

SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

13 DECEMBER 2021

PRESENT: Councillor R Haleem (Rotherham MBC) (Chair)

Councillor A Cherryholme (Barnsley MBC) (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: R Davison (Sheffield City Council), S Knowles (Doncaster MBC), B Lodge (Sheffield City Council), R Milsom (Sheffield City Council) and C Pickering (Barnsley MBC)

Independent Co-opted Members: W Carratt and Professor A James

M McCarthy, J Field, L Noble and A Shirt
(Barnsley MBC)

In attendance remotely:

Dr A Billings (South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner)

M Buttery, S Abbott, S Parkin, F Topliss and K Wright
(Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner)

Apologies for absence were received from
Councillor T Baum-Dixon (Rotherham MBC), Councillor P Garbutt
(Sheffield City Council) and Councillor C Ransome (Doncaster MBC)

1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and reported that today's Panel meeting would be webcast live to the public.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were noted as above.

3 ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

4 URGENT ITEMS

None.

5 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

None.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA

None.

7 PUBLIC QUESTIONS:-

7A TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

There were no public questions to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

7B TO THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

There were no public questions to the Police and Crime Panel.

8 MINUTES OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL MEETING HELD ON 20 SEPTEMBER 2021

Councillor Davison asked that page 5 (paragraph 5) of the minutes be amended to read: Councillor Davison asked how the PCC and Force invested in reserves.

Councillor Milsom asked that the spelling of her surname be corrected in the minutes at page 15 (paragraph 7).

The Panel discussed and noted progress in respect of agreed actions captured on the Action Log set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

The Panel noted that the following actions were all currently 'live' actions and requested that they be retained on the Panel's Action Log for further updates:

Action No	Meeting Date	Action / Resolution
Action 11	03.02.21	Services for Victims of Crime: Progress Update.
Action 13	19.07.21	IEP's work on Stop and Search.
Action 9 (v)	20.09.21	To undertake further discussions with the Chair of the Independent Ethics Panel (IEP) and Chief Constable to try and find an acceptable way forward in relation to the publication of IEP agendas and minutes to the OPCC website.
Action 11 (v)	20.09.21	Information to be provided to Members setting out details of the data around Violence against Women and Girls which is provided to the Commissioner and also data which is provided to him in his role as Chair of the Local Criminal Justice Board, together with an explanation of their differences.
Action 13 (i), (ii)	20.09.21	Additional Independent Member.
Action 16 (iii)	20.09.21	Review of the PAB text contained on the OPCC website.

The Panel agreed that the following actions be marked as ‘discharged’ on the Panel’s Action Log:

Action No	Meeting Date	Action / Resolution
Action 8	19.04.21	Number of Wildlife Crimes reported to the Force and individuals prosecuted.
Action 12 (ii)	19.04.21	Timescale for the delivery on the IEP’s work in relation to priorities surrounding disproportionality and inclusion.
Action 12 (iii)	19.04.21	To provide a standalone report to a future Panel meeting on the IEP’s work in relation to priorities surrounding disproportionality and inclusion.
Action 10 (i)	07.06.21	Countywide Strategy on Violence towards Women and Girls – PCC update report.
Action 10 (ii)	07.06.21	The PCC had agreed to explore in further detail the request which had been made by the Home Office in relation to recording crimes motivated by sex or gender on an experimental basis.
Action 11 (ii)	19.07.21	Agenda and minutes of the IEP had not been published on the OPCC website.
Action 9 (iv)	20.09.21	Data kept by the Force in relation to rural crimes and wildlife crimes.
Action 11 (ii)	20.09.21	Analysis to identify the number of Domestic Violence Protection Orders which had been issued by the Force.
Action 11 (iii)	20.09.21	Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to look to respond to Mr Carratt’s request to include details of other safeguarding responsibilities in a future report.
Action 11 (iv)	20.09.21	Procurement data information would be circulated to Members after today’s meeting by K Wright.
Action 11 (v)	20.09.21	Information to be provided to Members setting out details of the data around Violence against Women and Girls.
Action 11 (vi)	20.09.21	Analysis of CSE data on a local district level to be provided to the Performance Sub-Group.
Action 12 (iii)	20.09.21	Terms of reference and work programmes for the Joint Independent Audit Committee and Independent Ethics Panel to be provided to Panel Members.
Action 13 (i)	20.09.21	Additional Independent Member.

Professor James referred to Action 11 (ii) of 19 July 2021 (agendas and minutes of the Independent Ethics Panel (IEP) had not been published on the OPCC website). Noting that more detailed IEP assurance reports would replace the exception reports presented at Public Accountability Board (PAB) meetings, he raised concerns that Panel Members would not get the opportunity to raise questions and scrutinise the Commissioner around the work of the IEP.

In response, the Commissioner said that Members of the Panel received the agendas and reports presented at the Public Accountability Board meetings. If Members had any questions, then essentially, they could be raised at Panel meetings.

Professor James referred to Action 11 (vi) of 20.09.21 (Analysis of CSE data on a local district level to be provided to the Performance Sub-Group). He felt that it would be very helpful to have other data (for example, protecting vulnerable people) to be presented to the Panel on a local district level. He considered that this would allow the Panel to fully scrutinise and compare the data. Furthermore, he believed that this would assist the Panel in being able to scrutinise how effective the Commissioner is in terms of addressing performance around his priorities.

The Commissioner reminded Members that it was the Panel's role to scrutinise him and not the Force. The Commissioner provided the Panel with assurances that he received countywide reports from the Force and District Commanders in relation to the ongoing work to tackle the priorities set out in his Police and Crime Panel.

RESOLVED –

- i) That subject to the above amendments, the minutes of the Police and Crime Panel meeting held on 20 September 2021 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.
- ii) Noted that the Panel's Action Log would be updated following discussion at today's meeting.

9 QUARTER 2 - CONSOLIDATED BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2021/22

The Commissioner introduced a report which presented the consolidated financial position on the current budget and expenditure managed by the Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police force and budgets managed by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for the period 1 April 2021 to 30 September 2021.

The Commissioner reported that the Chancellor had announced a three year spending review on 27 October 2021, and he was awaiting the provisional settlement which was due to be announced before the Christmas parliamentary recess (expected on 16 December 2021). The final settlement was due four weeks after that.

In relation to next year's budget, the Commissioner said that he needed to take into account pressures around general inflation, significant increases in energy costs, police officer salaries now being open to a period of negotiation, increases in national insurance contributions and pension related issues. In addition, South Yorkshire also had legacy issues and CSE civil claims to factor into the budget.

A fundamental review of the funding formula had recently been announced, which would impact on the amount of grant South Yorkshire receives, which could make the medium to longer term planning difficult. The Commissioner had been invited to be a member of a Senior Sector Group, and would therefore be in a position of influence.

Councillor Davison queried how inflation would affect the police budget and if this would affect the number of additional officers the Force would be able to recruit.

Furthermore, he asked if the Force had details of its expenditure with regards to pension schemes.

The Commissioner replied that, with regards to inflation, the Force would need to take account of increased energy and fuel costs across its entire estate. In relation to recruitment, the Government had made it very clear that they did not wish PCC's to reduce officer numbers. In addition, the Government had pledged to continue to recruit 20,000 additional officers in England and Wales by 2023.

In relation to pensions, S Abbott said that a triennial review of each pension scheme was undertaken in order to understand what would need to be funded over a three year period. It was confirmed that the Police Officer Pension Scheme was an unfunded scheme with employer contributions received from the revenue account. The Police Staff Pension Scheme was a funded scheme administered by South Yorkshire Pensions Authority. Nationally, news was awaited with regards to the McCloud and Sargeant pensions ruling.

Referring to the report on today's agenda, S Abbott reported that the PCC had approved a revenue budget of £296.0m for 2021/22. The PCC had also approved a capital programme of £17.799m for 2021/21, anticipating that £17.412m borrowing would need to be undertaken during the year to fund the programme. The programme was increased to £19.6m in July 2021 to take account of slippage, re-phasing and adjustments.

Based on current assumptions, the forecast outturn position for the revenue budget was an underspend of £421k as at 30 September 2021.

As at 30 September 2021, the projected year end outturn position was a £42k underspend on the Chief Constable's budget, net of external funding. Full details were outlined in the Chief Constable's budget monitoring paper, attached at Appendix A to the report.

Councillor Milsom asked if the Panel could receive a breakdown of the projected outturn figures for police pay and overtime incurred during the last five years. Furthermore, she asked the Commissioner to provide comment in relation to what he expected would happen to the police officer pay and overtime budget when the Force had achieved its uplift in officer numbers.

The Commissioner acknowledged the request. He added that, due to the ongoing Coronavirus pandemic and the widespread impact of flooding across South Yorkshire back in 2019, it was difficult to compare one year to previous years due to abstractions from the Force due to a variety of reasons. Once the Force had achieved its officer uplift, he anticipated that overtime would reduce and not increase.

Councillor Lodge noted that there had been underspends in the call resolution unit at Atlas Court Communications of £0.21m and team leaders' posts of £0.16m. He asked if this was in relation to the 101 call handling service.

The Commissioner said that, in relation to the 101 call handling service, it was noted that staff had been affected by the Coronavirus pandemic. Call demand had

remained high on the 101 call service, despite asking people to use the call back service, online reporting and webchat service.

The Panel noted that ARV and 'Grip' funding confirmed after budget setting had created Police Officer pay underspends, which had enabled the recruitment of 24 Detective Now Officers.

Councillor Davison asked if information could be provided on the budget for training detectives and information on the quality of detective work.

The Commissioner replied that recruitment for filling detective roles was currently an immense national issue. The Force had been utilising recruitment of detectives via the Police Now National Detective Programme and other entry level programmes. He was assured that the training provided by the Force to new detectives was good.

The Commissioner queried if providing budget figures to Councillor Davison would be beneficial; he agreed to consider the request and look to provide information around the training provided to detectives after today's meeting.

The Panel noted that the PCC and OPCC budget forecast year end position was an underspend of £205k. The main reasons for the underspend and variances from the budget were presented within the report.

The PCC had approved a capital programme of £19.63m in July 2021. Expenditure to date amounted to £7.86m, and was currently projected to spend in full.

As at 31 March 2021, the overall level of revenue reserves available was £64.98m. This included general reserves of £42.2m, earmarked, and insurance reserves of £10.6m and £12.1m respectively. The expected movement in year, based on projections at the end of September 2021, was detailed in a table at paragraph 6 of the report.

Hillsborough, the Stovewood enquiry, and CSE civil claims were currently showing a combined underspend of £0.175m. The underspends would be transferred from the legacy reserve at the end of the financial year.

Paragraph 7 of the report set out a number of risks and uncertainties in the reported financial position.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the contents of the report and commented on any matters arising.
- ii) Noted that the Commissioner would provide, if feasible, the Panel with a breakdown of the outturn figures for police pay and overtime incurred during the last five years.
- iii) Noted that the Commissioner would consider Councillor Davison's request for information around the budget and training provided to detectives.

10 MONITORING DELIVERY OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PLAN - QUARTERLY REPORT (JULY TO SEPTEMBER 2021)

The Commissioner presented a report which set out the Quarterly Police and Crime Plan Performance Report for the period July to September 2021 (Quarter 2 2021/22), produced from the Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC's) Police and Partners Performance Framework.

The report aimed to provide information about how the police and partners, as well as the Office of the PCC (OPCC) are working to achieve the outcomes and priorities set out in the Police and Crime Plan for South Yorkshire.

The Commissioner paid tribute to the work of the Force throughout the COVID-19 pandemic which had resulted in an enormous amount of pressure and challenges being placed on them. The Force had responded and managed well during a very difficult time.

Professor James thanked the Commissioner and his staff for including information in the report around Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking.

Professor James asked if the Commissioner had any information with regards to the fall in victim satisfaction and if he was aware of any differences between the four districts and levels of satisfaction.

K Wright replied that victim satisfaction varied between quarters and across districts. He added that the main area where victims were least satisfied was around the Force follow up with victims regarding their case. The Force had recognised this as a weakness and were focusing its efforts to address this.

Mr Carratt referred to Protecting Vulnerable People and the Local Safeguarding Children Partnerships and recent media articles around child criminal sexual exploitation. He asked if the Commissioner could confirm if funding towards the South Yorkshire Local Safeguarding Children Partnerships had either increased, maintained or reduced since 2014.

Mr Carratt added that the role of the Local Safeguarding Children Partnerships in quality assuring the effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements in local areas was key. He asked if the Commissioner received Section 11 Self Assessments that South Yorkshire Police complete and submit to the Local Safeguarding Children Partnerships in line with the Children and Families Act 2014.

The Commissioner replied that funding levels had been maintained and were set in consultation with local authorities and the Force.

M Buttery referred to the recent troubling incidents highlighted by the media. She assured the Panel that specific questions had been raised with the Assistant Chief Constable responsible for safeguarding.

The Panel was informed that the Commissioner had statutory responsibilities in relation to holding the Chief Constable to account with regard to specific functions, of which, safeguarding was one single strand. She had asked for the OPCC's

assurance arrangements to be double checked to ensure that they are robust enough. M Buttery agreed to keep the Panel informed on progress in this area.

In response to a question from Mr Carratt, in relation to the Independent Custody Visitors Scheme, S Parkin confirmed that any person detained in custody who was deemed as vulnerable would be prioritised.

Mr Carratt noted that Remedi had received a potential 205 referrals into the service during the period. He asked why these were potential referrals and not confirmed referrals.

In response, K Wright said he was of the opinion that, referrals would only become live when both parties accepted that they would like Restorative Justice to take place. He agreed to clarify the position with Remedi and provide an update after today's meeting.

Councillor Milsom noted that the number of referrals to the Restorative Justice Service in the period July to September 2020 had been 142, and for the same period in 2021 there had only been 80 referrals. Councillor Milsom asked the Commissioner to comment on his perception of those figures and what they signify in terms of success or otherwise of the Restorative Justice Service.

The Commissioner said that it was very difficult to undertake a comparison year on year at the moment due to the ongoing Coronavirus pandemic and all the implications around this.

K Wright added that he would need to contextualise the data to be able to provide a detailed response.

Councillor Milsom asked if information could also be provided on referrals to the Restorative Justice Service during other quarters of the year. K Wright acknowledged the request.

Councillor Milsom referred to Section 2 of the report 'Tacking Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour'. She asked if the Panel could receive reports setting out information on a district level and month by month. This would enable the Panel to look at trends and comparisons.

M Buttery acknowledged the request and said that discussions would need to take place with the Commissioner and K Wright to consider provision of district level data to the Panel.

Professor James said he was concerned to note that, recorded levels of residential burglary in South Yorkshire had increased during Quarter 2 of 2021/22. He asked why South Yorkshire had higher levels of residential burglary in comparison to other Force areas.

In response, the Commissioner said that, he had also been very concerned for some time about levels of residential burglary in South Yorkshire. He did continue to ask the Force why South Yorkshire had high levels of residential burglary. However, there was no known answer for this, other than, it was historic. The

Commissioner outlined the various initiatives the Force was undertaking to tackle residential burglary.

Councillor Davison asked if there was any evidence to show if Neighbourhood Watch Schemes were effective in tackling residential burglary.

The Commissioner said that he would contact Neighbourhood Watch to ascertain if they have any evidence regarding their effectiveness.

Councillor Milsom asked if SmartWater schemes were perceived to be, or were recorded to be useful in tackling burglary. She also asked if SmartWater schemes were still being rolled out and funded across the region.

The Commissioner replied that SmartWater schemes had been successful, but a key part was advertising that SmartWater was being used in a particular area.

Professor James referred to Stop and Searches broken down by ethnicity. He noted that 16% of individuals had not stated their ethnic status during the 12 month period to the end of September 2021. He understood that there was an option for the Force to record their own assessment of a person's ethnicity and asked if this could be undertaken in South Yorkshire.

K Wright confirmed that there was an option for the Force to record their own assessment, but personally, he would not wish the Force to use this option as it was within someone's right not to give their ethnicity.

Councillor Haleem asked if there had been a rise in BAME victims of crime (not necessarily hate crime) over the past period.

Post meeting note - PAG have provided the following information: based on Investigations from 13th December 2020 to 12th December 2021 (current period) and compared to 13th December 2019 to 12th December 2020 (previous period).

In the 12-month period crime has increased by 3%, during the same period recording of BAME self-defined ethnicity has increased by 11%.

This does not necessarily mean there is more crime being recorded within our BAME communities.

Over half of self-defined ethnicity fields are blank within CONNECT – so there is insufficient data quality from which to make any assessment. It could be that in raising the data quality around ethnicity, there are increasing efforts to ensure ethnicity for people with minority ethnic backgrounds is completed – albeit it should just be all ethnicity being updated more on the system. It could also be more people with a minority ethnic background are reporting to the police rather than more crime, which may be a positive thing.

Councillor Haleem asked if the Force use face to face or telephone translators when they have victims of, e.g. modern slavery.

Post meeting note - PAG have provided the following information:

These are carried out by telephone in the majority of occasions to establish initial circumstances. There are two types of way that a victim may come to our attention:

1. SYP attend at a pre-planned or spontaneous incident and find a possible victim. On those occasions we use a telephone interpreting service to establish their welfare needs and whether any offences have been committed and to identify any urgent lines of enquiry. A pre-planned incident could involve SYP arranging for an interpreter to attend from the outset. However, we would not know for certain if a victim would be found and would be very unlikely to know the language or dialect that they speak.
2. SYP are contacted by the National Referral Mechanism who inform us that a potential victim of human trafficking has come to the attention of the authorities via a route other than ourselves and is now being housed in South Yorkshire. We would speak to the victim and again use a telephone interpreting system to see if the victim will engage with us and provide us with any information. This information would then be used to identify any criminal offences in this country or abroad. If in this country we would send details to the relevant force or arrange an interpreter to attend in person to obtain further evidence if required.

If it is clear that a criminal offence may have been committed and the victim wished to engage then a face to face interpreter would be used in order to carry out a video interview with the victim.

Councillor Haleem asked if the Force who go into schools have training and what topics do they present.

Post meeting note from Community Safety Manager Margaret Lawson:

Training of officers/staff:

Community Safety Project Officers and Community Safety Manager have a Level 3 Education and Training qualification and all resources utilised by the Community Safety are developed by these officers with consultation from Subject Matter Experts if required.

3 of the Project Officers have also attended Police in the Classroom National Training that was funded by NPCC for officers working in schools, however the last course of this training was cancelled at the beginning of COVID and we had 9 staff and officers booked to attend. The training has not been offered since although some forces have asked as part of the Mini Police programme if the training could be offered again.

Police Officers and PCSOs at district who have responsibility for schools do not necessarily have any formal training, although they are encouraged to utilise the resources that Community Safety are developing so that we have a corporate approach across the Force area. Resources held in SYP computer folder with police officers, staff and PCSOs being able to access this folder, these are updated by the community safety department.

Community Safety Department currently deliver the following training in schools:

Crucial Crew – all schools with year 6 pupils are invited and take part in 7 scenarios including:

- Knife/Hate crime
- Child Criminal Exploitation
- Home Safety – (with SYFR)
- Arson – (with SYFR)
- Road Safety – LA Road Safety team
- Travel Safe – First Buses
- Consequences in the Court – Magistrates

For the current academic year September 21 – July 22:

- Rotherham - 2936 pupils with 299 adults from 82 schools have attended, 2 more schools booked in, only 2 schools not currently attending
- Barnsley - 2847 pupils attended with 276 adults from 72 schools, 4 more schools booked in, 2 schools not currently attending
- Doncaster - 91 schools booked in for March/April, 1 schools already attended with 54 pupils, 3 schools not currently attending
- Sheffield – 121 schools booked in from January 2022, 3 schools not currently attending
- All SEND, Pupil Referral Units and alternative provision schools are also invited to Crucial Crew and the scenarios are tailored to meet the needs of the pupils.

Mini Police –delivered jointly by Project Officers and District PCSOs

- Year 5 and 6 pupils in over 30 schools currently
- Inputs include parking and speeding, personal safety/ASB and Communications and Phonetics,
- Schools are identified by the Neighbourhood Policing Team

Knife Crime – for secondary schools delivered by 2 CSD Project Officers to Years 7 to 9.

Since September 2021

- 32 Sessions
- 13 Schools
- 6170 Pupils
- 6 sessions planned for 2022 with 13,080 pupils
- Since 2017 in total 324 sessions, 56,622 pupils
- Primary school inputs are delivered where the NPTs have identified that there is an emerging trend/issue, but this is covered at Crucial Crew for all year 6 pupils

Your Life Your Choice – New input for 2021 as a result of an increase in firearms discharges in some areas of the County

- Delivered to year 9s in identified schools
- Based on the journey from becoming involved in County Lines and leading to carrying or using a firearm with the consequences of this

- The idea is that young people are taken on a journey using local stories and case studies and it's about them making the right choice
- Authorised Firearms Officers involved and bring the TACMED (medical) kit to show
- To date 2 sessions have been delivered to 400 pupils as part of a pilot

Social Media/ Sharing Images – delivered to primary and secondary schools Since September 2021

- 28 sessions have been delivered to 4460 pupils, 6 of these sessions were at primary schools

Child Criminal Exploitation – delivered as a request from Doncaster District at a local secondary school – 5 sessions to 1000 pupils. This resource has been developed by EPIC and PC Bloodworth. Community Safety Department Project Officers have now been trained to deliver this input.

Councillor Haleem asked if there were any attempts to raise awareness of cannabis growing with private landlords.

Post meeting note from Safer Neighbourhood Sergeant Martin Gamett.

PC Paul Davies, developed the Cannabis Grow Aware Scheme. Following his retirement from SYP, PC Sarah Brewis has commenced the re-launch of the scheme.

On Thursday 2nd December, PC Brewis had a face to face meeting with private providers to further promote the Cannabis Grow Aware Scheme, asking private providers to sign up to the scheme where they have not already done so, and in any case, to support the scheme by and retweeting/liking any related information when SYP publish it. The meeting was well attended with over 30 landlords present, 20 of whom signed up to the scheme for the first time. Further meetings are to be scheduled for the New Year, to continue generating awareness and 'take up' with local providers, and to generate further publicity for the scheme.

Further to this, PC Brewis has:

- Engaged with SYP media team to re-launch information about the cannabis grow aware scheme it on the SYP Facebook / Twitter pages. This will be published by the media team in due course. Posters have been requested for display in estate agents windows to further highlight the scheme.
- Commenced visiting local estate agents, to date visiting those in the Barnsley town centre and Penistone areas, re-introducing the scheme and establishing previous participation in the scheme since it was launched prior to lockdown.
- Liaised with Barnsley MBC's media team, requesting that they retweet SYP media information about the cannabis grow aware scheme when it is produced as a joint Barnsley MBC/SYP initiative.

In response to a question from Councillor Haleem, the Commissioner confirmed that all front line officers and call handlers received specialist intensive training and ongoing refresher training around identifying the signs of child sexual exploitation and child neglect cases.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the contents of the report and commented on any matters arising.
- ii) Noted that M Buttery had agreed to keep the Panel informed of the assurance arrangements in place regarding safeguarding.
- iii) Noted that K Wright had agreed to clarify with Remedi why there were potential referrals and not confirmed referrals during Quarter 2.
- iv) Noted that K Wright had agreed to contextualise the number of referrals to the Restorative Justice Service in the periods July to September 2020 and July to September 2021.
- v) Noted that K Wright had agreed to provide data on the number of referrals to the Restorative Justice Service during other quarters of 2020 and 2021.
- vi) Noted that a discussion would take place between M Buttery, the Commissioner and K Wright to consider provision of district level data to the Panel.
- vii) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to contact Neighbourhood Watch to ascertain if they have any evidence regarding their effectiveness and provide the Panel with an update after today's meeting.

11 OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER (OPCC) DELIVERY PLAN 2021/22

A report of the Police and Crime Commissioner was presented to provide Members with the Delivery Plan from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) which explained how the OPCC is contributing to delivery of the Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC's) transitional Police and Crime Plan for 2021-2024 (due for substantial revision in February 2022).

The Panel noted that, as in previous years, the PCC had asked that the OPCC, and those he commissions (including the Chief Constable) to provide delivery plans to explain how each organisation intends to contribute towards delivering the priorities and areas of focus within the Police and Crime Plan.

In addition, the PCC also required assurance as to how each organisation would monitor and report on progress. It was expected that the content of the delivery plans would be proportionate to the level of funding provided to each organisation.

At the beginning of October, the OPCC had approved the Delivery Plan at Appendix B to the report to respond to the PCC's transitional Police and Crime Plan. The Delivery Plan also explained the work the OPCC was undertaking to

support the PCC and his two statutory officers in the discharge of their statutory responsibilities.

Appendix A to the report provided the Panel with a 'Plan on a Page' with the top half of the page giving a summary of the PCC's transitional Police and Crime Plan and the bottom half of the page summarising the OPCC's key activities this coming year and a supporting narrative.

Professor James welcomed the inclusion of activity in relation to Violence against Women and Girls in the Delivery Plan. He asked if the Panel could receive regular feedback on progress with regards to the round table discussions scheduled to take place with partners.

M Buttery confirmed that further updates would be included in the Commissioner's update report presented at every Panel meeting.

Professor James asked if the Commissioner was assured that ethical issues relating to digital policing were being addressed by the Force. Furthermore, he asked if there were any plans in place to scrutinise the Force's work following the Independent Ethics Panel's (IEP) report and recommendations presented to the Commissioner in December 2019 regarding Ethical Issues and Digital Policing.

M Buttery replied that the Force had embraced and welcomed the work of the IEP. The Force did actively use a checklist of questions every time conversations took place around new technology and when horizon scanning was taking place. It was noted that the Force had now implemented a new Digital Strategy, which M Buttery had requested to view on the Commissioner's behalf to ensure the checklist of questions were captured within the Strategy.

Mr Carratt referred to page 9 of the Delivery Plan. He queried if there should be inclusion in the Plan around the OPCC's interface with the Local Safeguarding Children Partnerships.

M Buttery replied that the Statutory Guidance stipulates that, Health Commissioners are a statutory partner in seeking assurance and overseeing the effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Partnerships. However, it did not stipulate whether the responsibility rested with PCCs or police forces. M Buttery added that engagement could be strengthened with the Local Safeguarding Children Partnerships to provide assurances to the Commissioner and the OPCC.

Councillor Pickering asked if an awareness session could be arranged for Panel Members to provide them with an update on the work of the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU).

The Commissioner acknowledged the request and agreed to liaise with the Head of the VRU.

In response to a question from Councillor Milsom, M Buttery explained the relationship between the OPCC and the Community Safety Partnerships.

It was noted that the Commissioner had a holding to account responsibility, a convening responsibility and a funding responsibility with regards to the local Community Safety Partnerships.

In addition, the Commissioner had formed a countywide Community Safety Forum where each of the four local Community Safety Partnerships Chairs were invited to attend to discuss any co-commissioned initiatives and to share good practice around addressing crime and anti-social behaviour. The Panel also have observer status at the Forum, and dates are provided as part the Panel briefings.

Councillor Milsom commented that, she did not feel assured that there were targeted campaigns and strategies in place to address anti-social behaviour and low level crime in local communities.

In response, M Buttery suggested that, to help give assurance on this specific question, Councillor Milsom should view the reports submitted by the Force to the Commissioner's Public Accountability Board around tackling crime and anti-social behaviour. Furthermore, the Force's Neighbourhood Policing Model also set out their problem solving approach to tackling low level crime and anti-social behaviour in the local communities.

In addition, the OPCC also contributed to the annual Community Safety Partnership's Action Plans which detail how funds are to be utilised to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour in accordance with the specific needs of each district.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the contents of the report and commented on any matters arising.
- ii) Noted that the Commissioner had agreed to arrange an awareness session for Panel Members to provide them with an update on the work of the Violence Reduction Unit.

12 POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER'S UPDATE (INCLUDING DECISIONS MADE SINCE THE LAST MEETING)

A report of the Commissioner was presented to provide Members with an update on key PCC and OPCC activities since the Panel's last meeting held on 20 September 2021, under the headings within the OPCC's Delivery Plan.

The report also provided Members with information on the decisions taken by the PCC since the Panel's last meeting.

The key activities reported for the period were detailed in the Executive Summary of the report and noted by Members.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the contents of the report and commented on any matters arising.

- ii) Asked questions on the matters contained in within the report, given that it explained how the PCC has over the period delivered his Police and Crime Plan, and discharged the wide range of his legal responsibilities.

13 LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

A report was submitted to update Members on current events – national, regional and local, together with future plans in respect of learning and development for the Panel.

Suggestions for any other learning and development opportunities Members may have to support the Panel's learning and development were welcomed.

A summary of the events which had taken place since the last meeting together with details of proposed future events were set out within the report for Members' information.

Councillor Haleem and Mr Carratt wished to record their thanks to the Force and OPCC for arranging a very informative and enlightening Force Induction Day held on 12 November 2021.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the update.
- ii) Agreed to provide suggestions for future learning and development.

14 WORK PROGRAMME / PAB DATES

Members considered the 2022 Work Programme and were reminded that they could submit issues for the Work Programme that fall within the Panel's Statutory role in supporting and scrutinising the Commissioner.

All issues would be given full consideration by the Chair, Vice-Chair and Commissioner at the pre-agenda planning meetings.

L Noble reported that she would update the Work Programme for the February 2022 Panel meeting to include the results of the findings from a survey carried out by the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels.

Additionally, Members were encouraged to attend the meetings of the Commissioner's Public Accountability Board (PAB) to increase their operational knowledge. These were currently being held virtually and Members could obtain details to 'dial in' to the meeting from L Noble or A Shirt.

Members were reminded that they could also submit questions for PAB through the OPCC, with 5 working days notice prior to the meeting.

Professor James said that it would be helpful if PAB agenda papers could be circulated well in advance of meetings to enable Panel Members to fully read and digest the reports.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Police and Crime Panel:-

- i) Noted the contents of the 2022 Work Programme.
- ii) Noted that the Work Programme for the February 2022 Panel meeting would be updated to include the results of the findings from a survey carried out by the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels.

15 DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED –

- i) That the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel be held on Friday 4 February 2022 at 1:00 pm in Barnsley Town Hall.
- ii) That a Panel Budget Familiarisation Session be arranged towards the end of January 2022 and Panel Members notified of the arrangements.

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank