

CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL	Agenda Item No. 7
23 November 2022	Public Report

Report of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

Contact Officer – Jim Haylett

Contact Details – cambs-pcc@cambs.police.uk 0300 333 3456

TITLE: HMICFRS PEEL ASSESSMENT

1.	PURPOSE
1.1	To provide the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel (the “Panel”) with details of the Police and Crime Commissioner’s (the “Commissioner”) approach to the HMICFRS (His Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services) PEEL inspection report on Cambridgeshire Constabulary, published in June 2022.
2.	RECOMMENDATION
2.1	The Panel is recommended to note the contents of this report.
3.	TERMS OF REFERENCE
3.1	Item 6 – To review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, by the Police and Crime Commissioner in connection with the discharge of the Commissioner’s functions. Item 7 - To make reports or recommendations to the Police and Crime Commissioner with respect to the discharge of the commissioner’s functions. Item 8 - To support the effective exercise of the functions of the Police and Crime Commissioner.
4.	BACKGROUND
4.1	Under the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 (the “Act”) the Panel has a role in scrutinising the Police and Crime Commissioner’s (the “Commissioner”) in the exercise of his statutory functions. There is no reference in the Act to any duty of the Panel specifically relating to HMICFRS reports.

4.2	<p>The Act sets out that the Commissioner has a statutory duty to hold the Chief Constable to account, the specific duty is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The police and crime commissioner for a police area must; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) secure the maintenance of the police force for that area, and b) secure that the police force is efficient and effective. • The police and crime commissioner for a police area must hold the relevant chief constable to account for the exercise of; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the functions of the chief constable, and b) the functions of persons under the direction and control of the chief constable.
4.3	<p>The Commissioner is cognisant of the operational independence of the Chief Constable. That operational independence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decisions in relation to the appointment and dismissal of officers and staff; • decisions concerning the configuration and organisation of policing resources (or the decision whether, or whether not, to deploy police officers and staff; • total discretion to investigate or require an investigation into crimes and individuals as he or she sees fit; • decisions taken with the purpose of balancing competing operational needs within the framework of priorities and objectives set by the PCC; • operational decisions to reallocate resource to meet immediate demand; and • the allocation of officers' specific duties and responsibilities within the force area to meet the strategic objectives set by the PCC.
4.4	<p>HMICFRS PEEL reports are one source of information for the Commissioner to use in exercising the holding to account function. They do not constitute the entirety of policing responsibilities. There are multiple other bodies undertaking inspection/audit/assurance of different aspects of the Constabulary's functions. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal and External audits; • Information Commissioner's Office; • Independent Office for Police Conduct; • Criminal Justice Joint Inspections: Police, Probation/Prisons and CPS; • In the multi-agency arena Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Safeguarding Partnership Board for Adults and Children (2 boards) that does hold police and all partners to account; • The Investigatory Powers Commissioner's Office (for things like use of surveillance powers);

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent Custody Visitors scheme and the Independent Stop and Search and Use of Force scrutiny panels.
4.5	<p>In considering those reports detailed at 4.4, the Commissioner is also cognisant of performance outcomes. There are a range of different ways that crime statistics are presented and comparative police performance presented. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Constabulary's own performance management processes 2. National Policing Board with Crime and Policing Performance Board and Performance and Resources Scrutiny Board reporting into it 3. ONS and Police recorded Crime 4. Crime Survey England and Wales 5. Digital Crime and Performance Pack/Beating Crime Plan 6. 999 league tables (101 to come) 7. Criminal Justice Scorecards 8. HMICFRS – Value For Money (VFM) profiles; PEEL gradings <p>Caveat – Cambs are rated “Good” at recording crime and it is that recording that is reflected in much of the above, however some forces are graded by HMICFRS as “Inadequate” which means they are under-recording a significant number of crimes. One force within our “family” recorded only 3 out of 23 crimes reported by victims of anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>In considering performance, the role of the Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) must be considered. The concept that local multi-agency partnership working is vital in preventing and reducing crime is well established and locally CSPs have this responsibility. Local Authorities scrutinise the effectiveness of the 6 CSPs within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.</p>
4.6	<p>Given the multitude of ways “performance” can be assessed and for the purposes of a consistent message, the Commissioner focuses on the national crime measures as these are the focus of government, includes non-police data and is used to make comparisons with other forces. Below is the latest update regarding crime performance (published in full on the OPCC website 05b-BCB-National-Crime-and-Policing-Measures-Quarterly-Update-Website.pdf (cambridgeshire-pcc.gov.uk)):</p> <p>For the 12 months ending June 2022 there have been 7 homicides in Cambridgeshire, compared to 14 for year ending June 2019.</p>

The latest data on local admissions to accident and emergency for assault by sharp weapons shows Cambridgeshire has seen a decline compared to the benchmark.

The latest data for firearm offences shows Cambridgeshire recorded 41 offences in the year ending June 2022 which is 39.7% lower than year ending June 2019.

Cambridgeshire has seen an 11% increase in violence with injury offences compared to year ending June 2019 (although violence with injury crime rate per 100,000 population is still lower than the similar forces and the national rate)

In Cambridgeshire there has been a 39% increase in drug trafficking offences when compared to the baseline of year ending June 2019. (This reflects increased police activity to disrupt drug supply)

For “neighbourhood crime” the 12 months to June 2022 there has been the following reductions in Cambridgeshire compared to the baseline of year ending June 2019:

- 17.7% drop in personal robbery offences
- 22.8% drop in theft from the person offences
- 10.3% drop in theft of vehicle offences
- 39.6% drop in theft from a vehicle offence
- 33.6% drop in vehicle interference
- 46.4% drop in residential burglary offences

Domestic Abuse victims’ satisfaction for year ending June 2022 83.3% were at least fairly satisfied with the whole experience compared to year end figure for March 2020 of 82.1%.

The Constabulary also surveys victims of hate crime, burglary, and violence. Victim satisfaction compared to year ending June 2019 has declined going from 78.7% down to 76.2% for year ending June 2022.

Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG) offences increased by 48% in the last 12 months compared to year ending March 2020. (The majority of that increase is in stalking and harassment cases). Cambridgeshire has a rate of 1,205 VAWG crimes per 100,000 population which is comparable to similar forces average.

	<p>In year ending June 2019 there were 551 cyber-crimes, for year ending June 2022 there were 1863 crimes. It is likely that part of the increase between the two-time frames is in part down to an increase in offences and improved use of keywords to identify cyber enabled offending.</p>
4.7	<p>The Commissioner also considers the resources available to the Chief Constable when considering the PEEL report and the holding to account function. HMICFRS have recognised the link between funding and provision of service.</p> <p>In the HMICFRS State of Policing 2021 report this was stated: “The low funding base for some smaller forces in particular means that they consistently struggle to provide as effective service as better funded forces. There is only so much they can do with the resources at their disposal.”</p>
4.8	<p>The current funding for Cambridgeshire is based upon the funding formula and using population estimates from 2013/14. Despite reductions of population in some areas of the country, and significant growth in others, no adjustments have been made to the allocation approach. In effect this means that some parts of the country receive funding for a population they no longer have, and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough having had significant growth, have not received any additional funding for that extra population.</p>
4.9	<p>It is also worth considering the Cambridgeshire HMICFRS assessment, compared to its most similar family of forces. Those highlighted in orange have been reported as being in HMICFRS “special measures.”</p>

4.10 The table below shows those forces with published PEEL assessments, Cambridgeshire Constabulary has the best overall gradings. Forces highlighted in orange are reported as being in HMICFRS “special measures.”

“League table” of published PEEL reports	HMICFRS PEEL gradings	Cost per person per year ^[1] (national ave £224.25)	Officers per £1m funding	% of funding from precept	Band D precept
Cambridgeshire	4 Good 3 Adequate 2 Requires Improvement	£202.05	9.53	43.6%	£257.58
Thames Valley	3 Good 4 Adequate 2 Requires Improvement	£209.73	8.65	44.0%	£241.28
Gloucestershire	4 Good 1 Adequate 6 Inadequate	£218.08	8.52	47.3%	£280.08
Warwickshire	5 Adequate 3 Requires Improvement	£209.28	8.62	46.0%	£262.71
Staffordshire	1 Adequate 5 Requires improvement 3 Inadequate	£204.33	7.64	37.6%	£248.57
Wiltshire	5 Requires Improvement 3 Inadequate	£195.52	7.60	45.2%	£241.27
Avon and Somerset	HMICFRS yet to report on.	£209.51	8.48	40.1%	£251.20
Devon and Cornwall	HMICFRS yet to report on.	£210.14	8.85	40.4%	£246.56

^[1] Using ONS Mid-term population estimates 2020.

4.11	<p>Extraordinary demands on policing is a necessary factor to be considered. It is widely recognised that policing is the service of last resort - stepping into what can be considered “non-crime” roles but when the incident is presenting as a threat to life, becomes a police matter. Whether that is a person in mental health crisis, a missing vulnerable child, or a child needing to be taken into police protection - all these types of incidents are increasing and the police are finding that once they have preserved life, it is increasingly difficult to pass the case on to the most appropriate service for further resolution.</p> <p>This inevitably reduces the availability of police for what the public would view as “core policing” roles.</p>
5.	Statutory duties of PCC
5.1	<p>The Police Act 1996 S55 requires the Commissioner to publish his response to the HMICFRS report. This has been published on the OPCC website, see below link; The Police & Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire (cambridgeshire-pcc.gov.uk)</p>
5.2	<p>In terms of holding the Chief Constable to account, the Commissioner considers all of the factors detailed in the earlier part of this report.</p> <p>A “Thematic” Business Coordination Board (BCB) was held on 11 July 2022 with the only agenda item being the HMICFRS report and specifically the two themes of concern identified - Responding to the Public and Investigating Crime.</p> <p>At this Board, the Chief Constable gave a presentation on the findings of the report and the action plan to address issues within it. The presentation by the Chief Constable is appended to this document at Appendix 1. The minutes of that meeting have been published on the PCC website. The Commissioner and Chief Constable agreed that 6 weekly reporting on progress against the action plan would be considered at BCB.</p>
5.3	<p>A further BCB was held on 24 August where a further report was presented and a further discussion took place between the Commissioner and the Chief Constable. The Chief Constable provided an update on the progress of the action plan. The update report is published on the OPCC website and included at Appendix 2 of this report. The minutes of this meeting will be published when approved.</p>

5.4	The Commissioner and the Chief Constable will continue discussions on progress against the action plan and whether progress to improvement is sufficient or whether additional action is required.
6	BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS
	<p data-bbox="236 427 1007 461"><u>HMICFRS Cambridgeshire Constabulary PEEL report</u></p> <p data-bbox="236 499 1046 533">Cambridgeshire - HMICFRS (justiceinspectorates.gov.uk)</p>
7	<u>APPENDICES</u>
	<p data-bbox="236 674 799 707">Appendix 1 – 11 July 2022 BCB Report</p> <p data-bbox="236 745 762 779">Appendix 2 – 24 August BCB Report</p>