

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS & INTEGRITY (POLICE) COMMITTEE
Wednesday, 25 May 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Professional Standards & Integrity (Police) Committee
held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Wednesday, 25 May
2022 at 2.00 pm

Present

Members:

Caroline Addy (Chair)
Deborah Oliver (Deputy Chairman)
Tijs Broeke
Alderman Professor Emma Edhem
Jason Groves
Florence Keelson-Anfu
Michael Mitchell (External Member)

Officers:

Paul Betts	- City of London Police
John Cater	- Committee Clerk
Hayley Williams	- City of London Police
Dermont Robinson	- City of London Police
Ian Younger	- City of London Police
James Morgan	- City of London Police
Claire Cresswell	- City of London Police
Rachel Waldron	- Police Authority Team
Pauline Smith	- City of London Police

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Nicholas Bensted-Smith and Deputy James Thomson.

2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 18th February 2022 be approved as an accurate record.

4. **REFERENCES**

Members received a report of the Town Clerk and Commissioner regarding the Committee's outstanding references.

RESOLVED - that the Report be noted and that the action concerning the Attraction Strategy be closed on the basis that the Police Uplift Programme (PUP), recruitment, and attraction is being scrutinised and monitored alongside

the Workforce Plan at the Resource, Risk and Estates (Police) Committee (RREC).

5. **Q4 STOP AND SEARCH AND USE OF FORCE UPDATE - 2021-22**

The Committee received a Report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning Stop and Search and Use of Force in Quarter 4.

After officers provided an introduction, a number of queries were raised:

In response to a query concerning the differentiation in the dip sampling data, officers confirmed that, 20% of the samples were considered “best practice” in how stop and searches should be done, with the remaining 80%, whilst deemed professional and lawful, were not considered to be the best examples to utilise in a training environment. Noting Members’ interest in this area, officers would try to submit additional quantitative data in future which focused more on the identifiable trends; it was also pointed out that The Independent Advisory and Scrutiny Group (IASG) would be carrying out its 2022 Review and officers would present analysis around any disparities and common areas to the Committee in the autumn.

Separately, in response to concerns about the experience and feedback of those who are strip searched with a negative outcome, officers emphasised that any stop and search interaction (including those which involved a strip search) aimed for a positive experience with dignity and respect at the core. In the run-up to the meeting, the officer had gone through the records for Quarter 4 confirmed that in all video recordings, officers were professional, and he was felt assured that colleagues are striving to ensure that those being strip searched are being treated with dignity and respect. It should be noted that during the strip search the camera is turned off to safeguard the privacy and dignity of the individual.

The Chair requested that, in future, reporting around strip searches included statistics on strip search types and that it picked up on any distinct patterns according to each of these types; she also encouraged the Force to ensure that they were doing all they could, including rolling out refresher training, to further improve the processes and outcomes for individuals; officers responded that, in light of the Child Q case, the Force was changing its internal processes in an effort to ensure under 18s continue to be afforded greater protection when it came to stop and searches; an update would be provided to the Committee in September.

The Chair added that it would be helpful to consider improving ways in which young people could feedback their experience of being stopped and searched (e.g. by distributing contact cards). It was particularly concerning that, across England and Wales, some individuals were still being repeatedly stopped and searched despite these resulting on each occasion with a negative outcome; the corrosive affect this had on that individual’s perception of the Police should not be underestimated.

Noting concerns about officers' use of body worn video during stop and searches, namely, that officers ensured the video captured all parts of the interaction (excluding strip searches), officers informed Members that the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC), would be reporting soon on use of body worn video and a summary would be brought back to the Committee at its next meeting in September.

In response to a query, officers confirmed that Project Servator training dates were being set up.

A Member remarked that the 44% "not stated" figure for self-defined ethnicity was concerning and asked whether any steps could be taken to lower that figure. Officers responded that the collection of ethnicity data came via two methods – self defined and observed/officer perceived. Individuals were not compelled to state their ethnicity, and, per Code A, the Force was prohibited from trying to influence what people say during a stop and search. Members asked that the statistics based on the observed/officer perceived ethnicity, should be submitted alongside the self-defined ethnicity data in future iterations of this Report. The officer responded to say that this would rely on the full data being produced.

RESOLVED – that the Committee noted the Report.

6. ACTION FRAUD STATISTICS – QUARTER 4 – 1ST JANUARY 2022 – 31ST MARCH 2022

The Committee received a Report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning Action Fraud Statistics for Quarter 4.

Reflecting on the work around communications, in particular the template letters, a Member remarked that it was encouraging and welcome that previous learnings have been acted upon and that improvements have been made.

The Chair added that, given its topicality, it would be helpful if some consideration could be given to the Force's approach to the experience of the victims for the emerging threat from crypto currencies and associated cases of fraud.

RESOLVED – that the Committee noted the Report.

7. CITY AND HACKNEY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN PARTNERSHIP (CHSCP) CHILD Q PRACTICE REVIEW

The Committee received a Joint Report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police and the Director of Community and Children's Services concerning the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership (CHSCP) Child Q Practice Review.

Several Members commented that the record of the treatment of Child Q in the Review was very alarming, and the performance of the Metropolitan Police Officers involved was lamentable, with particular concerns around the presumption throughout that Child Q was the perpetrator, a lack of an

appropriate adult being present, the rationale for the strip search, namely, the suspicion that Child Q had been smoking/was in possession of cannabis, and, the finding that after the search was completed, she had been sent home on her own in a taxi. The learnings of this case needed to be swiftly absorbed and measures put in place to ensure that these types of occurrences were not repeated. It was vital that when the Police does have contact with children these interactions are dealt with properly.

The Chair added that it would be beneficial if all schools in which the City Corporation had a remit over had a dedicated Police Officer that could be called upon if a similar situation arose in the future.

In response to a query, officers confirmed that there had been nine recorded strip searches of individuals under the age of 18 by City of London Police Officers over the past 3 years, between 2019 and 2022. These were all males between 15 and 17 years old; the ethnicity breakdown was 3 black males, 2 Asians, and 2 white southern Europeans and 2 white northern Europeans. For additional scrutiny, officers were carrying out a deep dive of the strip search data over that period, and the details would be submitted to the Committee for review in the autumn.

Offices stressed that whilst this longer-term work was being examined, immediate actions and measures were being put in place as a response to the Review findings, these included communications and briefings to all officers, better preparation of custody suites, and a renewed focus on the use of appropriate adults. Given the limited number of strip searches of under 18s in an average year, it was important that officers were given the all the tools and knowledge available to ensure that any occurrence abided with the guidelines and the experience of the individuals being searched was one based on respect and dignity. The Chair added that as best practice, it might be optimal to always carry out strip searches of under 18s in a custody suite to best ensure compliance with the guidelines. The Force confirmed that this was the case currently.

In response to a query, officers provided the definition of an appropriate adult; they added that it was important to ensure that this support was clearly communicated to the child; Members noted that it was not always beneficial to designate a teacher as an appropriate adult. Officers added that on occasion there were grounds for not having an appropriate adult present, but that this should always be by rare exception with clear a rationale outlined.

RESOLVED – that the Committee noted the Report.

8. **UPDATE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS (VAWG) ACTIVITY**
The Committee received a Report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning VAWG activity.

The Chair welcomed the update as very encouraging; she asked officers to ensure that they were doing all they could to promote the work externally.

She added that it was important that the right portals and avenues for girls and women to contact the Police were established and clear; positive early contact between victims and the Police were critical to ensure progress in this area.

A Member asked officers to ensure that they were engaged with the emerging plans for Destination City, particularly given the concerns of local residents that a likely result of the renewed drive to build up the night-time economy in the City, would be an increase in anti-social behaviour.

A Member queried a couple of points on the Reframe the Night campaign posters, referring to page 108 in the agenda pack, she pointed to her experience as a professor at university, where a common occurrence in recent years was for young men to choose to not step into scenarios where young women were being harassed due to concerns that they themselves would be accused of wrongdoing.

Given that the activity in this area should not just be left to the Police to respond to, the Chair asked officers to identify areas in which the Corporation can potentially help with, for instance there was currently no women's refuge in the Square Mile; whilst recognising that resources would be a factor, it was vital to see this as a situation which required the mobilisation of various different agencies and departments in the City to secure a real step change.

A Member added that it would be beneficial if the Police could work with and leverage the considerable reach and resources of the larger employers and business networks in the City as this was rightly a universal concern for all responsible organisations across the Square Mile.

RESOLVED – that the Committee noted the Report.

9. **QUARTERLY EQUALITY AND INCLUSION UPDATE**

The Committee received a Report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning the latest position regarding activity supporting the delivery of the Equality and Inclusion Strategy & Action Plan.

In response to a number of queries, officers emphasised that, whilst facing a challenging recruitment environment, a great deal of work was being undertaken to increase the number of female recruits and those from diverse backgrounds, with a renewed focus on improving outreach and the introduction of a buddying system. It was apparent that progress was being made in diversifying the civilian staff profile at a greater pace than warranted officers, however, there were inherent challenges particular to the latter category, not least the highly competitive recruitment environment due to the national police uplift programme. In terms of outreach, a Member suggested that the Force could reach out to law school graduates, given their transferable skills and the steady pipeline of available talent due to the highly competitive nature of that industry. She added that she would be happy to reference the City's recruitment opportunities to her students during her university lectures.

It was also highlighted that the age profile of the Police Officer pool at the City was older than the average Force across England and Wales and this had a knock on effect for retention given more officers were closer to retirement. There had been a surge in retirements recently due to changes in pensions arrangements.

Alongside exit interviews, the Force also undertook retention interviews, whereby senior officers would sit down with individuals who had indicated that they were looking to move on to see if the Force could do anything to retain them, and if they were certain about departing, whether there was anything the Force could change for the future.

In terms of the challenges around retention, officers pointed out that the Force was comparatively small compared to other Forces across the country, and there was limited scope for civilian staff members to be rotated or moved into different subject areas and they were recruited as City of London Corporation employees on specific terms and conditions.

Several Members cautioned that improving retention, whilst desirable in terms of resilience, should be balanced by the positive fact that staff members were moving to often more senior roles elsewhere across the country, this indicated an encouraging sign that the City of London Police possessed a talented workforce.

A Member noted that the tone of the approach seemed to be one based on a listening strategy, which was very welcome; he emphasised that just tracking numbers was not enough, the step change in terms of culture came through building up qualitative data by listening to current staff, leavers, and potential recruits, and giving them the confidence that the organisation was empowering them to affect material changes for the better, a key part of this had to include listening to dissatisfied staff and taking on board their views and feelings.

The Committee asked for further data concerning the differentials in promotion based on gender and ethnicity, officers responded that they would bring this back to the Committee. Members also noted a wider issue of women not always taking up opportunities for promotion when they were clearly qualified and experience to move up to a more senior role, lessons could be drawn from the private sector and Members were happy to share their experience of the types of measures their employers had introduced to encourage women to go for it. Officers raised the example of other Forces taking the initiative and inviting certain individuals to interview when roles became available. This could be something which the City of London Police could look to emulate.

Members noted the high number of respondents of staff members preferring not to state their sexual orientation and suggested that improving this figure would be a good indication that culturally, the organisation was moving in the right direction. It was noted however that this was not mandatory, but voluntary.

A Member queried whether more could be done in collecting data around silent diversity, for example, faith. Officers responded that this data is already presented as part of the HR monitoring report to the RREC.

The Chair asked that the target dates on KPIs needed to be finalised soon, given the critical need to keep things focused and on track.

RESOLVED – that the Committee noted the Report.

10. INTEGRITY AND CODE OF ETHICS UPDATE

The Committee received a Report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning the work of the Forces Ethics and Integrity Lead, the Force's Integrity Standards Board (ISB), regional and national activity of relevance, and the Integrity Standards dashboard and the Ethics and Integrity delivery plan for 2022.

RESOLVED – that the Committee noted the Report.

11. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no public questions.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no other business.

13. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED, that under Section 100 (A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

14. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 18th February 2022 be approved as an accurate record.

15. NON-PUBLIC REFERENCES

The Committee received a Joint Report of the Town Clerk and the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning the Committee's non-public outstanding references.

16. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS STATISTICS – QUARTER 4 - 1ST JAN 2022 – 31ST MARCH 2022

The Committee received a Report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning the Professional Standards Statistics for Q4.

17. PCR CASE SUMMARY

Members received a report of the Commissioner regarding a series of PCR Case Summaries, namely;

17.1 **CM/05/21**

17.2 **MI/384/21**

17.3 **CO/47/21**

17.4 **CO/142/21**

17.5 **CO/273/21**

17.6 **CO/279/21**

17.7 **CO/284/21**

18. NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There was one non-public question.

19. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at 4.00 pm

Chair

Contact Officer: John Cater
John.Cater@cityoflondon.gov.uk