

Stop and Search Scrutiny panel

Location: Virtual

Date and Time: 25th November 2021

In Attendance: (Alex French (AF) Chair) Natalie Cox (PCC Office NC), Simon Graham (WMP Inspector SG), Neville Fletcher (NF), Faz Chishty (Chief Inspector Warwickshire Police FC), Jill Hall (Warwickshire Police JH)

Apologies: Mohammed Sharif, Mr Ali, Zulehka Ali, Tina Bickley

	Item Discussed	Actions
1	Welcome and introduction. Minutes of the last meeting, update on any actions taken from the last meeting.	<p>The following actions have been taken against the points raised at the last meeting on the 22nd September 2021.</p> <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? Update – All 87 records in the last data set were vehicles 2. Can the ethnicity of an officer who conducted a Stop and Search or used force be recorded? Update – From force lead, this is not a legal requirement and would also need an IT upgrade to all devices allocated to officers. The force lead has looked at a previous independent study by Warwick Business School for data between 2014-2017 which concludes there is no correlation between ethnic bias in SS and officer characteristics 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? Update – The force has Silver lead meetings regularly to discuss all aspects of SS and UoF for every area and department of the force. Leads are held to account and regularly asked to review certain aspects, including disproportionality, of the data and report back. Locally there are reviews completed by line managers to identify any themes. Finally at BE we have just commenced a peer review process that sees around 130 SS records and all UoF records per month reviewed by peers.



	Item Discussed	Actions
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="691 197 1430 539">4. Why is the time stamp different on the footage from the body worn camera to that recorded on the e-search form? Update – the main reason is that the current BWV cameras times do not move when clocks go forward. Now we are in winter, the times should be closer together. Where the difference is a few minutes this may be down to the time delay in completing the form. The new cameras due for rollout will be auto adjusted to the correct times.<li data-bbox="691 562 1430 629">5. Recognition and feedback provided to the officer involved in the SS.<li data-bbox="691 651 1430 719">6. SS record sent to Sgt of officer. I will read out the update.<li data-bbox="691 741 1430 808">7. UoF record sent to supervisor. I will read out the update.<li data-bbox="691 831 1430 1066">8. Recording of ethnicity. An answer as to why a record can be submitted with ethnicity missed off hasn't yet been found. Update – The software is not set up to ensure an ethnicity is recorded for each record. It would be expected that each record would have at least the officer defined ethnicity recorded.<li data-bbox="691 1088 1430 1223">9. Census data. It is not known yet when item latest data set will be included on Business Insight. Update – I am informed that Census data is likely to be updated in March 2022.<li data-bbox="691 1245 1430 1525">10. Data set parameters. The previous figures from the preceding 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. Update – This has been included in the presentation<li data-bbox="691 1547 1430 1682">11. Axon. A date will be found by SG in the new year to receive a briefing from Axon. Update – I would suggest the panel identifies a couple of dates and I can liaise with SME



	Item Discussed	Actions
2	UPDATE on stop and search data from Inspector Graham	<p>Stop and Search</p> <p>Across BE the positive outcome rate has dropped by 5% compared to the previous two months and the % of stop and searches recorded on video has also fallen by 1.7%.</p> <p>Within the three impact areas there has been a sharp rise in the number of Stop and Searches compared to the previous two months, 259 compared to 180 a rise of 44%. Interestingly the positive outcome rate has fallen significantly over the same time frame to 18.5% from 27.8%. Why have so many more searches being carried out which don't have a positive outcome rate?</p> <p>Find rates across BE for drugs were 30.5%, for knives 8.8% and for firearms 0%.</p> <p>When ethnicity is considered the search ratio of Asian to White people is 3.4 and for Black to White people 3.7. This is drawn from roughly half of all stop and searches across BE involving Asian people and roughly 12% involving Black people.</p> <p>Use of Force</p> <p>There have been 602 recorded uses of force across BE which is roughly split into 500 males and 100 females. The % recorded on Body Worn footage is 85.2%. When ethnicity is considered the use of force ration of Asian to White is 0.8 and for Black to White 2.1. <i>NE asked about why force was used more often on Black people than White and Asian people. There is a significant change in ratio's when you compare stop and search ratio's with those for use of force i.e. Black and Asian rations are roughly equal for stop and search but the Black ratio becomes roughly three times that of Asian when looking at use of force. How do you know that Officers are not resulting to the use for force quicker when a black person is involved due to unconscious or even conscious bias?</i></p>
3	<p>Dip sample of stop and search</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. SSBE-GZ-141857 Search of A by PC 22196 on Log 4367/ 2/9/212. SSBE-GR-144915. Search of D by PC 23764 on 15th October 21.3. SSBE-2B-146171 .Search of M by PC 23682 and 31st October 21...4. SSBE-3W-14340 2. Search of H by PC 21712 on 25th	<p>Record 3 chosen by NF</p> <p>It was noted that this record hadn't been signed of by a Sergeant despite in occurring 25 days previously. The video footage did not record the name and badge number of the officer being given to the person being searched. <i>NC asked why a female officer was searching a male person when a male officer stood by watching.</i> SG responded that the officer may have needed to have had a search sign doff on their training record. <i>AF asked why there was an apparent discrepancy between the grounds recorded for the search in the record and those given on the video.</i></p> <p>Record 1 chosen by AF</p> <p>It was noted that this was a difficult situation with a number of bystanders getting involved. It was noted that an officer who arrived on the scene later did very well deescalating the situation. <i>AF asked about the tone of and the language used by the officer whose video was being watched as it appeared to be inflammatory. The officer also named a suspect who wasn't on the scene but who the officer claimed was the driver of the car. This person</i></p>



	Item Discussed	Actions
	September 21 ¹	<p><i>was not named by any of the people present yet his details were recorded in the electronic record. Is it right that a person not named by anyone present is added to the search record and doesn't know that they are added so can't exercise their rights of looking at what has been recorded?</i></p> <p><i>NC asked a question concerning the narrative recorded on the electronic record and that seen on the video. In particularly the officer whose footage was watched didn't conduct the search and the officer who conducted the search didn't record the search.</i></p>
4	<p>Dip sample of Use of Force records</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Log 3277/31/10/21. PC 22607 2. Incident 3931/15/10/21. PC 22956. 3. Incident 4248/12/10/21. PC 23219. 4. Incident 1193/26/9/21. PC 22987. 5. Incident 1054/31/10/21. SPC 70075 	<p>Record 4 chosen by JH</p> <p>It was felt that both officers dealt with the situation well, engaging with the lady and using force with appropriate care. <i>AF asked a question about how the homophobic language used by the lady would be recorded. SG said that unless it was included in the victim's statement then it wouldn't be recorded despite two officers hearing it. This raised a discussion about the recording of hate incidents and whether the recording of it came only from victim statements or whether bystanders could initiate a sequence of events that would result in a hate incident being recorded.</i></p> <p><i>SG to check whether a hate incident was recorded for this situation and would speak to the Force Crime Registrar to find out whether hate incidents were only recorded from victims statements.</i></p> <p><i>SG to initiate a 'praise and reward' entry for the way in which the two officers dealt with the situation.</i></p>
5	Action noted from discussions for update at next panel	<p>Why have so many more searches being carried out across the three Impact Areas which don't have a positive outcome rate?</p> <p>How do you know that Officers are not resulting to the use for force quicker when a black person is involved due to unconscious or even conscious bias?</p> <p>Is it right that a person not named by anyone present is added to the search record and doesn't know that they are added so can't exercise their rights of looking at what has been recorded?</p> <p>Check whether a hate incident was recorded for Use of Force record 4 and speak to the Force Crime Registrar to find out whether hate incidents were only recorded from victims statements.</p> <p>Initiate a 'praise and reward' entry for the way in which the two officers dealt with the situation from Use of Force record 4.</p> <p>If there are no data privacy issues, the data presentation to be sent out a week before the panel meeting to panel members.</p>
6	Date and location of next panel	20th January 6pm at Stetchford Police Station.