

Stop and Search Scrutiny panel

Location: Stetchford Police Station

Date and Time: 22nd September 2021

In Attendance: (Alex French (AF) Chair) Natalie Cox (PCC Office NC), Simon Graham (WMP Inspector SG), Mohammed Sherif (MS), Mr Ali (MA), Rackeem Reid (RR)

Apologies: Zulekha Ali, Tina Bickley

	Item Discussed	Actions
1.	Welcome and introduction Minutes of the last meeting, update on any actions taken from last meeting	<p>The following actions have been taken against the points raised at the last meeting on the 26th May 2021:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recording of ethnicity. An answer as to why a record can be submitted with ethnicity missed off hasn't yet been found. This will be carried over as an action for the next meeting. 2. Census data. It is not known yet when item latest data set will be included on Business Insight. 3. Data set parameters. The previous figures from the proceeding two months will be included on the headline data summary for Stop and Search and for Use of Force. The heat maps will be taken out. At each meeting there will be the opportunity to drill down deeper into the data if panel members desire. 4. Axon. A date will be found by SG in the new year to receive a briefing from Axon.



<p>2. UPDATE on stop and search data from Inspector Graham</p>	<p>The dataset for July and August 2021 was looked at.</p> <p><u>Stop and Search data</u> The positive outcome rate for the BE NPU was now (compared to the last data set) closer to the Force total (26.8% compared to 27.7%) but below an expected figure of around 30%. RR asked about why the ethnic disproportionality was at the level that it was (Asian search ratio 2.9, Black search ration 3.5). MS asked about how the decisions were taken by Sergeants regarding whether the E Search record and video footage met the required standard. NC stated that this was a subjective judgement. RR asked why a record system couldn't be implemented that didn't allow you to proceed until all the required information fields were complete (there are concerns that ethnicity if being missed off some records of searches).</p> <p><u>Use of Force data</u> There had been 602 incidents where force had been used, 87% on which were captured on body worn footage (compared to 81.9% for the force in total). Questions were asked around the black disproportionality ratio which stands at 2.5 (Asian ration was 0.7).</p>
--	--



<p>3. Dip sample of stop and search</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. SSBE-MZ-14088 Search of BK by PC 24692 on 5th August 2021.2. SSBE-8B-141549. Search of BW by PC 22238 on 28th August 2021.3. SSBE-BU-140794. Search of RH by PC 23931 on 16th August 2021.4. SSBE-6K-141637. Search of MA by PC 23762 on 29th August 2021.5. SSBE-KE-141710. Search of BK by PC 22098 on 31st August 2021	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Not viewed2. Chosen by RR. Clear instructions given, search carried out in a calm, professional manner which appeared to diffuse any potential escalation. SG to initiate a 'reward and accolade' for the officer involved. It was noted again that the time stamps on the footage and e record don't match (they are out by around 35 minutes)3. Not viewed4. Chosen by MA. It was discovered after the footage had been viewed and discussed that the video has been wrongly selected for the meeting as it didn't match the record. However the footage watched raised concerns about the treatment of property of the person whose car was searched. At one point a container was emptied out into the passenger footwell which eventually was then placed into a storage compartment behind the gear stick. The contents that had been emptied out wasn't returned back into its container. Why was there a 15 day wait for the record to be signed off by the Sergeant?5. Not viewed
--	---



4.	Dip sample of Use of Force records	
	1. Log 296/11/8/21. PC 24600 on subject T	1. Chosen by MS. Three officers were with the individual in a confined space. The footage was from the BWC of the officer who stood behind the two officers who were directly involved with the subject. A question was raised by AF about why the officer who deployed force didn't have his camera turned on. The panel felt that the force used was excessive given the impact on the subject and the conditions that it was used within e.g. the confinement of the space and the number of other people who were present. SG to ask the Sergeant who signed the record off to view it again and consider from their perspective whether the force used was excessive.
	2. Log 3711/29/7/21. PC 21126 on subject A	2. Not viewed
	3. Log 4495/2/7/21. PC 22180 on subject unknown	3. Not viewed
	4. Log 3786/15/8/21. PC 22275 on subject S	4. Not viewed
	5. Log 1518/24/7/21. PC 23621 on subject S	5. Not viewed



5.	Action noted from discussions for update at next panel	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Why in the Stop and Search data is a figure recorded of 11.6% for records where ethnicity is 'not applicable'? Are these all searches of vehicles?2. Can the ethnicity of an officer who conducted a Stop and Search or used force be recorded?3. What processes do the police force use to assure themselves that the proportion of Stop and Searches and Use of Force aren't racially disproportionate?4. Why is the time stamp different on the footage from the body worn camera to that recorded on the e-search form?5. See Stop and Search notes for record 26. See Stop and Search notes for record 47. See use of Use of Force notes for record 1 <p>Actions carried over from previous meetings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">8. Why can an e-record be submitted with ethnicity missing?9. Why are the time stamps different between the e search record and body worn footage?
6.	Date and location of next panel	Thursday 25th November at 6pm at Stetchford Police Station. The meeting can be attended virtually as well.