

OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

LEAD CHIEF OFFICER:	DCC Amanda Blakeman
TITLE:	PSD Performance Report, Q2 2019-20
DATE:	26th November 2019
TIMING:	Routine
PURPOSE:	For monitoring
1.	<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>
1.1	The purpose of this report is to provide a narrative to accompany with IOPC national Police Complaints Information Bulletin, an update on misconduct outcomes and on force vetting.
2.	<u>INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND</u>
2.1	<p>The IOPC produce a national Police Complaints Data Bulletin on a quarterly basis which includes comparative data against the MSFs and nationally. It provides an overview of the number and types of complaints, timeliness, the number of appeals to the force and the IOPC and the outcome of these appeals.</p> <p>The bulletin provides a number of measures relevant to the performance of the Professional Standards Department. This report is intended to provide a narrative to accompany the IOPC data.</p> <p>It should be noted that although the IOPC bulletin is produced quarterly, the data provided uses cumulative year to date figures, rather than examining performance in each individual quarter.</p>
2.2	A brief overview of Conduct cases concluded in this period is also included. Where cases were held in public, full details will already have been published on the force website.
2.3	The force vetting function forms part of the Professional Standards Department. It carries out vetting checks on potential new recruits and police staff applicants, contractors and re-vetting current officers, staff and contractors. This report includes an update on the work of the Vetting team.
3.	<u>ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION</u>
3.1	<p><u>Commentary on attached IOPC Complaints Information Bulletin</u></p> <p><u>IOPC Appeals:</u></p> <p>There were only 2 appeals upheld by the IOPC in Q2. Both related to recording decisions where PSD believed the complaints had been dealt with on previous occasions. Both were matters involving persons who have made numerous other</p>

complaints to PSD.

Force Appeals:

There were no appeals upheld this quarter.

Complaint Timeliness:

81% of complaints have been recorded complaints within the 10-day target. There has been a slight reduction since the last quarter, which is likely to be as a result of the pre-planned absence of both the PSD Complaints Assessor and the Public Response Unit Assessor in the period.

Timeliness for resolving complaints by has fallen over the quarter from 88 to 81 days and remains better than the MSF (96 days) and National average (98 days).

Allegation Timeliness:

The average number of days to locally resolve allegations (47 days) is lower than in the previous quarter (53 days) and still below the MSF (68 days) and National average (70 days). Local Resolutions only account for 12% of the allegations dealt with in this period.

The average number of days to finalise allegations by local investigation is 115 days. Although this has increased since the last quarter (93 days), it is still well below the MSF (158 days) and national average (152 days). There has been a reduction in staff dealing with these types of complaints in the last quarter, although it is too early to determine if this has resulted in the increase.

Allegations recorded:

The number of allegations per 1000 employees recorded in Q2 (73) is similar to those recorded in Q1 (73). This is 145 in total for the year to date and is comparable to our MSF (152) and the National average (137).

<i>Allegations Recorded by Qtr and year to date</i>										
	Qtr 1		Qtr 2		Qtr3		Qtr4		YTD	
<i>Category</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>
Other Neglect or failure in duty	40%	62	45%	83					46%	145
Incivility/Impoliteness/Intolerance	10%	16	16%	30					15%	46
Breach of Code C	4%	7	13%	23					10%	30
Discriminatory Behaviour	5%	8	4%	8					5%	16

In line with the national picture, "Other neglect of failure of duty" remains is the most prevalent category for allegations.

Whilst Neglect can be a catch all for allegations that do not fit within the other available options, in general terms, complainants were unhappy with:

- Poor quality of service provided.
- Failure to investigate
- Being kept up to date/informed.
- Failure to contact

Incivility is broken down as conduct that is:-

- Unhelpful/Unprofessional
- Rude or Abrupt
- Intimidating/Aggressive

Breach of Code C allegations predominantly relate to:-

- Refusal of Medication
- Refusal of access to a Solicitor
- Refusal of access to a Doctor

Discriminatory Behaviour is broken down as follows:-

- Race

Examples include;

- Complainant felt she was dealt with inappropriately due to his colour, and would not have treated in the same way if she was white.
- Complainant felt excessive force was used during an arrest because she was of black Nigerian origin.
- Complainant felt he was ignored whilst officers spoke with two females he is of Asian appearance and the females were white.

Allegations Finalised:

Gwent locally resolve a lower percentage of complaints than most forces. (Gwent 12%) (MSF 46%) (National Av 50%).

The IOPC guidance allows Local Resolutions to be used in appropriate cases, including where the complainant does not support use of the LR process. However, in Gwent we do not routinely use the LR process unless the complainant consents. As a result, there are very few appeals against this process.

The changes to Police Regulations, expected in February 2020, will lead to a new, national approach to dealing with these types of investigations. There will no longer be a distinction between Local Resolutions and Proportionate Investigations.

There are a high percentage of withdrawals (27%) compared to the MSF (9%) and National Average (6%) but these numbers are consistent with the same period last year (23%). As noted above, this is believed to be the result of accessible on-line reporting facilities, combined with the PSD Sergeants in the LPAs spending time with complainants to explain force processes and the law, which often results in early withdrawals.

3.2 Distribution of allegations

The distribution of allegations remain proportionately split between East and West with no discernible patterns in any area.

There was 1 complaint in Q2 that related to the Investigative Framework.

3.3 Equality Monitoring – complainants

The force has adopted the national electronic complaints form which has allowed improved equality monitoring. The form is used by complainants reporting on-line and also by staff to record complaints made via 101 or at the station.

The level of data recorded is much improved on previous years; however, there is further work to be done to understand the outcome of these complaints and how they relate to the local population.

Ethnicity	Percentage 2018/2019	2019/2020 Q1		2019/2020 Q2		2019/2020 Q3 % / No.s	2019/2020 Q4 % / No.s
		%/	No.s	%	No.s		
White	60%	75%	46	82.5 %	66		
Unknown	28%	11.5 %	7	9%	7		
Asian	9%	5%	3	2.5%	2		
Black	2%	6.5%	4	6%	5		
Other	1%	2%	1	-			

Sexual Orientation	Percentage 2018/2019	2019/2020 Q1 % / No.s		2019/2020 Q2 % / No.s		2019/2020 Q3	2019/2020 Q4
		%	No.s	%	No.s		
No data	52%	15%	9	4%	3		
Bisexual		-		1%	3		
Hetero	42%	66%	40	91%	73		
Unknown	2.5%	3%	2	3%	2		
Prefer not to say	2%	6.5%	4	1%	4		
Gay / lesbian	1%	8%	5	0			
Other	1%	1.5%	5	0			

Disability	Percentage 2018/19	2019/2020 Q1		2019/2020 Q2		2019/2020 Q3	2019/2020 Q4
		%	No.s	%	No.s		
No data	96%	90%	55	84%	67		
Unknown	1.5%	2%	1	5%	4		
Mental Health	1%	6%	4	2%	2		
Physical	0.5%	3%	2	1%	1		

	Learning Difficulty	0%	2%	1	0																															
	Sensory	0%	2%	1	1%	1																														
	Prefer not to say	0%	2%	1	1%	1																														
	none	1%	0%		9%	7																														
3.4	Conduct																																			
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Conduct</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Reporting Period</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Reporting Period</th> <th>Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q1 2018 /2019</td> <td>11</td> <td>Q1 2019/2020</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2 2018/2019</td> <td>10</td> <td>Q2 2019/2020</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3 2018/2019</td> <td>10</td> <td>Q3 2019/2020</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q4 2018/2019</td> <td>6</td> <td>Q4 2019/2020</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>37</td> <td>Total</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>								Conduct				Reporting Period	Number	Reporting Period	Number	Q1 2018 /2019	11	Q1 2019/2020	9	Q2 2018/2019	10	Q2 2019/2020	16	Q3 2018/2019	10	Q3 2019/2020		Q4 2018/2019	6	Q4 2019/2020		Total	37	Total	
Conduct																																				
Reporting Period	Number	Reporting Period	Number																																	
Q1 2018 /2019	11	Q1 2019/2020	9																																	
Q2 2018/2019	10	Q2 2019/2020	16																																	
Q3 2018/2019	10	Q3 2019/2020																																		
Q4 2018/2019	6	Q4 2019/2020																																		
Total	37	Total																																		
	<p>The number of conduct cases remains steady with the majority of matters relating to off-duty conduct. The largest number of cases relate to conduct at work-related social functions.</p>																																			
3.5	Misconduct Outcomes for Q2 2019/20																																			
	<p>No misconduct proceedings have been undertaken in this quarter.</p>																																			
3.6	External scrutiny																																			
	<p>There are currently no live independent IOPC investigations.</p> <p>There are currently three managed IOPC investigations being undertaken by external forces.</p>																																			

4. Vetting

Of the 419 people vetted during this period 398 were granted vetting. 21 were refused. The force is now up to date with MV vetting. However, there are 25 officers/ staff members who have do not comply with standard vetting requirements.

Vetting Completed – Quarter 2 2019/20				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Police officer / staff	114	210		
Contractors / outside agency	225	178		
Vetting Health Checks	29	31		
Total	398	419		

Vetting Refusals – 2019/20				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Previous conviction / caution	6	13		
Financial Vulnerability	4	2		
Negative Intelligence	3	3		
Associates	1	3		
Residency	1	0		
Total	15	21		

Vetting Refusals- Protected Characteristics – (Police officer / staff) 2019/20*				
*To be populated from Q3				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
BAME			/	/
Sexual Orientation			/	/
Disability			/	/
Gender Reassignment			/	/
Male			/	/
Female			/	/

Decisions Following Vetting Appeals- Protected Characteristics– (Police officer / staff) 2019/20				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
BAME Accepted		1		
BAME Rejected		0		
Sexual orientation Accepted		0		
Sexual orientation Rejected		1		
Disability Accepted		0		
Disability Rejected		0		
Gender Reassignment		0		
Gender Reassignment		0		

5. NEXT STEPS

5.1 To consider if the information in this quarterly report still meets the requirements of the OPCC and Chief Officer Team.

6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 None

7.	<u>PERSONNEL CONSIDERATIONS</u>
7.1	None
8.	<u>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</u>
8.1	None.
9.	<u>EQUALITIES AND HUMAN RIGHTS CONSIDERATIONS</u>
9.1	This report has been considered against the general duty to promote equality, as stipulated under the Strategic Equality Plan and has been assessed not to discriminate against any particular group.
9.2	In preparing this report, consideration has been given to requirements of the Articles contained in the European Convention on Human Rights and the Human Rights Act 1998.
10.	<u>RISK</u>
10.1	No issues to risk to note.
11.	<u>PUBLIC INTEREST</u>
11.1	No public interest issues.
12.	<u>CONTACT OFFICER</u>
12.1	Supt Nick McLain
13.	<u>ANNEXES</u>
13.1	None.

For OPCC use only

Office of the Chief Constable	
I confirm that the above Q2 PSD Performance Report has been discussed and approved at a formal Chief Officers' meeting. It is now forwarded to the OPCC for approval/monitoring purposes.	
Signature: <i>P.C. Kelly</i>	
Date: 19/11/19	
	Tick to confirm (if applicable)
Police and Crime Commissioner for Gwent	
I confirm that I have considered whether or not I have any personal or prejudicial interest in this matter and take the proposed decision in compliance with the Code of Conduct. The above request has my approval.	
Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>	
Date: 26/11/19	