

Hertfordshire Community Stop and Search Panel
30th September 2025, 10am – 1pm
Joint Emergency Services Academy, Stevenage
Minutes

Attendance:

Mohammad Islam Ruman (Chair)	MIR	Dennis Elam	DE
Andy Taylor	AT	Robert Lloyd	RL
Jeffrey Burke	JB	Tara Bullworthy	TB
Eddie McCarroll	EMc	Supt Ben Wright	BW
Ben Platt	BP	Insp Clare Cray	CC
Bukola Efunshile	BE	PS Adrian Pikett	AP
Godfrey Minsky	GM	Amie Birkhamshaw	AB
Phil Millard	PM	Keeley Smyley	KS
Valerie Shrimplin	VS	Lucy Nicolson-James	LNJ
Paulette Reed	PR	Sue McNeill, OPCC (minutes)	SMc

Also present: PC Lumm, PC Roberts, PS Neath and DC Riley

1	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies
1.1	The Chair (MIR) welcomed panel members, officers from the Constabulary and observers, particularly Supt Ben Wright (BW)
1.2	Apologies were noted from: Demitrius Nurse, Jerry Rudd, Jacqueline Gaffin, Linda Blake, John Gillett, David Reynolds, Mamadou Bah and Megan Holland.
1.3	MIR noted that several panel members had not sent apologies at the time of the meeting, which adversely affected the group preparation. He reminded that the panel invites were sent on an 'opt-out' basis, in that anticipated non-attendance should be communicated ahead of the meeting.
2	Minutes of the Previous Meeting, Actions and Matters Arising.
2.1	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed (see pack item 1) and the action tracker was updated (item 2.)

2.2	Prior to the meeting, Constabulary feedback was provided by presentation on the individual concerns raised. (Item 3).
2.3	AP reminded that the Constabulary has an expectation that, within 7 days of a stop/search record being uploaded to the system, a supervisor will review the entry. Most records, therefore, will have been reviewed prior to panel selection. The three cases flagged as red at the last meeting all related to stop/searches conducted in St Albans. The theme for all related to poorly written grounds and feedback has been given to officers and reviewing supervisors.
2.4	JB was concerned to note that for two of the records, relating to separate incidents occurring several weeks apart, the supervisor had cut and pasted a review. AP assured that feedback highlighting this as an unacceptable practice has been provided to that sergeant.
3	Introduction – Supt Ben Wright
3.1	BW introduced himself to the panel and advised of the recent restructure within the Constabulary resulting in the Operation Strategy Team being disbanded. Police Powers now sits within Local Policing Command under Ch Supt Jon Simpson. BW assured the panel that Insp Clare Cray and Sgt Adrian Pikett will continue to support the panels.
3.2	AP advised the panel that in terms of the feedback and learning loop, an additional layer of review has been added. Should an officer's engagement be flagged as red by the panel, a stop/search record will be provided for review at the six months point. This is to ensure that any learning has embedded, and improvement (or otherwise) is subject to the same scrutiny.
4	OPCC Update
4.1	AB updated the panel on: Accountability & Performance Meeting: The most recent HMICFRS PEEL inspection was positive in terms of the legitimacy element. Police Powers and public treatment fall into this category. The scrutiny panels were deemed to be amongst the best in the country, particularly the comprehensive feedback loop and independence of the panel. The PCC discussed the inspection report with the Chief Constable during the August webinar. <u>August APM can be viewed here</u> The

	PCC was pleased to note that the panel had recorded an increased level of confidence, with fewer red and amber grades awarded. There were more positive outcomes and, overall, fewer stops. The Chief Constable's focus was on quality and accountability. He was aware of the variation between CSP performance and this was being monitored. Additionally, understanding disproportionality remains a priority.
4	Data Subgroup Update
4.1	EMc reminded the panel that the data subgroup reviewed statistical information for performance anomalies, which have fed into various deep dive recommendations. He raised concerns that resource and continuity issues within the Data Engineering Team meant that, whilst the data subgroup had had some progressive discussions, it had not received timely data and lost momentum. He stated that consistency and continued focus was key to identifying trends and improvement. He expressed concern regarding the Constabulary's response to disproportionality, seeming to accept as the norm, a ratio consistently showing black people five times more likely to be stopped, with few actions evidently in place to address this. The subgroup members felt that the high-level measure of disproportionality was unreliable as it relies on out-of-date census data, recording of stops of people from outside of the region and a range of other factors. Because of this, the team wanted to focus more on outcomes. EMc asked for more trend data to be provided with context and detail on the actions to address those trends, with a view to returning to deep dive topics for future scrutiny.
4.2	AB advised the group that she would reach out to the Constabulary's Head of Performance, who was well-versed in disproportionality data, for assistance in terms of consistent provision of the relevant information. Action: AB to contact Chris Pratt, Head of Performance regarding data provision.
4.3	The most recent data set (item 4) was reviewed by outcome, suggesting this was the best indicator. BP added that the most recent data showed that the number of stops required per positive outcome sat at 3.3 and 2.4 for Asian and White individuals respectively. The recommended deep dive isolated those stops on Black and Asian individuals where no further action was recorded as the outcome.

5	Panel Feedback – Deep Dive: NFAs by ethnicity																																																																																									
5.1	The scrutiny took place between 11.00am and 12.25pm. The below grid represents the gradings as recorded by the panel. A registration sheet is cross-referenced with the individual records for accuracy. The figures in brackets relate to scores given for the BWV footage as this is also fed back to the Constabulary but separated so as not to distort record review figures. Where the panel was split in its decision, the poorest grade has been recorded.																																																																																									
5.2	As there were insufficient panel members for five subgroups, group four records were not scrutinised. Panel members were thus reminded of the importance of letting the OPCC know if they were unable to attend a meeting.																																																																																									
5.3	<table><tr><th>Group no.</th><th>Checked</th><th>Green 1 Excellent</th><th>Green 2 Satisfactory</th><th>Amber 3 Not confident</th><th>Red 4 Serious concerns</th></tr><tr><td>Grp 1</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>BWV</td><td>(5)</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Grp 2</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>U18 strip search</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Grp 2</td><td>12</td><td>7</td><td>5</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>standard searches</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Grp 3</td><td>7</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>standard searches</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Grp 4</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>standard searches</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Grp 5</td><td>15</td><td>11</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>standard searches</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>39</td><td>25</td><td>10</td><td>3</td><td>1</td></tr></table>						Group no.	Checked	Green 1 Excellent	Green 2 Satisfactory	Amber 3 Not confident	Red 4 Serious concerns	Grp 1	5	5	0	0	0	BWV	(5)	0	0	0	0	Grp 2	0	0	0	0	0	U18 strip search						Grp 2	12	7	5	0	0	standard searches						Grp 3	7	2	3	2	0	standard searches						Grp 4						standard searches						Grp 5	15	11	2	1	1	standard searches						TOTAL	39	25	10	3	1
Group no.	Checked	Green 1 Excellent	Green 2 Satisfactory	Amber 3 Not confident	Red 4 Serious concerns																																																																																					
Grp 1	5	5	0	0	0																																																																																					
BWV	(5)	0	0	0	0																																																																																					
Grp 2	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																					
U18 strip search																																																																																										
Grp 2	12	7	5	0	0																																																																																					
standard searches																																																																																										
Grp 3	7	2	3	2	0																																																																																					
standard searches																																																																																										
Grp 4																																																																																										
standard searches																																																																																										
Grp 5	15	11	2	1	1																																																																																					
standard searches																																																																																										
TOTAL	39	25	10	3	1																																																																																					
5.4	One record was not graded as panel members believed it referred to a Section 163 stop, however this was a vehicle-only search and within the scope of the panel. AP stated that he would review the record regardless.																																																																																									
5.5	General feedback: There were two instances where, although the grounds for the stop/search were justified, the panel requested the relevant footage is reviewed by the use of force panel for the officer’s engagement.																																																																																									

	<i>Post-meeting note: both items of footage have been located and prepared for the Use of Force Panel to review in November.</i>
6	Complaints Resolution Team Update
6.1	KS shared complaints data (item 5.) She reminded the panel that the purpose of the Complaint Resolution Team (CRT) was to service recover low level complaints, with certain criteria being referred to PSD. Of the 42 complaints received, three related to Stop & Search but only two of those were dealt with by CRT (and not upheld.) The third was referred to PSD due to the nature of the allegation.
7	Any Other Business
7.1	No items raised and MIR closed the meeting.
8	Date of next meeting: Monday 24th November 2025, 10am – 1pm Three Rivers District Council, 3 Rivers House, Northway, WED3 1RL