be trained to deal with cases of stalking and harassment
- Reports of stalking had increased by 231% in 2017/18 and reports of harassment had gone up by 20%
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services had been commissioned by the PCC to inspect Sussex Police's response to stalking and harassment

4. Improve access to justice for victims and witnesses

- The PCC thanked all her officers for their hard work during the year

6.2 Summary of responses to the Panel's questions and comments: -

- The new Anti-Modern Slavery Delivery Manager would work across agencies and forces to raise awareness of this hidden crime and help identify where it was happening – the Hastings Discovery Hub was an example of good practice in this area and had made a number of recent arrests
- The SRJP only dealt with adults, youth offending teams handled restorative justice for children, but the PCC's office was looking at a model operated by Surrey County Council which did deal with young people
- The deployment of the extra police offers being recruited would be decided by the Chief Constable
- The PCC was holding the Chief Constable to account over police response times
- Evidence from the Drive Project may have an impact on how services were commissioned in the future

- The Medium Term Financial Strategy was flexible and could be reviewed to reflect increasing demand e.g. from new housing developments
- The PCC's office was working with councils to make use of S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy money
- The Youth Commission provided an opportunity to learn about young people's concerns over policing and had a big impact, but was only ever meant to be short-term
- Sussex Police had adopted some of the Commission's recommendations and had introduced child-centred policing and young people's advisory groups
- There were over 90 youth ambassadors
- The ambassadors had suggested changes to the Stop and Search video
- Money from reserves had been used for parts of the budget, both revenue and capital, with money from capital receipts going back into reserves
- The PCC regularly challenged the Chief Constable over crime-solving rates
- The PCC was not consulted on the cuts to East Sussex County Council's housing support services which would be mitigated for one year
- The PCC was on the Domestic Violence Oversight Group and co-commissioned domestic violence services with East Sussex County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council using a pooled budget for a three year contract
- Joint working could lead to more funding
- The length of the contract was good for both service providers and victims

6.3 Resolved – that the Panel welcomes the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner's Annual Report and looks forward to updates on the work around domestic violence and cross-boundary co-operation.

7. Financial Outturn Report 2017/18

7.1 The Panel considered a report by the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (copy appended to the signed minutes) which was introduced by Katy Bourne, Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC), who told the Panel that the audited accounts would be published by the end of July and highlighted the following: -

- The £3.7m underspend had been returned to reserves and then allocated to the 2018/22 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) – this still left emergency reserves at 4% of the budget
- £16.8m had been saved during the year and £3m had been raised through the increased precept – this enabled local policing to be strengthened and more police officers and specialist staff to be employed
- There was a small underspend on the PCC's office
- The investment interest gained of £0.560m was higher than expected due to better than anticipated interest rates
- £22.8m had been invested in new estate and vehicles
- The MTFS would be reviewed and brought to the Panel at its October meeting

- The audited statement of accounts can be viewed at <https://www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/media/3463/pcc-group-final-signed-accounts-2017-18.pdf>

7.2 Summary of responses to the Panel's questions and comments: -

- Sussex Police had a 30 year Public Finance Initiative contract for the provision of custody services which was being reviewed as better value for money could be achieved by doing things differently
- Better interest rates than expected were achieved by forecasting ahead and investing for longer periods
- Sussex Police achieved more savings than its target which showed the effectiveness of its change programmes
- Seized assets were split evenly between Sussex Police and the PCC's office which then gave funds to the safer Sussex community partnerships
- The team responsible for seizing assets was funded by the assets seized

7.3 Resolved that – the Panel notes the report.

8. Police Officer Recruitment Diversity Outcomes 2017/18

8.1 The Panel considered a report by the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (copy appended to the signed minutes) which was introduced by Mark Streater, Chief Executive, Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner, who highlighted the following: -

- 2.3% of the Sussex Police workforce was Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) and 45.4% was female
- A Positive Action Plan had been developed that supported recruitment campaigns in February and October 2016 with further campaigns in July 2017 and February 2018 – the progress of all BME and female candidates in the July 2017 campaign have been tracked through all stages
- Community representatives were used to reach BME groups in urban areas and engagement events were held in Crawley
- There was a dedicated team to support BME applicants
- As a result of the July 2017 campaign, five BME candidates were successful (16.7% of BME applicants) compared to 31.8% of white applicants
- There were encouraging signs from the February 2018 campaign
- It was hoped that an extra 800 police officers would be employed in the next four years with the means to do this set out in an Attraction Strategy

8.2 Summary of responses to the Panel's questions and comments: -

- New recruits were supported through their probation periods
- There were clear procedures on bullying and discrimination with any breaches likely to be picked-up in exit interviews if not before
- Diversity balance was also important for civilian police staff
- The recruitment experiences had been shared with the Fire & Rescue Service

- Further detail of the breakdown of applicants was available – **ACTION:** The office of the PCC to supply this information to the Panel via Ninesh Edwards
- Unsuccessful candidates for any role were given feedback
- Sussex Police operated a fast track entry system for graduates and direct entry for superintendents
- Sussex Police had an apprenticeship scheme through which apprentices could earn a degree after three years

8.3 Resolved – that the Panel notes the update.

9. Video Enabled Justice

9.1 The Panel considered a verbal update by Mark Streater, Chief Executive, Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner, who told the Panel: -

- A Home Office grant of £11m was obtained last year that was used to partly pay for a £42m programme to make better use of video technology in courts – this would mean savings and better access to justice for victims and witnesses as they would not have to travel to court
- The programme involved Sussex, Surrey, Kent and London and created virtual courts initially dealing with remand hearings only
- The system was working efficiently in six custody centres in Kent meaning prisoners did not have to travel to court
- The system would go live in Sussex and Surrey in November with full regional implementation in the New Year
- It was hoped that hearings would become more effective and that there would be more guilty pleas
- It was estimated that 500 trials carried out this way would save 3,000 hours of police time
- The programme operated within the national courts reform structure

9.2 Summary of responses to the Panel's questions and comments: -

- Trials still involved people attending court – if they became more virtual the national courts reform structure would have to decide how the public could have access to them
- A vulnerable witness suite had been established in Sussex and it was hoped to add a second

9.3 Resolved – that the Panel notes the update.

10. Tactical Firearms Unit Tour Feedback

10.1 Those Panel members who took part in the tour found it extremely interesting and informative and were pleased to learn that there were plans to upgrade the firearms training facility in the future.

11. Annual Report from the Host Authority

11.1 The Panel considered a report by the Clerk to the Police & Crime Panel (copy appended to the signed minutes) which was introduced by

Ninesh Edwards, Senior Advisor, West Sussex County Council, who highlighted the proposed change to the Panel's constitution whereby the Police & Crime Commissioner had agreed that members of the public could attend Panel meetings to ask questions in person as well as in writing. A new mileage rate of 45p per mile for travel expenses had also been introduced.

11.2 Summary of responses to the Panel's questions and comments: -

- Panel members would receive performance management training after the October formal meeting
- A detailed breakdown of the Panel's expenses could be found at www.westsussex.gov.uk/pcp

11.3 Resolved – that the Panel: -

- i. Notes the budget outturn for 2017/18
- ii. Agrees to amend its constitution to allow questions from members of the public at the beginning of every formal meeting of the Panel
- iii. Notes the new mileage rate of 45p per mile in respect of Panel members' travel expenses

12. The National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels

12.1 The Panel considered a report by the Clerk to the Police & Crime Panel (copy appended to the signed minutes) which was introduced by the Chairman who told the Panel that the constitution and work programme of the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels would be agreed at its November meeting.

12.2 Resolved – that the Panel: -

- i. Formally agrees to join the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels and agrees the annual fee of £500
- ii. Agrees that the Sussex Police and Crime Panel is represented on the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels by the Chairman, with the Vice Chairman acting as substitute in the event the Chairman is unavailable

13. Written Questions

13.1 The Panel received responses provided to written questions received from members of the public prior to the meeting (copy appended to the signed minutes). The Panel had no further questions.

13.2 Resolved - that the Panel notes the report.

14. Commissioner's Question Time

14.1 The following responses were given to questions: -

- Terrorism –
 - The Police & Crime Commissioner's (PCC) budget reserves would be used if needed as a result of any act of terrorism in Sussex

- 101 response times –
 - The PCC had raised this with the Chief Constable in May and learned that the Chief Superintendent was looking at staff rotas and recruiting more staff, but it was hard to predict busy times
 - More time spent on calls resulted in better outcomes for those reporting crimes
 - 40% of calls did not relate to police matters
 - Online reporting was increasing
 - A tour of the call centre was offered to the Panel
- No PCC representation at Worthing County Lines event and progress with County Lines –
 - The PCC would look into why no-one from her office attended the Worthing event
 - Sussex Police was the first force to use drug dealing telecommunications restrictions orders to close down lines
 - A lot of work was going on with partners regionally and further afield on County Lines
- Sufficient police officers in Brighton to deal with the expected influx of travellers over summer –
 - There were transit sites in the Brighton area that should be able to cope with any increase in travellers over summer
- The allocation of police officers
 - This was an operational matter to be decided by the Chief Constable

14.2 Resolved – that the Panel notes the Commissioner’s responses.

15. Working Group Appointments

15.1 The Chairman called for volunteers to form this year’s Precept Working Group.

15.2 Resolved – that the following Panel members be appointed to the Precept Working group: -

- Cllr Bentley
- Cllr Miller
- Cllr Mitchell
- Cllr Nicholson
- Mr Nightingale
- Cllr Simmons
- Cllr Webster

And that Ninesh Edwards ask Miss Scholefield if she would also join the group so that it contained both independent Panel members.

16. Date of Next Meeting and Future Meeting Dates

16.1 The next meeting of the Panel would take place on 5 October 2018 at 10.30 at County Hall, Lewes.

The meeting ended at 1.31 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

5 October 2018

Public Questions to the Commissioner and Panel

Report by the Clerk to the Police and Crime Panel

The table below provides a schedule of the questions received prior to this meeting and where possible responses have been included. Responses will be tabled at the meeting that were not available at the time of despatch. Written Questions must be received 2 weeks before a meeting of the Panel and the Commissioner or Panel Chairman is invited to provide a response by noon of the day before the meeting.

Questions that relate to operational matters of Sussex Police will be passed to a relevant officer at Sussex Police for a response and a brief summary of the question will be provided below. For the current meeting nine questions have been received for a response by the Commissioner.

An updated version of this report can be found here which includes the written responses to the written questions.

Question	Response
<p>1) Thank you very much for giving the opportunity to West Sussex Growers' Association (WSGA) to ask a question at your public meeting in Lewes on 5th October 2018.</p> <p>You are probably already aware that WSGA businesses have annual sales values of over £1billion and employs more than 9,000 people; mostly in the Arun & Chichester Districts. You will also be aware that over many years our Members have suffered the consequences from the illegal camping of Travellers on their land. The consequences include; not only the legal costs of getting the Travellers moved on, but concerns around security for both staff and the site itself, and the cost of clearing up the rubbish, general detritus and human waste left behind. You will also know that this problem has occurred equally on land owned by Local Councils.</p> <p>We know that local police forces are as frustrated as we are concerning their inability to act robustly and swiftly when Travellers camp illegally on both private and publicly owned land.</p> <p>So; the question is: "What's the problem? What's stopping our police force from acting robustly & swiftly to move Travellers and to charge them with an offence? What's the Commissioner doing about it?"</p>	

<p>John Hall – West Sussex Growers’ Association, and Chairman of the Farming & Rural Issues Group South East</p>	
<p>2) How much does it cost to run the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (including all salaries and other expenses)?</p> <p>2b) In this time of huge government cuts would that money not be better spent directly by Sussex Police?</p> <p>Chiddingly Parish Council</p>	
<p>3) In a newspaper it was reported that there is shortage of police constables but every police service has a commissioner, chief constable, commander, chief superintendent and chief inspector together with all their deputies and assistants.</p> <p>I know it may have little relevance to the truth but it is a common theme – Do the Sussex Police Service have a disproportionate supply of senior officers with associated costs?</p> <p>Chiddingly Parish Council</p>	
<p>4) Does the Commissioner feel there is a sufficient visible policing presence in our high streets at night (I live in Bognor Regis, and don’t feel there is)?</p> <p>Mr Phillips, Bognor Regis</p>	
<p>5) Could the Commissioner please advise how many people (including herself) are included in her team, what is the annual budget for her and her team (including the cost of the various initiatives planned for the current financial year), and how many front line policemen could be employed for this cost?</p> <p>Chris Bloor, Hooe.</p>	

<p>6) Many residents in my Parish (Donnington, Chichester) are seriously concerned about the escalating levels of anti-social behaviour – often fuelled by alcohol and drug use – and even worse, drug dealers are now peddling their wares in our Parish, seemingly with impunity.</p> <p>The lack of Police presence on our streets, whether warranted officers or PSCOs, has resulted in this escalation. An expedient application of resources to nip this in the bud in the first place would have prevented the more difficult, time consuming and expensive solutions now required.</p> <p>How does the PCC intend to address this issue (in my Parish and across the County) – now and in future?</p> <p>Mr Hipkiss of Chichester</p>	
<p>7) Does Sussex Police have sufficient resources to tackle drug use and anti-social behaviour, or do alternative approaches need to be employed to manage the situation?</p> <p>Mr Dean, Chichester</p>	
<p>8) We have seen an increase in crime in Horsham town centre wards and local residents are understandably concerned about the lack of community policing. Residents do not feel safe and some are changing their daily routines as a result, e.g. avoiding walking from their home to the station early in the morning and in the evening. We have therefore launched a campaign calling for an increase in resources for community policing which, so far, has been supported by over 300 concerned Horsham residents. What are your plans for addressing this serious and pressing issue?</p> <p>Karen Symes Horsham Labour Party</p>	
<p>9)</p> <p>a) Time spent at road traffic accidents (RTA). When police attend an RTA they typically close the road for a substantial period while they attend to the accident. I can understand the need to properly deal with any injuries, but the time then spent on</p>	

gathering witness statements, other evidence and awaiting recovery vehicles can take even longer. Meanwhile hundreds, if not thousands, of motorists may be held up for an hour or two. Ok, some of these may be in no hurry, but many more have jobs to do, meetings to attend, children to fetch, flights to catch etc. The direct and indirect cost can be very high. Hence my question is, might it be possible for the police to give more priority to getting the traffic moving again asap? If this means witness statements being curtailed, or vehicles being manually pushed to the side of the road, albeit with volunteer assistance, then it seems a price worth paying for the general public good.

- b) **Breathalysing drivers at RTAs.** The first time I was ever breathalysed was when I went to help a friend of the family who was a passenger in an RTA vehicle at 4 o'clock in the morning, and needed some support. The lead police officer at the scene, seemed to make a point of breathalysing all drivers in sight, even though he could clearly see that I for one, was stone-cold sober and had only come along to support my friend. Needless to say I was clear, but when I recall the story to other friends and relatives it makes us all wonder whether we should ever stop at, or travel to, an RTA, if an item high on the police agenda is taking the chance to breathalyse you. This can be bad for the police and bad for justice. Hence my question is why can't the police be given a little more discretion as to who they breathalyse? And please don't think I'm trying to be soft on drink-driving. I'm all in favour of breathalyser tests – especially random checks.
- c) **Freemasonry.** What percentage of your officers are freemasons? If its more than the national average, do you think that this is good for public confidence in the police?

Mr Woodridge of Henfield

No Background Papers



To:	The Sussex Police & Crime Panel
From:	The Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner
Subject:	The role of the Commissioner in ensuring Sussex Police provides an effective response to schools and other educational establishments
Date:	5 October 2018
Recommendation:	That the Police & Crime Panel note the report.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides a further update from the previous report that went to the Sussex Police & Crime Panel on 6 October 2017 in respect of the Sussex Police response to schools and other educational establishments.
- 1.2 The report also sets out the continued role of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner in ensuring that Sussex Police provides an effective policing response to schools and other educational establishments, and how the Chief Constable is held to account to ensure that the Sussex Police response is both efficient and effective.

2.0 Prevention Youth Officers

- 2.1 Prevention Youth Officer (PYO) posts were introduced by Sussex Police on 6 November 2017 when the Prevention strand of the Local Policing Programme went live.
- 2.2 Sussex Police currently has 20 PYO posts dedicated to developing and maintaining working relationships with schools and other educational establishments. The PYOs replaced the Neighbourhood School Officer posts that performed this role previously. It is worth emphasising that there were no reductions in the number of these posts during this transition.
- 2.3 PYOs have been in place now for 11 months and are an integral part of the Local Prevention Teams. These officers work closely with multi-agency safeguarding and vulnerability teams to tackle any identified problems that arise and ensure that a more consistent and joined-up approach exists around information sharing and problem solving.
- 2.4 PYOs also have a responsibility to share their knowledge and expertise with police colleagues from Response, Investigations and other departments within the Force. They are also required to assist in upskilling all officers (especially other officers working in Prevention) in their understanding of how best to engage and deal with children and young people and of Operation Stepping Stone - the Sussex Police initiative to reduce the criminalisation of children and young people.

Agenda Item 5

- 2.5 The PYOs spend at least 25% of their time in schools and other educational establishments delivering targeted inputs around specific priority areas. These inputs are agreed at the start of each academic year and look at both the policing priorities for Sussex Police and the data recorded by the Force in respect of crimes in schools and other educational establishments.
- 2.6 Sussex Police has developed new processes to provide greater structure around communication with schools and other educational establishments. This includes the requirement for head teachers and/or safeguarding leads to carry out risk assessments on any incidents that take place within their grounds.
- 2.7 Schools and other educational establishments are also asked to record the actions and interventions they complete within their premises. Part of this process includes making decisions about whether there is a need to escalate a matter to the police or not because many low-level crimes and incidents can be dealt with by schools and other educational establishments within their own behavioural policies.
- 2.8 If a young person is subsequently referred to the police, the collation of this evidence provides the investigating officer with more information to assist them in their decision making, allowing a greater consideration of all possible outcome options. There is a clear need for schools and other educational establishments to be able to intervene and offer children and young people diversionary activities that are broader than simply pursuing prosecutions through the criminal justice system. This approach should also contribute to reductions in the number of children and young people who are unnecessarily criminalised.
- 2.9 As well as working with children and young people in schools, the PYOs have also formed long-standing relationships with young people and their carers in children's homes. Sussex Police recognise that children and young people in care are some of the most vulnerable in our communities. By forming these relationships in different settings and establishments, the Force aims to reduce the risk of these children and young people becoming vulnerable through child sexual exploitation.

3.0 Other Sussex Police Initiatives to Work Closely with Children and Young People

- 3.1 Sussex Police continue to work closely with the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) lead for children and young people. There is a national appetite to treat children as children first and to reduce the unnecessary criminalisation of children and young people. Operation Stepping Stone is used to embed this ethos throughout Sussex.
- 3.2 The Force now has an established Youth Ambassador role consisting of over 120 police officers and staff with a passion for developing and improving the relationship between young people and the police in Sussex. The Youth Ambassadors are a local point of contact and seek to influence their peers and colleagues in the way they work and engage with children and young people.

- 3.3 Each of the three policing divisions (Brighton & Hove, East Sussex and West Sussex) has a senior officer representative who sits on the relevant Youth Offending Service Executive Boards and Partnership Tactical Coordinating Groups. The regional Prevent lead also links the Youth Safety Team within Sussex Police to the Prevent Board.
- 3.4 Two Police Constables continue to work across the three campuses of the University of Brighton to provide support and guidance to more than 20,000 students. The two officers have a strong visible presence at the University within the educational buildings and the on-site and community accommodation, and are contactable through clinics, telephone, email and social media.
- 3.5 Effective working relationships have also been developed with student services to ensure that there is good information sharing around safeguarding. These posts also provide a comprehensive communication pathway between the University and the relevant Local Policing Teams. Both of these roles are paid for by the University of Brighton, with a 10% contribution received from the funds recovered through the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA). These posts do not currently serve Sussex University.
- 3.6 Sussex Police is currently in the process of developing a pan-Sussex Youth Early Intervention Community Engagement Protocol with a number of other providers including: East Sussex Youth Offending Team; Brighton & Hove Youth Offending Service; West Sussex Youth Offending Service; Safer East Sussex Team; National Health Service (NHS) Partnership; and the Police and Court Liaison and Diversion Service (PCLDS).
- 3.7 The Protocol aims to create a consistent approach to delivering a service to the local communities within Sussex who are suffering the effects of anti-social behaviour and low-level criminality. The Protocol also sets out a joint response to provide targeted support to children and young people involved in these types of offences at the earliest opportunity, and to reduce their risk of exploitation and likelihood of re-offending in the future. The PYOs will be a key part of the success of this Protocol.
- 3.8 Sussex Police is also working with the Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (OSPCC) to bid for part of the £22 million that has been made available by the Home Office through the Early Intervention Youth Fund to provide preventative and diversionary activities. This Fund is linked to the Serious Violence Strategy that was launched by the Home Secretary in April 2018.
- 3.9 There is national work ongoing around policing in schools, which will provide guidance for schools about when to contact the police. In the interim, schools and other educational establishments are asked to contact Sussex Police through the non-emergency number (101), online through the Force website or by email if the matter does not require an immediate response. This contact should always be made through the emergency number (999) if an immediate response is required. All reports of crime will be recorded and assessed based on threat, risk and harm. This approach ensures that the most appropriate response can be taken.

Agenda Item 5

- 3.10 The Personal, Social Health and Economic (PSHE) Association is also working with the police service to develop nationally recognised packages for the police to deliver in schools and other educational establishments.
- 3.11 Sussex Police has also introduced a newsletter that is distributed to schools and other educational establishments on a termly basis with information that is relevant to them.
- 3.12 In addition, the Force has established a Younger People External Reference Group (ERG) to improve the trust and confidence young people have in Sussex Police. The ERG will provide younger people with an opportunity to advise, challenge and inform Sussex Police on a variety of topics. The membership comprises of Sussex residents between the ages of 16 and 24 years old and meets three times a year to discuss specific topics and provide feedback.

4.0 Performance Information Relating to Educational Establishments

- 4.1 There was a 7% increase in the number of recorded crimes relating to educational establishments in 2017/18 (1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018), in comparison to the same period in 2016/17. This included all recorded crimes relating to schools, colleges and universities, and equated to an additional 114 crimes recorded.

Educational Establishment	2016/17	2017/18	Difference	% Difference
School	1,451	1,527	+ 76	+ 5%
College	160	198	+ 38	+ 24%
University	141	141	+/- 0	+/- 0%
Total	1,752	1,866	+ 114	+ 7%

- 4.2 Schools had the greatest number of recorded crimes in 2017/18 and the biggest percentage increase in comparison to the year before. There are 656 schools in Sussex, which equated to 2.33 crimes recorded per school in 2017/18. This was an increase of 0.12 crimes (and +5%) per school. The data available is again not separated between primary and secondary schools although, as set out in last year's report, it is recognised that the vast majority of these crimes were recorded in secondary schools.
- 4.3 Increases of note included 'sexual offences' (+ 63 additional offences recorded and +45%), 'burglary' (+ 22 additional offences recorded and +17%), and 'violence against the person' (+25 additional offences recorded and +3%). A breakdown of all of these crime types by educational establishment is included in Appendix A.
- 4.4 Sussex Police can be confident that the increases in the number of recorded crimes is accurate because of the grading of 'good' that the Force has received in previous Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Service (HMICFRS) crime data integrity inspections.
- 4.5 A reduction in the resources and ability of schools to deal with matters within their own behavioural policies and procedures continues to be recognised as a potential contributing factor to the increases in recorded crime.

5.0 Role of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner

- 5.1 The Commissioner has continued to support the Chief Constable and Sussex Police to provide an effective response to schools and other educational establishments by providing funding through the following: policing precept, Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and Safer in Sussex Community Fund (SiSCF).
- 5.2 The Commissioner was again given public and Police & Crime Panel support to increase the policing part of the Council Tax for 2018/19 following a proposal set out by the Chief Constable. The Chief Constable has published his Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy which sets out how the Force will use the additional funding provided by the PCC to modernise and strengthen local policing.
- 5.3 The Commissioner also allocated £1.215m to the CSPs in Sussex across 2018/19. This was the sixth year running that the Commissioner protected this funding despite national reductions, with CSPs receiving the same level of funding as they did in 2012/13. This funding has been used by each of the CSPs to tackle crime and local priorities, including the provision of support to schools and other educational establishments in their areas.
- 5.4 The three Youth Offending Boards in Sussex are also given a combined total of £318,896 each year by the Commissioner as part of the community safety funding settlement. The Head of Partnerships from the OSPCC continues to sit on all three of these Boards and provides additional oversight, monitoring and guidance around initiatives to reduce youth offending.
- 5.5 In addition, a total of £14,350 from the SiSCF has been allocated to support three local projects that tackle crime and improve community safety in and around schools and other educational establishments since last year's report. A summary of these projects, amounts awarded and a brief description of their work is included in Appendix B. In total, £86,310 has been allocated to support 19 projects in and around schools and other educational establishments since the SiSCF was created.

6.0 Accountability

- 6.1 The Commissioner has supported the Chief Constable in the development of the Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy.
- 6.2 Now that the Strategy has been launched, the Commissioner will hold the Chief Constable to account for its delivery. This will include an expectation that this investment will enable Sussex Police to demonstrate:
- improvements in crime prevention and public engagement, as highlighted by HMICFRS;
 - an increase in public awareness and understanding of police deployments and the revised local policing approach; and
 - an increase in public confidence.

Agenda Item 5

- 6.3 The Commissioner will monitor progress made against the delivery of the Strategy and challenge, where appropriate, through her schemes of corporate governance on behalf of the public including her public monthly webcast Performance & Accountability Meetings (PAMs).
- 6.4 The Sussex Police response to schools and other educational establishments and the Sussex Police 2018/22 Transformation Strategy were raised as themes at the PAMs on 15 September 2017 and 20 April 2018, respectively. These sessions are archived and can be viewed on the Commissioner's website through the following link:
www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/get-involved/webcasting/

Recommended – That the Police & Crime Panel note the report.

Mark Streater
Chief Executive
Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner

Email: mark.streater@sussex-pcc.gov.uk
Telephone: 01273 481584

APPENDIX A – Performance Information Relating to Educational Establishments

Educational Establishment	Crime Type	2016/17	2017/18	Difference	% Difference
School	Auto theft	4	6	+ 2	+ 50%
	Burglary	96	121	+ 25	+ 26%
	Criminal damage	163	167	+ 4	+ 2%
	Other offences	57	49	- 8	- 14%
	Other theft and handling	231	219	- 12	- 5%
	Possession of controlled drugs (cannabis)	38	24	- 14	- 37%
	Possession of controlled drugs (excluding cannabis)	2	1	- 1	- 50%
	Robbery	2	1	- 1	- 50%
	Sexual offences	124	187	+ 63	+ 51%
	Trafficking in controlled drugs	4	5	+ 1	+ 25%
	Vehicle interference and tampering	0	1	+ 1	+/- 0%
	Violence against the person	730	746	+ 16	+ 2%
Total		1,451	1,527	+ 76	+ 5%
College	Auto theft	2	2	+/- 0	+/- 0%
	Burglary	16	12	- 4	- 25%
	Criminal damage	16	22	+ 6	+ 38%
	Other offences	3	10	+ 7	+ 233%
	Other theft and handling	55	76	+ 21	+ 38%
	Possession of controlled drugs (cannabis)	3	2	- 1	- 33%
	Possession of controlled drugs (excluding cannabis)	1	0	- 1	- 100%
	Robbery	0	2	+ 2	+/- 0%
	Sexual offences	13	9	- 4	- 31%
	Vehicle interference and tampering	0	1	+ 1	+/- 0%
	Violence against the person	51	62	+ 11	+ 22%
	Total		160	198	+ 38
University	Auto theft	1	2	+ 1	+ 100%
	Burglary	15	16	+ 1	+ 7%
	Criminal damage	11	13	+ 2	+ 18%
	Other offences	0	1	+ 1	+/- 0%
	Other theft and handling	81	76	- 5	- 6%
	Possession of controlled drugs (cannabis)	6	2	- 4	- 67%
	Possession of controlled drugs (excluding cannabis)	0	2	+ 2	+/- 0%
	Sexual offences	4	8	+ 4	+ 100%
	Vehicle interference and tampering	1	1	+/- 0	+/- 0%
	Violence against the person	22	20	- 2	- 9%
	Total		141	141	+/- 0
Grand Total		1,752	1,866	+ 114	+ 7%

APPENDIX B – Safer in Sussex Community Fund – Grants Awarded

CSF Reference	Name of Project	Name of Organisation	Area	Amount awarded	Brief
CSF253	Positive Placements	YMCA Downslink Group	Brighton & Hove	£4,500.00	Positive Placements project utilises resources within the local community to support vulnerable, isolated 16-25 year olds to access education, employment or training. We would like to extend this to specifically be able to support young people who have been, or are involved with, criminal activity/antisocial behaviour or come from a family with a family history of this. Volunteer mentors will be recruited from the local community and provide unique support by meeting with a young person once a week for up to a year to build their mentee's readiness for work and overcome challenges. Together they will identify and work towards achieving the young person's goals.
CSF242	This Is Me Programme - The Juno Project	The Juno Project	Sussex-wide	£5,000.00	This Is Me (TIM) is a programme targeted at Year 10 and 11 girls in schools across West Sussex, and Brighton and Hove. The girls have been, or are at risk of being, excluded from school or becoming NEET and, as a result, are marginalised and increasingly isolated.
CSF270	Safety Crew	Safety Net	Brighton & Hove	£4,850.00	At Safety Net we keep children safe from harm and abuse. We believe all children have the right to feel and be safe, and that adults need to protect children from harm. Safety Crew: The aim of our Safety Crew project is to encourage greater public participation in the prevention and solution of crime and antisocial behaviour in Whitehawk. Reinforcing safety messages that children are learning through our Feeling Good Feeling Safe (FGFS) programme at Whitehawk Primary School - expanding the FGFS programme from schools into the wider community.
Total in support of schools and other educational establishments				£14,350.00	

Sussex Police and Crime Panel

5 October 2018

Complaints about the Police and Crime Commissioner

Report by The Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel

Recommendations

That the Panel considers the complaints against the Commissioner, and any action that the Panel might take in respect of these.

1. Background

- 1.1 In accordance with the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2011, the Sussex Police & Crime Panel (PCP) is responsible for the initial handling of complaints against Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC).
- 1.2 At its meeting of 26 November 2012 the Panel decided to delegate its initial handling duties to the Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel, and to consider a report of the complaints received, quarterly.
- 1.3 Serious complaints (those alleging criminal conduct) are referred automatically to the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC). A sub-committee meets to consider complaints against the PCC requiring informal resolution (those considered "non-serious").

2. Correspondence Received from 4 April to 24 September 2018

- 1.4 The Panel takes the view that all correspondence raising issues with policing in Sussex should be recorded, whether or not the issues fall within the Panel's statutory remit.
- 1.5 During the subject period, three people contacted the Panel (either directly, or via the IOPC) to raise issues, and three were recorded. The Clerk to the Panel considered this correspondence to determine if any matters raised fell within the remit of the Panel. One person also contacted the Panel to express their gratitude to the Commissioner and her officers.

Complaints

- 1.6 During the subject period no correspondents raised issues which constituted a serious complaint, as defined by the Regulations (see 1.3).

Correspondence Recorded, but not Considered by the Clerk to be a Complaint within the Panel's Remit:

- 1.6.1 Concerning correspondence received and determined by the Clerk to the Panel not to be (within the terms of the Regulations) a complaint within the Panel's remit:
- 1.6.2 The IOPC referred one complaint to the Panel. The complaint pertained to historical events which predated the Commissioner's first term of office by 18 years, and in which no involvement of the PCC could be determined.

Correspondence Recorded, and Considered by the Clerk to be a Complaint within the Panel's Remit:

- 1.6.3 Concerning correspondence received and determined by the Clerk to the Panel to be (within the terms of the Regulations) a complaint within the Panel's remit (two received).
- 1.6.4 The IOPC referred two such complaints to the Panel.
- 1.6.5 One complaint alleges that the PCC made inaccurate public statements about a Sussex Police investigation. Consideration of this complaint is on hold pending the outcome of related complaints being considered by other bodies.
- 1.6.6 One complaint alleges the PCC speaks about operational matters when making media appearances. Consideration of this complaint is ongoing.

Serious Complaints

- 1.6.7 None have been received, or are in process.

Other Correspondence

- 1.6.8 In addition to the complaints under 1.6 above, a resident contacted the Panel to express her gratitude to the Commissioner and her staff for their work to address problems with anti-social driving in her street, crediting this intervention with "saving my marriage and my life".

2 Resource Implications and Value for Money

- 2.1 The cost of handling complaints is met from the funds provided by the Home Office for the operation and administration of Sussex Police and Crime Panel.

3 Risk Management Implications

- 3.1 It is important that residents can have confidence in the integrity of the system for handling complaints against the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner and their Deputy (where one has been appointed).

4 Other Considerations – Equality – Crime Reduction – Human Rights

- 4.1 Not applicable

Tony Kershaw

Clerk to Sussex Police and Crime Panel

Contact:

Ninesh Edwards
(T) 0330 222 2542
(E) ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



To:	The Sussex Police & Crime Panel
From:	The Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner
Subject:	Policing and Crime Act 2017 – Police Complaints Reform
Date:	5 October 2018
Recommendation:	That the Police & Crime Panel note the report.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Policing and Crime Act 2017 introduced a significant change to the police complaints system, building on the previous reforms both of the complaints and conduct system, and of police governance in the form of Police & Crime Commissioners (PCCs).
- 1.2 The legislation allows PCCs to determine how complaints will be managed in their area, with three models for consideration. The PCC is required to select their preferred model and this report outlines the chosen model for handling policing complaints in Sussex.

2.0 Current Police Complaints System

- 2.1 Under the Police Act 1996 and the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, PCCs have a number of specific duties in relation to complaints, including the formal handling and management of complaints against their Chief Constables.
- 2.2 This legislation did not give PCCs the authority to become involved in complaints against police officers and staff below the rank of Chief Constable. Complaints of this nature are currently the responsibility of Chief Constables to investigate, through their Professional Standards Departments (PSD) and/or by local resolution, as appropriate.
- 2.3 Members of the public are often unclear about the difference between the role of the police force and the PCC when making complaints. The process is complex to follow and the formal terminology can often make it unclear. The frequently expressed public view is that the police should not investigate themselves and that the outcomes are biased as a result.

3.0 Policing and Crime Act 2017

- 3.1 The Policing and Crime Act 2017 introduced significant changes to the police complaints system, and allows PCCs to determine how complaints will be managed in their area, with three models for consideration.
- 3.2 The mandatory Model One determines that PCCs should take over the appellate function currently carried out by the PSDs within each police force area. With PCCs undertaking the role of the review, this should give greater independence, allowing PCCs to have more effective oversight and scrutiny of the Force, whilst simultaneously providing the public with increased confidence.

Agenda Item 7

- 3.3 There are two further options to allow a more localised approach to PCC involvement in the complaints process and for further functions of PSD to be taken on by the PCC for each police force area: Model Two and Model Three.
- 3.4 Model Two – includes Model One – together with the handling of the initial contact with complainants, resolving issues informally, and recording the complaint, if this cannot be managed informally. The ownership of the complaint, its resolution and learning outcomes would remain with the police force. Model Three would, on top of this, take on all statutory responsibilities and duties for complaints. A summary of these three models is included in Appendix A.
- 3.5 The consideration of a new complaints model is not the only change to the police complaints system. As well as changes to the handling of reviews and potential changes to the recording and handling of complaints, the responsibilities of the various bodies involved has also been reviewed in the legislation. PCCs will now have an explicit statutory duty to hold the Chief Constable to account for complaint matters, requiring an in-depth focus and analysis of the information provided by the police force, and of the processes and outcomes.

4.0 Preferred Model in Sussex

- 4.1 The PCC considered a business case which set out each of the three options and delivery models available. The PCC approved a recommendation to adopt Model One (oversight and appeal body) as the preferred option. A decision notice (18/2017) dated 19 September 2017 is available on the PCC's website through the following link: <https://www.sussex-pcc.gov.uk/about/transparency/pcc-decisions/decisions/0182017-preferred-complaints-model/>
- 4.2 Consultation on the proposals was undertaken with police officers in Sussex Police PSD; colleagues from Office of Police & Crime Commissioners (OPCCs), including Surrey, Hampshire, Thames Valley and Kent; Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC); and Association of Police & Crime Commissioners.
- 4.3 The PCC considered a selection of delivery models for this particular option and selected the Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner (OSPCC) Review Panel model. With this model, the file preparation of the appeals will continue to be undertaken by the case-workers in PSD, in line with current practice.
- 4.4 The reviews will then be considered by the Assurance Manager within the OSPCC, on behalf of the PCC. Appeals are currently considered by a Detective Chief Inspector (DCI) based in PSD, on behalf of the Head of PSD. It is proposed that initially, a dip-check of the reviews will be undertaken by a Review Panel within the OSPCC, comprising the Head of Performance, Assurance Manager and a representative from PSD.

- 4.5 This model would also be the most cost-effective and require the least amount of change to the current system, whilst still complying with the legislation and meeting the necessary requirements. There will be investment required, largely time, of officers within the OSPCC to ensure that they have received the necessary training and skills to consider reviews and appeals effectively. This approach is also likely to remove some of the demand from the DCI in PSD, although perhaps not so initially during the transitional process.
- 4.6 The implementation of the changes to the police complaints system has been delayed substantially from the original planned commencement date which was summer 2018. It is now anticipated that these changes will be implemented on 1 April 2019.

5.0 Next Steps

- 5.1 The PCC has agreed the following next steps to ensure that the OSPCC is prepared for the changes to the police complaints system:
- A comprehensive training and shadowing programme will be undertaken by the Head of Performance, Assurance Manager and Assurance Officer, in consultation with PSD;
 - Two additional licences for the Centurion complaints system have been allocated to the OSPCC;
 - National training and development initiatives are being attended by members of the Performance team, including shadowing staff within PSD;
 - The Assurance Manager attends regular network meetings with South East regional colleagues at which best practices, themes and issues are discussed;
 - A dip-check process will be established within the system to assess the quality of the reviews and appeals considered by the OSPCC; and
 - The trends from the OSPCC Review Panel will be reported to the PCC at her quarterly Governance and Integrity meetings.

Recommended – That the Police & Crime Panel note the report.

Mark Streater
Chief Executive
Office of the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner

Email: mark.streater@sussex-pcc.gov.uk
 Telephone: 01273 481584

Appendix A – Streamlining the Process for Complaints Handling

The diagram below (taken from a Home Office presentation) sets out the streamlined process for handling complaints, together with a simplified version of the three models that PCCs could adopt.

