

AGENDA

KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Dear Councillor

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the **KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL** will be held in the **Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone** on **Thursday, 24th July, 2014, at 2.30 pm** when the following business will be transacted

Members of the public who require further information are asked to contact Joel Cook on 01622 694764

Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting in the meeting room

Membership

Councillor Paul Clokie	Ashford Borough Council
Councillor Pat Todd	Canterbury City Council
Councillor Anthony Martin	Dartford Borough Council
Councillor Sue Chandler	Dover District Council
Councillor John Burden	Gravesham Borough Council
Mr Mike Hill (Chairman)	Kent County Council
Councillor Annabelle Blackmore	Maidstone Borough Council
Councillor Les Wicks	Medway Council
Councillor Peter Fleming	Sevenoaks District Council
Councillor Malcolm Dearden	Shepway District Council
Councillor Andrew Bowles	Swale Borough Council
Councillor Peter Campbell	Thanet District Council
Councillor Mark Rhodes	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council
Councillor Caroline Derrick	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
Mr Roger Latchford	Co-opted member – Kent County Council
Councillor Gordon Cowan	Co-opted member - Dover District Council
Councillor Ian Chittenden	Co-opted member - Maidstone Borough Council
Councillor Rupert Turpin	Co-opted member - Medway Council
Mr Dan McDonald	Independent Member
Mr Gurvinder Sandher (Vice-Chairman)	Independent Member

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

- 1 Introduction/Webcast Announcement
- 2 Apologies and Substitutes
- 3 Declarations of Interests by Members in Items on the Agenda for this Meeting
- 4 Minutes of the Police and Crime Panel held on 05/06/14 (Pages 3 - 10)

B - Commissioner's reports requested by the Panel/offered by the Commissioner

- B1 Engagement Strategy (Pages 11 - 14)
- B2 Corporate Communications (Pages 15 - 16)
- B3 Police Contact Points / Mobile Police Stations (Pages 17 - 20)

C - Commissioner's Decisions

- C1 Commissioner's Decisions (Pages 21 - 26)

D - Panel Matters

- D1 Future work programme (Pages 27 - 28)
- D2 PCC Correspondence following 'Meet the Commissioner' documentary (Pages 29 - 30)

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services
(01622) 694002

Wednesday, 16 July 2014

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

KENT AND MEDWAY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 5 June 2014.

PRESENT: Mr P M Hill, OBE (Chairman), Mr Gurvinder Sandher (Vice-Chairman), Cllr P Clokie, Cllr P Todd, Cllr T Martin, Cllr Mrs S Chandler, Cllr J Burden, Cllr Mrs A Blackmore, Cllr L Wicks, Cllr R Turpin, Cllr M Dearden, Mr A H T Bowles, Cllr Campbell, Cllr M Rhodes, Mr H Birkby (Substitute for Mr R A Latchford, OBE), Mr G Cowan, Mr I S Chittenden and Mr Dan McDonald

ALSO PRESENT: Mrs A Barnes (Kent Police and Crime Commissioner), Mr M Stepney (Chief of Staff) and Mr S Nolan (Chief Finance Officer)

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Campbell (Policy Officer), Mr P Sass (Head of Democratic Services) and Mrs A Taylor (Scrutiny Research Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**88. Introduction/Webcast Announcement**
(Item 1)

1. The Chairman welcomed Members and the Commissioner to the Police and Crime Panel meeting and advised Members that the meeting would be webcast and filmed by television cameras.

89. Discussion following the Cutting Edge documentary 'Meet the Police Commissioner'
(Item B1)

1. The Chairman explained that the purpose of the meeting was to review, with the Commissioner, the Channel Four documentary 'Meet the Commissioner' which had attracted media and social media comments, most being critical, some highly critical, accepting that this was a carefully edited programme, designed to some extent to shock and entertain, it had clearly been a public relations disaster and the Panel needed to consider how it happened, what damage had been done and what steps could be taken to recover the situation.
2. Mr Campbell reminded the Panel that the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act enabled the Panel to review or scrutinise any decision of the Commissioner, make any report, and make any recommendations to the Commissioner. The Panel could require the Commissioner to respond in writing, to come back to future meetings with any actions or to report back to the Panel. The Act also requires the Panel to exercise powers with a view to supporting the effective exercise of the PCC's functions, the office of the PCC rather than the particular holder.

3. The Commissioner offered an apology, especially to the hard working men and women of Kent Police, some of whom were very upset about the documentary, it was not the Commissioner's intention to upset them. The only reason the Commissioner agreed to do the documentary was to help people better understand the complex and challenging role of the PCC. The Commissioner did not believe the programme did that well, and she was deeply sorry for the negative reporting and upset it had caused. When approached to do the programme the Commissioner took advice but the final decision was the Commissioner's, with the benefit of hindsight it was the wrong decision and she was sorry. There had been accusations of damage to the reputation of Kent Police; it was never the Commissioner's intention to draw adverse publicity to the excellent work carried out by officers and staff as well as the Commissioner's staff and the work of fellow Commissioners. The Commissioner confirmed that she would continue to do her job, being the link between the people of Kent and the Police and delivering promises within Police and Crime Plan, however the Commissioner's approach to engagement was being reviewed, she would still be out and about and open and transparent, but there would be a change of emphasis on the excellent work being delivered rather than the role of the Commissioner.
4. The Chairman opened the questions by asking why the Commissioner agreed to the programme, such documentaries were considered notoriously dangerous particularly with the decision to cede editorial control. In addition, why did the Commissioner not inform the Panel of the significant decision to take part in the programme? The Commissioner confirmed that it was done with the best of intentions, advice was taken but the Commissioner made the final decision to do an education piece explaining the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner. The work of the company was researched, but with hindsight the Commissioner would not do it again. Advice was taken on whether to inform the Panel and it was considered not necessary, the Panel did know the film was taking place, and Members did give interviews after the Panel meetings.
5. Following the negative publicity as a result of the programme a member asked what was the Commissioner's strategy to regain the confidence of the people of Kent in the Office of the PCC. The Commissioner explained that she was unhappy with the programme, it gave a snapshot and focussed too much on the Commissioner as an individual, it was not the educational programme it was hoped it would be. The Commissioner did acknowledge the concerns raised, and there was work to do to repair the damage, however, the Commissioner considered she was a fit person to do the job, with 15 years experience of policing and police governance both locally and nationally. Firstly the Commissioner would continue to deliver her Police and Crime Plan, Members of the Panel were aware that the Commissioner had delivered two Police and Crime Plans, with victims at the heart and delivered on manifesto promises with healthy budgets and high crime recording figures. There was also the victim's centre and the new Sexual Assault Referral Centre which was better than Kent had ever had. The Commissioner would be looking at her approach to engagement and she had every intention of putting this right. The Commissioner confirmed that her revised strategy would be brought back to the Panel.

6. In relation to editorial control the Commissioner confirmed that the filming agreement, an industry standard agreement, did not allow the Commissioner editorial control which was standard practice.
7. A Member asked whether the Commissioner and her officers had had opportunity to view the programme and agree the content. The Commissioner had been offered the opportunity to view the programme at the completion of the first round of production, however the offer was rescinded as Channel 4 had requested further editing from the production company. . The Commissioner then saw it towards the very end of the production process (shortly before airing) by which time there was no opportunity to make substantive changes, despite requests from the Commissioner's office. The programme was viewed by the Commissioner, a senior member of the force and two senior members of staff and it was decided that it did give a flavour of the job, it did not show the in depth work of the Police Commissioner, it did raise issues around funding, expectations of a Commissioner and difficulties to have contact with all communities. If the requested changes could have been made it was not an ideal programme but was as good as the Commissioner was going to get. There was no option available to the Commissioner to stop the programme being shown.
8. A Member commented on issues which had arisen with the Commissioner such as the former Youth Commissioner, the documentary and a more recent issue. Regarding the programme, following four months spent with the film crew and advisors, the perception produced by the programme destroyed the integrity of the office and the integrity of the Panel. What advice did the Commissioner have before entering into the decision to give uncontrolled access and editorial control to the film company? The Commissioner explained that with regard to the first Youth Commissioner, there was an independent review, which led to two recommendations, these were taken on board, the Panel reviewed and discussed the report, and lessons were learnt. With regard to the office move, the rationale was purely business case which was submitted to the Panel and requested comments, no comments were made. With regards to the revelations made by 'The Sun' newspaper the Commissioner assumed that Members were aware of the reasons why it was not possible to discuss that issue at the present time. With regard to advice around the programme this was received from all quarters, but it was the Commissioner's responsibility.
9. Following previous media controversy around the Youth Commissioner it seemed naive of the Commissioner to go forward with this documentary, there were laudable reasons for going ahead with the programme some of the more damaging clips were around issues where the Commissioner seemed ill-prepared; this was perhaps negligent when undertaking this exercise. The Commissioner explained that the film crew spent hundreds of hours filming, with the Commissioner explaining the role of a PCC and the role of the Police and related ramifications and achievements of the PCC. The Commissioner did ask that the first few clips be removed, these set the tone, and following a discussion with the producer it became apparent that Channel four had released these clips early. The Commissioner reiterated her comments that this was done with the best of intentions and with the benefit of hindsight the Commissioner would not make the same decision and there was a need to restore her own credibility.

10. A Member queried the Commissioner's relationship with the Chief Constable; he had offered no public support for the Commissioner and was not available to be at the Panel meeting. The Commissioner was asked for her views on how she came across in a way that led people to have confidence in her in the future. There was a need for a debate about the priorities of Kent Police. The Member stated that the Commissioner had not learnt from the mistakes with the former Youth Commissioner. The Commissioner confirmed that she had a good relationship with the Chief Constable and they worked closely together, most recently over the crime recording and the new policing model. The Chief Constable was not present because it was not his role to be present. The former Chief Constable's retirement gathering was a very pleasant occasion. The Commissioner explained that she spent all her time listening to people, referring to the 'onion' which was the former Chief Constable's view of policing with its different layers. The Commissioner had spent hours explaining the work of Kent Police and the Commissioner's work, a lot of this was on the cutting room floor. The Panel was aware of the priorities of Kent Police having signed them off through the Police and Crime Plan. 31% of people in Kent were under 25 years old and a bridge was needed, there were no guidelines for the independent review of the previous Youth Commissioner. The onion showed the core policing in the middle, with the outside being partnership working, with cuts to budget something had to go, but in the opinion of the Commissioner partnership working and visible policing was vitally important.
11. It was agreed that the Police Force worked very hard and many people also spoke well of the Commissioner, however, with regards to the documentary the positive aspects were the genuine disappointment of the Commissioner when it was not possible to bring in a higher precept to meet policing demands. The Commissioner's apology was commendable, but there were concerns over whether the Commissioner was genuinely listening to what is being said. What was the Commissioner's strategy for moving forward and increasing engagement with the Police and Crime Panel?
12. The Commissioner repeated previous comments regarding her regret over the reputation accusations which had been damaging. The past few years had been difficult for the Police Force, and she was sorry to have added to the negativity. The Commissioner was genuinely listening and she was trying hard to engage with Panel Members and Councillors. There was an extensive communications programme. The strategy was in progress and would be brought back to the Panel.
13. With regards to the advice taken around the documentary, did the Commissioner receive any advice to encourage her to go ahead with the documentary? The Commissioner explained that she received advice both to go ahead with and not go ahead with the documentary, it was a carefully weighed up decision. The Member considered that the Commissioner did listen but there were concerns around whether the Commissioner 'heard' what Members were saying. The Commissioner was asked to consider whether she was still the right person for the job. The Commissioner explained that she was 'hearing' hence many of her manifesto promises. The Panel and Commissioner had had a previous discussion about the Domestic Abuse campaign, the Sexual Assault Referral Centre, and crime recording which resulted in a nationwide debate and praise from the House of Commons Select Committee.

14. A Member asked when the Commissioner first raised concerns about the programme, with regards to the damage to Kent Police, did the Commissioner feel that reputation damage had been done to Kent Police Force, had the Commissioner considered her own position? In response the Commissioner saw the film for the first time at the final stages of the production process, at which point the production company were unwilling to make any significant changes. The Force had a very good reputation; it was a high performing force. The Commissioner was sorry for the timing of the documentary and subsequent unrest, she did not think the force would suffer as their reputation was based on the work they did, not the Police and Crime Commissioner, it was the reputational damage that was the most concerning. The Commissioner hoped the programme had not damaged Kent Police Force and she would build bridges. She had looked long and hard at the work done in the county, she did deliver, did know the job and the priority was delivering the Police and Crime Plan priorities across Kent. The Commissioner's approach to engagement would be reviewed and brought back to the Panel.
15. A Member of the Panel was concerned that the Panel was treated with contempt, had been spoken to rather than with, information not provided on a timely basis and with oral statements rather than written reports. Kent's professional Police Force needs a professional Police and Crime Commissioner. The Commissioner's decision making capabilities were questioned in a role where decision making is crucial. The Commissioner was thanked for her humility at the Panel meeting and this was considered essential for the future. The Commissioner refuted that the Panel had been treated with contempt, or any member of the force with contempt. Regarding oral reports this may have been around the precept when information had not been received about the capping levels. The documentary looked more at the Commissioner's personality rather than the role and that was disappointing. The Commissioner deeply regretted any damage to the reputation of Kent Police Force; the Force did a really good job on a day to day basis.
16. The Commissioner was thanked for her attendance and her apology, it was considered that the programme was heavily edited, it did highlight the limitations of the role, the role was led by Government and the Commissioner had a democratic mandate from local people. The member was appalled by some of the comments made in the media, and some individuals who it was considered were going out of their way to smear and bully the Commissioner. Many people in local communities did not agree with the comments being made and the Commissioner should ignore some of the horrendous comments being made. Information set out in communications between the Commissioner and the Panel had been leaked to the media. It was important to move forward, and concentrate on the projects being delivered by the Commissioner. The Commissioner confirmed that she did look at the comments on social media, and she did genuinely take on the comments made. A quality policing service was at the heart of the Police and Crime Plan focussing heavily on victims.
17. One Member commented that he was in favour of the Commissioner system but was disappointed in the way it was working out. It was a badly balanced programme and there was an impression given about a lack of direction and purpose. With not enough seriousness or professionalism. Did the

Commissioner now see herself working more closely with the Police and Crime Panel? The Commissioner explained that there was no job description, there were statutory duties but it was for individual Commissioners to determine how these were fulfilled. Commissioners were undertaking these statutory duties differently across the country depending on local need. Everything delivered by the Commissioner and her office had intellectual rigour, the Force and Office were hard working, with immense intellectual rigour and she hoped to work even more closely with the Police and Crime Panel in the future.

18. The Panel had a mandate to support the function of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner; there were concerns around the outcomes of the Panel's meeting, given the documentary. The Commissioner confirmed that her engagement strategy would be reviewed in detail and brought back to the Panel with a written report. The Chairman requested that the Commissioner also review her decision to retain control over the Public Relations staff within the Force.
19. There were concerns that the programme makers did not ever intend for the documentary to be an education piece and the Commissioner confirmed that she did not question why the company had approached her.
20. Regarding the Councillors featured in the documentary, a query was raised about visible community policing and whether there was a conflict between the Commissioner and the Chief Constable. Could the Commissioner confirm that she could perform her job for the next two years? The Commissioner stated that the programme did show a lack of understanding over what Commissioners could/could not do; the Commissioner was not able to put police officers at the end of every street. There were currently 80 more uniformed officers on the street, there was a new policing model and predictive policing. Single targets had been removed from the Plan and work was ongoing around new performance measures, there was no conflict between the Commissioner and the Chief Constable, the Force had to be embedded in communities. The Commissioner's job was to hold the Chief Constable to account on behalf of local people for the county.
21. Regarding mobile police stations, the Commissioner confirmed that this would be brought back to the Panel.
22. One Member commented that he did not feel that the Commissioner had treated the Panel with contempt, condescension perhaps. Concerns were not arising from a political mandate, rather from local people. There was a concern about misjudgements made with limited confidence going forward if the status quo pertained. The Commissioner explained that she was an independent and would not be drawn into politics, the misjudgement was rejected, there were difficulties around the appointment of the first Youth Commissioner and the documentary, and any problems over the office move and the current Youth Commissioner were refuted.
23. A Member asked how things would change once the Panel meeting was over, how would Members of the public be approached, and what was the current situation with the mobile vans. The Commissioner explained that with regards to her community outreach vehicle, she was determined to engage with people across the huge county of Kent. The vehicle was used as an office, with a private

space to talk to people. The Commissioner purchased a second hand camper van which had been very useful as a mobile office. It was recently parked in Canterbury where people were waiting to speak to the Commissioner. With regards to the mobile police stations, they were a manifesto promise, and they were becoming a community resource and the Commissioner would report back to the Panel on this issue.

24. A Member asked whether the Commissioner's new initiatives would be coloured by history and therefore diluted in effectiveness, secondly because of the perception given off by the programme did the Commissioner retain the respect of the Police Force. The Commissioner did not believe the new initiatives would be coloured, they were vital pieces of work. Regarding the respect of the Force the reputation of the Force was foremost in the Commissioner's mind.

25. A Member commented that no-one wanted to see the politicisation of Kent Police Force.

26. In response to a question about the availability of the Commissioner at the Panel meeting on 5 June, the Commissioner was clear that she was always open and transparent; there was a particular difficulty with the date of the Panel meeting. The Commissioner confirmed that she was on leave from 5 June 2014.

27. The Chairman summed up the meeting with the following conclusions:

- a. It was a mistake, by the Commissioner, to engage in the programme and to concede editorial control;
- b. It could not be business as usual in the future, the Commissioner was requested to change her style particularly with regard to engagement with the public and the Police Force, some of the behaviours shown in the documentary could not continue, the Panel requested an assurance from the Commissioner, when she reported back to the Panel on her engagement strategy, that there was going to be a change of style in the way she operated;
- c. Damage had been done to the Police and Crime Commissioner
- d. Damage had been done to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner both locally and nationally
- e. Some minimal damage by association to Kent Police Force

RESOLVED that the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel:

28. Require the Commissioner to come back to the Panel in writing with a report on the review of mobile police stations;

29. Require the Commissioner to come back to the Panel in writing with a report on the decision to retain the public relations and communications team within the control of the Commissioner;

30. Recommend the Commissioner take heed of the public and panel comments following the documentary and report back to the Panel in mid-July in writing on the revised engagement strategy in light of those comments.

POST MEETING NOTE: A meeting of the Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel has been arranged for 2.30pm, 24 July, 2014.

From: Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner
To: Kent Police and Crime Panel
Subject: Communications and Engagement: The Next Chapter

Introduction

I am writing a personal introduction to this paper because I want no one to be in doubt of my absolute commitment to ensuring effective engagement. At our last meeting, you sent me a very clear message that I have listened to and I am now acting upon.

I have reviewed every aspect of my engagement with communities in Kent and considered where and how things could be done differently. Some of the changes referred to in this strategy can only be achieved through time, others can be implemented and achieved sooner rather than later.

I will implement this strategy to bring about positive engagement and I look for your support to do this.

Background

1. At the Police and Crime Panel on 5 June, the Panel requested that the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner (the Commissioner) report back on a revised engagement strategy in light of the comments following the Channel 4 documentary.
2. The Kent Police and Crime Commissioner's engagement strategy is the means by which the promise of being highly accessible to the people of Kent is achieved. It also facilitates the way in which a number of wider responsibilities are delivered including:
 - To understand community needs and perceptions of the police service in Kent.
 - To gather information to influence priorities in the Police and Crime Plan and undertake the statutory function of holding the Chief Constable to account; and
 - To develop trust and confidence in the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner corporate identity.

Way forward

3. The Commissioner has always and continues to be committed to listening to the views of the people of Kent, but recognises the need to ensure the right style and tone of engagement. Effective engagement is based on the following principles:
 - Style and tone
 - Narrative and timing
 - Audience; and
 - Relationships.There will be full consideration given to these throughout all aspects of this strategy in order to support delivery of a first-class policing service for the people of Kent.
4. Changes that can be implemented immediately include altering the corporate identity so that there is a continued focus on the work of the Commissioner as the elected Member, as

well as a greater focus on the work of the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC). A further change is to make the website reflect a more 'business oriented' corporate identity.

5. There are three key areas where change will be made in order to address the shift in focus:

Engagement and communication

6. Future engagement and communication plans will link to the Commissioner's strategic objectives as well policy and business arising from the office. This will assist the public in understanding the work of the OPCC and the added value that this work brings to policing in Kent.
7. Rather than a "one size fits all" approach to engagement, we are developing Local Profiles to drive engagement. These draw upon a range of data sources including: demographic Mosaic information, indices of deprivation, Kent Crime and Victimisation Survey (KCVS) data, User Satisfaction Survey data and crime trends. This will present an opportunity to engage with each of the 12 Districts and Medway to build a full profile reflecting:
 - The demographics within a community
 - Their preferred method for engagement; and
 - Their likely priority issues.
8. This data will enable a better understanding of the issues that are impacting Kent's communities and allow more targeted and appropriate engagement. As part of engagement planning, there will be management of expectations to clearly define the Commissioner's role and ability to influence within the bounds of statutory responsibility.

Partnership Working

9. The Commissioner is committed to building meaningful and mutually beneficial relationships with partners and stakeholders and there is full recognition that the objectives in the Police and Crime Plan cannot be delivered without a coordinated approach to partnership working.
10. The Commissioner will renew focus on partnership working, with particular attention on developing existing and forging new working relationships such as:
 - Further discussions with the Police and Crime Panel to enhance working relationship whilst ensuring statutory responsibilities are met by both parties.
 - Enhancing and developing two-way information flows, communication, understanding and dialogue with all partners and stakeholders, in line with the Commissioner's aspiration to be a 'hearing and listening' organisation.
 - Undertaking regular programmed meetings with key partners / stakeholders to further develop dialogue, communication and develop relationships.

Internal communication

11. The Commissioner has acknowledged the concern recent events have caused to police officers and staff and is absolutely committed to addressing the situation. The Kent Police workforce is the driver behind the quality service that the people of Kent receive and their trust and confidence is paramount.

12. The Commissioner has already put in place a People Board and the first meeting was held in early July. The board provides the opportunity for the Commissioner, on behalf of the people of Kent, to ensure that Kent Police's Mission, Vision and Values are being truly engrained within the workforce. The Commissioner wants the People Board to be a place where officers and staff can talk freely and openly about matters which are affecting them and their ability to do their job. The Commissioner intends to invite representatives from a wide variety of staff (with the agreement of the Chief Constable) to give their perspective on the organisation and the issues that matter to them.
13. In addition to the People Board, the Commissioner's internal engagement plan will seek to include more face-to-face engagement and briefings with officers and staff. The Commissioner will continue to work closely with staff associations and support groups to understand their members' issues and concerns to forge greater and more trusting relationships.

Conclusion

14. This paper sets out the high level strategy for change and areas where the Commissioner can bring about a shift of focus whilst fulfilling the promises laid out in the manifesto. The Commissioner is steadfastly committed to change and seeks the full support of all partners and looks forward to discussing some of further detail in the oral presentation.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner
To: Kent Police and Crime Panel
Subject: Corporate Communications

Introduction:

1. This report provides the latest position on the new public relations and communication team in Kent Police.

Background:

2. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act created two new corporation soles, the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable. At the point when Police Authorities ceased to exist in 2012, all police staff (previously employed by the Police Authority) 'transferred' to the employment of the Commissioners, which was referred to as the Stage 1 transfer.
3. The Government then directed that there should be a second transfer of police staff between Commissioners to the Chief Constable. This was referred to as Stage 2 Transfers and occurred on 31 March 2014. As part of the process, 'Transfer Schedules' (which essentially set out who will employ which groups of police staff) would need to be agreed between a Commissioner and their Chief Constable by late 2013 - in order to allow for the necessary consultation periods with unions and staff before the March transfer. Transfer Schedules would then be submitted to the Home Secretary for approval.
4. In Kent a transfer schedule was agreed between the Commissioner and Chief Constable. It set out that all police staff would transfer to the employment of the Chief Constable with exception of staff working in the Commissioner's office, the Corporate Communications Team and the Research Bureau - the rationale for this approach is set out below.
5. Kent's transfer schedule was approved by the Home Secretary and the transfer of police staff (with the exception of the groups listed above) occurred without incident on 31 March 2014.

Transfer schedule rationale

6. Effective public engagement is a key component of the Kent Police and Crime Plan, with a move towards more community involvement or participation in communications being supported by research published on the College of Policing website.
7. Given the long lead-in for decisions to be made (December 2013) coupled with the change of Chief Constable in early 2014, neither the Commissioner or Chief Constable wanted to be rushed into making a decision by the tight Stage 2 Transfer deadlines. This included decisions around the delivery model, how operational independence is maintained between both organisations, whether it is a shared or separate platform of delivery and where employment of the staff best sat. Therefore it was agreed that employment of the groups listed in paragraph 4 would remain with the Commissioner until further work had been done to find the right strategic model. While this work was ongoing, there was no change to day-to-day work for staff.
8. To further understand the above issues, research was commissioned in early 2014 to consider what the public require from the Police and OPCC in terms of the engagement, and to understand the needs and expectations of intended audiences. The research, understood to be the first of its kind nationally, involved speaking to the Corporate Communications team as well as exploring the issues with a cross section of the Kent public.
9. The research reported back in May 2014, with the core recommendation being to focus on engaging with the public through communications by establishing a listening, dialogue and feedback loop which provides them with highly relevant, local information. This approach also complemented the new Kent Police Model, which was close to being rolled out operationally.

10. The research was internally presented to the Commissioner, Chief Constable, Corporate Communications team, Research Bureau and OPCC Staff where it was discussed with interest and constructively debated. The end result has seen the team lead on the design of a pilot engagement model, which blends the strategic intent coming from the research with the ideas and suggestions of those who will be delivering it operationally on the ground.

Next steps

11. The Chief Constable and Commissioner are extremely pleased with the direction of travel. The research recommendations complement the new policing model, support the research from the College of Policing and a great deal of work has been done to create the new engagement pilot. The new engagement model clearly indicates a closer linkage between operational policing and engagement, so for this reason the Chief Constable and Commissioner agree that employment of staff working in the Corporate Communications and Research Bureau should transfer to the employment of the Chief Constable. The Head of Corporate Communications (which is currently temporarily filled) will be replaced by a new Head of Community Engagement. This role will oversee the operational roll-out of the new engagement model to ensure it meets the requirements of the OPCC as well as Kent Police.

12. Staff have been briefed about the upcoming transfer and have been advised there will be no change in terms and conditions (as a result of the transfer) or break in service. The exact date of the transfer is anticipated to be as soon as possible (date being finalised at the time of writing) to ensure the smooth roll-out and implementation of the engagement model.

From: Ann Barnes, Kent Police and Crime Commissioner
To: Kent Police and Crime Panel
Subject: Police Contact Points

Executive summary:

- PCPs staffed by a dedicated team of PCSOs
- Provide a countywide, 7 days a week resource
- Facilitate local engagement, and support both critical incidents and community events
- Support force operations providing crime prevention advice
- As a force operational resource PCPs are subject to continuous review and assessment

Introduction:

1. This report has been commissioned for the Kent Police and Crime Panel and is intended to provide a review of the role of Police Contact Points since their inception and an assessment of that role in the future, including developments in their organisation and implementation. Given the largely operational nature of the information contained, the Commissioner's office acknowledge Kent Police's assistance in providing the relevant operational information contained in this report.

Background

2. The Police and Crime Commissioner's pre-election manifesto included a pledge to introduce a fleet of Mobile Police Stations (Police Contact Points) to support enhanced engagement in rural communities and make it easier for those communities to access policing services. Following funding provision by the Commissioner, the existing fleet of Mercedes Sprinter vans was refurbished and a phased county roll out completed on 4th September 2013 under the operational direction of the Chief Constable.
3. The scheme initially ran from Wednesday to Sunday each week with a fixed schedule over a fortnightly period. The aim was for each of the six vehicles to achieve three engagements each shift over the fortnightly schedule.
4. Initially, District PCSOs were used to staff Police Contact Points (PCPs). However, a dedicated team of 15 PCSOs has now been recruited and trained. They took up full responsibility for the program w/c 22nd April 2014.
5. As with any new scheme it was decided to keep working practises under constant review and to adjust and amend the time spent at each venue from 90 minutes to an hour to free up time at the end of each shift to deploy to crime and ASB hotspots. This had a positive impact in that we ensure that PCPs are deployed to areas which need them most. This is something that we will continue into the future.
6. It was also decided at an early stage that PCPs would be an ideal platform to act as focal points for community engagement within Critical Incident scenarios. A recent and high profile example of this was the extreme flooding experienced in Yalding during the Christmas/New Year period where the PCP provided a base for police activity and a reassuring presence for the community. Without doubt, where appropriate circumstances prevail, they could be used very effectively for similar incidents in the future.
7. They are also a flexible resource to deploy in response to force priorities; a good example being their county-wide involvement in Operation Tri-Star which focussed on burglary reduction towards the end of 2013. In December 2013 and January 2014 the teams concentrated on giving crime prevention advice to residents in hotspot areas.

Phase 2 – new developments

8. We have now concluded the first phase of the initiative. Whilst the project is still relatively new, only being a year since the first PCP deployed in East Kent, we have already implemented a number of changes which will ensure the project remains responsive to community needs.

Developments include:-

- The project operates through a dedicated team of 15 PCSOs who took up responsibility for the initiative in April 2014, the investment bringing with it increased continuity and resilience. Consideration is currently being given to reinforcing this investment in staffing with the purchase of an additional van in order to provide a similar resilience in equipment.
- The new scheme covers a combination of fixed venues, dynamic response to daily business priorities, and ring-fenced weekends to attend community events.
- By reviewing shift patterns, we have been able to extend PCP coverage and have amended deployment times to provide greater coverage from the initial five days to seven days.
- Routes and venues have been amended. Experience has shown that some initial locations did not attract sufficient visitor numbers so new venues have been selected. These include some original popular venues but also carefully chosen larger venues taking into account issues of crime, ASB, visibility and confidence. The emphasis is now on being a pro-active visible patrol. All fixed venues are decided by District CSU's, having considered attendance and demand data (based on crime, ASB, violence, local priorities) along with local knowledge of each District. Locations will be changed regularly according to demand.
- Each weekday PCPs attend three fixed venues a day followed by a 'dynamic deployment' to a crime, ASB or other hotspot.
- Flexibility has been built in to enable the PCP to respond to changing crime and ASB hotspots, repeat crime locations and areas vulnerable to seasonal crime trends. As a result we will extend the PCP range into some urban locations.
- Attending fetes, fairs and other kinds of community events presents an excellent opportunity for public engagement and bespoke crime prevention advice. Weekends are kept free and event organisers invited to bid for PCP attendance at events. The means to bid are well sign posted and can be found on the Kent Police website (contact us/Police Contact Points and then follow the links).
- Offering crime prevention material at vulnerable locations presents a good opportunity to engage with the public and give crime prevention advice. Distributing purse chains, shed alarms and similar items to potentially vulnerable people in focussed locations can also be a cost effective crime prevention measure. All PCP vans were stocked with such items in support of the latest Operation Castle burglary campaign. We will continue to do this for future initiatives.
- Interest has now been expressed by partner agencies in joining forces and we will explore ways to work with others in areas of mutual interest.
- Routes and venues will be constantly reviewed and assessed to ensure the best uptake and outcomes.
- Details of the locations and timings are published on the Kent Police website (visit www.kent.police.uk/contactus) and tweeted by the PCSO staffing via a Twitter account. Parish Councils are advised of current routes and venues and any changes necessitated.

Conclusion

9. Police Contact Points have undergone significant development over the past 12 months. They are now a more local resource that is still delivering the original objective of providing enhanced engagement and access to policing services. During the same period the force has also undergone change, but the initiative remains entirely complimentary to our evolving policing model, with the focus very much on locally delivered policing services. PCPs now provide District Commanders with a flexible resource which can be quickly and easily directed towards District policing priorities, helping to address threats, harm and risk as they occur.
10. Attending weekend events is already proving popular with significant numbers visiting PCPs and this is something that we would expect to increase, particularly in the summer months. This is supportive of the requirements for local visible engagement and the demand profiles for Kent Police.
11. Finally, as with all operational deployments, Kent Police will continue to review and evaluate this initiative to ensure that it remains responsive to community needs.

This page is intentionally left blank

Commissioner's Key Decision – April 2014

Decision:

Decision to support three bids to the Police Innovation Fund, two of which are in collaboration with Essex Police & Crime Commissioner.

1. Collaborative Operational Vehicle Efficiency: in conjunction with Essex Police & Crime Commissioner
2. Visual Media Evidence: in conjunction with Essex Police & Crime Commissioner
3. Video Conferencing for Courts

Bids to the Police Innovation Fund require co-investment by Police & Crime Commissioners of between 30-40% and therefore the potential co-investment from Kent is: £641.65 over FY 14/15 and FY 15/16.

Justification:

The Police Innovation Fund enables Police and Crime Commissioners to invest in a range of innovative approaches that will improve policing and deliver further efficiency. In particular the focus of bids is on collaboration and improved digital working.

The operational vehicle efficiency is focused on implementing a telematics fleet system for the monitoring and tracking of fleet vehicles. This will allow for a number of opportunities and savings to be realised for example targeted driver reports which will support improved fuel economy through targeted driving training and freeing up officer time through automated mileage.

The visual media evidence has 5 distinct areas, visual media capture, visual media storage and linking, visual media enhancement and analysis, visual media evidence sharing and organisational embedding. This work has a number of potential benefits including removal of the need to copy evidence resulting in a reduction in administrative cost, possible reduction of specialist staff/officer attendance at court and improved management and security of sensitive data.

The video conferencing in courts builds upon existing good work in developing a network of video enabled courts. This bid focuses on the purchase of mobile court units and developing the live link in a further two courts in Kent. The benefits of this approach include savings in Police time, greater flexibility to manage vulnerable / intimidated victims or witnesses, improved court utilisation and swifter justice

Decision:

Decision to support the force by 'pump priming' the recruitment of three Legal Executives for 6 months to deliver Domestic Violence Prevention Orders (DVPO), at a cost of £67,250.

Justification:

Police forces are required to implement DVPOs by June 2014 and to initially manage the additional demand 'pump priming' has been provided for 3 Legal Executives. These additional posts will provide expertise and capacity to manage the anticipated volumes across 6 days a week. It is anticipated that in the long term these additional posts can be incorporated into the longer term restructure of Legal Services and savings made elsewhere.

DVPOs are a secure and co-ordinated approach across agencies to enhance the protection of victims and allow better management of perpetrators. They are aimed at perpetrators who present an on-going risk of violence to the victim. A DVP Notice is issued for a 48 hour period during which time the Police must apply to the Magistrates Court to make an

application Order, which if agreed, will be in place for between 14 and 28 days. A breach of DVPO is a civil contempt of court and can result in arrest and remand in custody and is also punishable by a fine and up to two months imprisonment.

Commissioner's Key Decision – May 2014

Decision:

Decision to establish collaborative arrangements for regional units with the Police and Crime Commissioners and Chief Constables in Hampshire, Kent, Surrey, Sussex and Thames Valley.

Justification:

Sections 22 and 23 of the Police Act 1996 enable joint working between police forces and/or Police & Crime Commissioners where collaboration would deliver greater efficiencies or effectiveness. Under a section 22 agreement the Commissioner has agreed to formalise and enhance existing collaboration between the South East police forces via regional units, which include the South East Regional Organised Crime Unit (SEROUCU) and the South East Counter Terrorism Unit (SECTU). This is in conjunction with the key capacity played by the joint Serious Crime Directorate for the Kent and Essex forces.

Decision:

Decision to progress a single tender with Victim Support from the 1 April 2015 for 12 months with the option of a 6 month extension.

Justification:

To ensure continuity of service from when responsibility is devolved from the Ministry of Justice for the commissioning of victim support services. This also allows the creation of a co-located service opportunity with the Force witness support service as a first phase towards a broader victim centred approach with partners across the wider criminal justice system in future phase. As well as ensuring service continuity from April 2015, the approach allows the longer term commissioning approach to be developed in the coming months in conjunction with partners including the Kent Criminal Justice board"

Decision:

Decision to establish a 'People's Board' as a subset of the Governance Board to review and understand organisational health and workforce matters generally within the Force including equality and diversity. The Board will meet twice yearly and will seek to hear directly from the range of officers and staff within the force and also other external stakeholders depending on the item under consideration.

Justification:

As part of the broader duty on the Commissioner to hold the force to account and to ensure that Kent Police's mission, vision and values are being truly ingrained within the workforce.

This page is intentionally left blank

Commissioner's Key Decision – June 2014

Decision:

Decision to explore co-location of Victim Support and the Police Witness Care Unit within Kent Police Estate in Ashford, as phase one of the Victims' Centre, which will support the broader victim centred approach.

Justification:

The development of the Victims' Centre supports delivery of the strategic priority in the Kent Police & Crime Plan of putting victims and witnesses at the heart of processes. It also aligns to the devolution of victim services funding from the Ministry of Justice to Police & Crime Commissioners. The decision to explore co-location in the Kent Police Estate in Ashford has been made as a result of this being the current location of Victim Support and the Police Witness Care Unit and the potential availability of suitable Police Estate, which is independent from the main Police Station.

This page is intentionally left blank

Panel programme of future reports as at 24 July 2014

9th September 2014

Victim Services – implementation of Commissioner’s new commissioning responsibilities	Requested by Panel
Commissioner’s correspondence	Requested by Panel
Report back on work to understand engagement needs of Kent’s communities	Agreed at Panel on 28 th May 2014
Panel communications strategy	Requested by Chairman (report by Panel officers)

4th November 2014

Initial thinking on budget, grants and commissioning for 2015/16	Requested by Panel
Impact of Youth Commissioner	Requested by Panel
Progress with local Mental Health Concordat	Agreed at Panel on 28 th May 2014
Update on the new policing model including response to discussions with Council leaders	Agreed at Panel on 28 th May 2014
Progress in developing quality of service data	Agreed at Panel on 28 th May 2014
Annual Accounts 13/14 and Annual Report 13/14,	Statutory Requirement

February 2015

Draft Police and Crime plan 2015/16	Statutory requirement
Precept proposal 2015/16	Statutory requirement
Further report on Crime recording	Agreed at Panel on 28 th May 2014
Developing more positive activities for young people	

April 2015

Partnership working	
Delivering value for money	

June 2015

Complaints against the PCC and policy review	Report by Panel officers or Sub-Panel
Force performance in 2014/15	
Annual report 2014/15 and accounts 2014/15	Statutory requirement

September 2015

Working with the business community	
Review of Panel Communications Protocol	Review agreed by Panel (report by Panel officers)

November 2015

Protecting the public from Serious harm	
---	--

February 2016

Draft Police and Crime plan 2016/17	Statutory requirement
Precept proposal 2016/17	Statutory requirement

Items to note at each meeting

Commissioner's decisions

Commissioner's forward plan of decisions

Governance Board minutes

*Items to be presented by Panel officers

By: Mike Campbell, Police and Crime Panel Policy Officer

To: Police and Crime Panel

Subject: Dip sample of Commissioner's correspondence following Channel 4 programme "Meet the Commissioner"

1. Introduction

1.1 The Commissioner receives a high level of correspondence in a variety of forms – emails, blogs and letters. As might be expected, there was a significant increase in volume following the Channel 4 programme "Meet the Commissioner". As much of the media comment was critical of the Commissioner, her Chief of Staff invited Panel officers to dip sample the correspondence to see whether the way in which it was dealt with was appropriate and, in particular, that any correspondence that amounted to a complaint against the Commissioner, was dealt with as such.

2. Dip sample

2.1 Officers were advised that the Commissioner and her staff have received approximately 170 pieces of correspondence about the programme. I initially sampled 10% of the correspondence, selected at random and including emails, blog comments and letters. Officers were told that the correspondence was, roughly 40% positive and 60% negative. Additional sampling of negative correspondence was undertaken to ensure that the sample fully reflected the overall 40:60 split. The Office of the PCC provided the sampled correspondence, the Commissioner (or her staff's) reply and any follow-up correspondence.

3. Comments

3.1 Every piece of correspondence was replied to and the replies were sent within a few days of receipt. All correspondents were thanked for writing and for expressing their opinion (whether the correspondence was positive or negative). In no case did the reply attempt to enter into a debate or to respond in detail to points made, beyond a re-iteration of the reasons why the Commissioner agreed to take part in the programme and her disappointment that it did not feature more of the work of the Office.

3.2 The critical comments were similar to those made in the media. They included criticism of the number of staff in her Office, criticism of those who advised her to take part, criticism of the PCC's salary, and criticism of her performance during several incidents shown on the programme.

- 3.3 In my judgment, none of the criticisms amounted to a complaint against the Commissioner and I therefore agree with the decision of her Chief of Staff to treat them all as correspondence to be replied to rather than complaints to be recorded. A few of the correspondents wrote back after the Commissioner's response to re-iterate criticisms but there were no complaints about the way their original correspondence had been dealt with.
- 3.4 A minority of correspondents made highly offensive remarks about the Commissioner personally and some made offensive comments about her staff. In all cases there comments were ignored and a courteous reply sent.

Recommendation

That the Panel notes the contents of this report.

Contact: Mike Campbell Tel: 01622 696603
