



**INDEPENDENT CRIME RECORDING CONFIDENCE PANEL**

**5 April 2019 12.00pm to 1.48pm**  
**OPCC Meeting Room**  
**Police Headquarters**

**NOTES**

**In attendance:**

Cate Moore – Panel Chair  
George Krawiec – Panel Deputy Chair (Member of the Lincolnshire Police and Crime Panel)  
Malcolm Burch (Chief Executive, OPCC)  
Olwen Edwards (Contract Manager, Victim Support)  
David Forbes (Chair of the Joint Independent Audit Committee)  
Professor Matthew Hall (Professor of Law & Criminal Justice, Lincoln University)  
John King (Corporate Administration Officer, OPCC)

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Laura McKane (Chief Executive Officer, Lincolnshire Rape Crisis)</li><li>• Nick Gray, Panel Advisor (Force Crime and Incident Registrar, Northamptonshire Police)</li></ul>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Notes of 1 February 2019 meeting</b> <p>The notes were agreed.</p>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Action Log</b> <p>Progress with the Action Log was noted.</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Panel Member's Session</b> <p>The Chair explained the purpose of the Member session, which was to agree a set of recommendations based on the Panel's findings for consideration by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC). These would be set-out within a covering report that she would draft on behalf of the Panel. Mr Forbes volunteered to proof read the paper once drafted. It was hoped that an initial draft would be prepared in</p>	

time for the next meeting of the Panel scheduled for 7 June 2019. The Chair also raised the possibility of the Panel continuing in some form of oversight/monitoring role at least until the outcome of the Force re-inspection was known. Mr Burch suggested that the PCC was likely to support such a proposal. Mr Forbes confirmed that there would be no duplication of effort between the Panel and the Joint Independent Audit Committee. He envisaged that the Committee would look to the Panel for assurance around the Force's crime recording arrangements.

The Chair invited general comments from Members prior to reviewing the responses made to a series of questions that had been put to HMICFRS and Force officers at the last Panel meeting.

The Deputy Chair commented on the reluctance of HMICFRS to consider whether the existing National Crime Recording Standards and associated Rules were fit for purpose. It was clear from the Panel's previous discussions with the Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) and Force Crime Registrar that examples of good practice had been developed locally, which did not conform to current norms. Whilst unsighted on the methodology used to develop the current standards/rules, Members felt that a mechanism was needed to facilitate reviews of their current and on-going suitability.

Concerns were expressed about the current standards/rules failing to drive the right fundamental behaviours for achieving better outcomes. Being in receipt of a 'Good' rating from HMICFRS might reflect a high level of compliance, but did not necessarily translate into good outcomes for victims. The danger was in forces becoming servants to a 'data beast' rather than the public.

The Panel considered the responses detailed in the minutes of the last meeting.

*Question 1: What is the extent to which the findings for Lincolnshire are out of line with those for other forces going through the inspection process? Are there features/practices unique to Lincs?*

It was noted that rather than address the question directly, HMICFRS had taken refuge in the National Crime Registrar's role as final arbiter in disputes arising out of their inspection findings. Members also disagreed with the suggestion that operators employed by G4S in the Force Control Room were a unique and distinct feature, particularly as they were managed directly by the Force.

*Question 2: Is there a direct correlation between the amount of resources dedicated to crime recording and compliance with current rules?*

The Chair highlighted the view put forward by HMICFRS that making a recording decision at the point a report was received would be the most effective approach. She acknowledged that whilst this currently

<p>presented some technical challenges for the Force, those issues were expected to be addressed once the new Command and Control system became operational in 2020. However it was acknowledged that this wouldn't be until after the re-inspection had occurred. The Chair highlighted comments made by the DCC that factors such as tiredness and stress could impact on the quality of decision-making by police officers. Whilst in agreement with the general sentiments expressed, it was an area that the Panel might want to explore in more detail with the DCC.</p> <p>Mr Burch referred to a briefing that both he and the Chair had received from the Crime Registrar prior to the establishment of the Panel. The briefing included a warning about performance and audit, which was subsequently raised with the Force. It was agreed that Members would be provided with a copy of the briefing document.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted a key concern for the Panel around the lack of audit capacity, which meant that the Crime Registrar and his Deputy had to fulfil this particular function. It was agreed that reference to this anomaly should be made within the draft report.</p> <p>The Panel had picked-up on comments made by HMICFRS regarding the danger of focussing too much attention on those aspects of their Inspection report that dealt with victims of rape. Members were clear that whilst the report did highlighted a number of other issue areas such as reports of Domestic Violence, it was the Force's approach to recording reports of rape that had attracted significant adverse comment not only within the Inspection report, but from victims, the general public and media. It was suggested that the Panel report might include some positive examples of how reports of rape had been handled by the Force to provide a balanced picture.</p> <p>Whilst Members were sympathetic to the victim-led approach adopted by the Force in relation to the recording of Domestic Violence incidents, there was a strong view that incidents should still be logged even if victims later decided not to cooperate with the police. It was only through recording such information that an intelligence picture of the alleged offending/abuser could be constructed.</p> <p>The Panel found it anomalous that the Force should be rated as 'Inadequate' for crime recording by HMICFRS but 'Good' for leadership to meet recording standards. This suggested a level of disconnect between Chief Officers and those responsible for making recording decisions.</p> <p><i>Question 3: Can you please explain to us the methodology used by HMICFRS and perhaps forward us a copy of the spreadsheet they use? This would assist the panel members in their understanding.</i></p> <p>Reference was made to the list of 'success factors' that had been identified by HMICFRS. It was acknowledged that delivery of those factors would be reliant on the new Command and Control system in</p>	<p>MB</p>
--	-----------

addition to improvements in training and supervision.

Question 4: *What is the extent to which HMICFRS as an organisation, have the ability to feedback to the Home Office on whether there is a current recording regime?*

Members noted the statement by the Force Crime Registrar that changes to the national standards introduced in April 2019 would have reduced the number of reports of rape that had not been recorded from 23 to 13. The Panel was clear that a single missed report of rape was one too many and acknowledged that improvements had to be made.

Question 5: *What is HMICFRS ability to identify and promote good practice if they come across it even if that practice does not conform to current rules?*

Members expressed disappointment at the response to this particular question. It was likely that there were a number of models of good practice in operation across the country. The response from HMICFRS again suggested that the primary focus was on inputs not outputs.

Question 6: *We heard evidence from Laura Wint-McKane from Lincolnshire Rape Crisis that many people in the County were very upset when the HMICFRS report came out. That demand fell on Laura and her colleagues, not on Lincolnshire Police. Without seeking to apportion blame on either HMICFRS or the Force, can we use this meeting to look towards a jointly more responsible approach, keeping the needs of the public at the forefront?*

Whilst it was important to ensure that both sides understood how impactful the Inspection report had been on victims and the public in general, Members recognised that HMICFRS, acting in the public interest, could not be expected to 'pull its punches'. It was suggested that the adverse impact of the Inspection report might be a good starting point for the Panel's report.

Prof Hall referred to a reoccurring theme that could be found in many of the responses provided by both the Force and HMICFRS, namely, that victims were at the heart of crime recording. However this was at odds not only with the outcome of the Inspection, but also with the Panel's own findings. It was clear to him that victims of crime were being let down and, as a consequence, were being denied services within the Criminal Justice System to which they were entitled.

### Recommendations

Members agreed that the following points be reflected within the Panel's report and recommendations.

1. Panel to continue to meet on a 6 weekly cycle until the

	<p>outcome of the Force re-inspection is known. Revert to quarterly basis thereafter to reassure PCC/public that crime recording is being addressed and appropriately handled.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Crime Registrar function be reviewed to ensure sufficient capacity/capability to meet demand. Clear need for extra crime-recording audit capacity and potential cost benefits of taking a shared regional approach to the audit function.</li> <li>3. How is the Force evidencing/measuring the effectiveness of training programmes (including CPD), policies and practices, support and supervision of crime recording arrangements?</li> <li>4. Maintenance of an open dialogue approach to crime recording between the Force and HMICFRS.</li> <li>5. Focus on long term qualitative improvements.</li> <li>6. Strengthen ties with Victim Support and other specialist coping and recovery services.</li> <li>7. Public statements issued periodically (possibly through the AGS) indicating the PCC's level of assurance around the effectiveness of crime recording arrangements in Lincolnshire.</li> </ol>	
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>Friday 7 June 2019 12.00 to 2.00pm in the OPCC Meeting Room.</p>	All