

Performance and Accountability Management - July Meeting-20260727_090122UTC-Meeting Recording

Matthew Barber (C2871) 0:37

KS

Hi, we've got a few other people who have joined online. Just a reminder, if you do join in at some point, I'll ask you to introduce yourselves. And can we go round the room? I suppose people can't see who's on camera. Could you have it? on name under the picture. So I'm Matthew Barber, Police and Prime Commissioner. Emmick Kirsty Sumner, Admin Support. Gillian Ormston, Chief Exec. Tim Saunders, Head of Financial Planning and Analysis. She's back the Head of Service Improvement.

Sorry, Ali Nicholls, Head of Strategic Governance. Thank you. And apologies. We've got apologies from Mark Thornley, my CFO, Linda, who is your CFO, Jason, and any other apologies? That was it. OK, good stuff. Right.

Let's go through the actions.

From the previous meeting.

Beat.

have a couple just still due to be actioned. One is on the local authorities understanding the accuracy of council tax forecasting. That was with Martin and Linda. We did an update through on Friday.

Chief.

That's right. If we've got an update. Yeah, I think we'll have a highlight as the areas of concernment. Fine. OK, that's helpful. That's just so that we can get better forecasting for our accounting tax figures for future budgets. But we'll follow that one up with Martin separately, then we've got that.

Matthew, I think you were going to be updating some figures on statutory time limits. That's in the performance pack. Fantastic. And I think most of the other ongoing ones are as well. So we've got statutory time limits data to come back in 12 months. That's obviously not happened yet. And then the hotspot patrols and Project Cornerstone, they both

Yeah, so the cornerstone has been, I've sent Gillian an update ahead of the meeting. It's been with Mark Tarbit, who's leading up to the force, and then I believe he's meeting with Rachel Gilbert.

So, that's all I know on that one, but I know Mark's owning that. In terms of the

hotspots, I can give an update on that today. And then the last one there, the one that is completed at the bottom, shared feedback that I've been given to HMIC on the tiering system to Gillian.

Very happy to talk about that in brief terms if you'd like me to have the public presentation of that result. Okay, that's great. Thank you. We'll leave that for the action for now. We will move on to item 3, which is KPIs and scrutiny areas.

This was for you, Jason, but I imagine you might pass this on to Matthew, so unless you want to say it by introduction.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 3:59

No, the Matthias never put that in this one.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 4:02

Yeah, OK. Very happy to take these Matthew. So on the first point, I very confidently said to Kirsty the end of the meeting, I won't put anything on screen for the MSF because it's not being made public and in between that update today to be made public. So the new MSF groups have been made public.

For those who don't know, MSF stands for Very Similar Forces.

I don't propose putting anything on screen today, really, because my brief was to give an update in layman's terms. And there are people around the table that have had my presentation on this already. And there are lots of things that probably don't fall into the category of layman's terms in there. The way in which the Home Office have gotten to the new most similar forces groups is quite complicated.

But in essence, what they are trying to do is provide smaller groups of police forces in the country against which they can compare each individual force. So each individual force is within a group of seven other forces. And we have always had this, well, for a long time, but it just refreshed the methodology. So what that means in practice for TVP,

is that up until only about a week ago, publicly, our most similar forces were Somerset, Cambridgeshire, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, Essex, Leicestershire and Sussex. And post the new methodology and a change to the groupings, we have retained Avon and Somerset, Cambridgeshire, Hampshire and Herts.

but we have lost Essex, Leicestershire and Sussex, and instead we are in a similar group with Bedfordshire, Surrey and Wiltshire. The methodology the Home Office have used, and the one that they published on their website, suggests that the purest

way of using these most similar forces is to look at weighted crime demand profile. So that's a valid thing for it to be used for. Outside of that, the validity of how they've calculated those groups essentially starts to decrease. And I think that's a really important thing for us just to understand as police forces and be very aware of.

that you can't apply those groups to every single data that you'll be talking about in terms of police performance. It doesn't give you a extensible comparison necessarily. So that's just one that we obviously very alive to as a force and informed about.

Thames Valley Police also sits as a slight outlier within the whole process because we are a very large force.

because of the particular things that they have used to feed through into that grouping decision. We are already an outlier within our grouping, so they give a similarity score for each group of forces, and our similarity score to the forces around us in that group is quite low in comparison to others. So things for us to be aware of. But I've worked through all of the vagaries of that in force, given that presentation to the PCC office, given it a force liaison at Chief Officer Group as well. It feels like the presentation that has legs, legs, legs. I think that's it now. I don't think anybody else is asking me to do it, but it's there and we understand the benefit. I think the interesting thing will be how those motion group groups are used in the performance framework.

And that's something I'm keeping a watchful eye on with HC, with the Home Office as I'm talking. So I think, thank you for that. In the previous presentation, you said quite a complex area. I think realistically, if I want to think Mark Twain lines down lines and statistics, the risk is

that we could argue that the new MSF is imperfect, but you could also argue the previous MSF was imperfect and there was probably no subject solution. So whilst we collectively, in term finally, might say we don't like it very much for X, Y, Z reasons, there's probably not a perfect solution we should be pushing people towards per se. but there are particular characteristics of this setup, which may present some challenges for TVP in the future. So I think for me, and we did touch on this previously, but I'm not sure we've actually yet, so to capture as an action for today, is if you can provide that sort of one page summary of the foreseeable challenges that this might present, because I think it's worth us making that case to the Home Office publicly now and to HMIC in terms of that sort of forced tiering system, so that if in two years time we're crying foul over some

statistical anomaly,

It doesn't look like we're just making it up because we don't like it. We've highlighted what the challenges are earlier.

Matthew, I think there's also a bit for us to work through internally about the holding to account and how we use those most similar forces in that aspect as well. So what we would want to do is be setting up to fail against, because we're going to be an outlier, I think, in a number of areas, and it's how do we use that internally as well as The HMOC stuff. It's a good, a good name to make, but that one page get out. My advice at present would be to not use them for our for our understanding of our forced performance, that is looking at crime rates, I think that's legitimate. We can have a look at those. There are some crime rates that doesn't work as well for that set out in the technical.

advisory paper that came alongside it. But I think articulating where we are against the 43 forces is absolutely valid because you can anchor yourself against the whole profile of policing the country, understand the differences between using that grouping for something like outcome performance as an example.

And.

probability is very low. So I would suggest in force we use the wider force profile, where we are against 43, and then we can react to the political and inspectorate approach to how we use them.

Thank you, Jason. Anything else you want to add on that for Google?



Jason Hogg (P0010) 9:57

I mean, the key issue which Matthias has mentioned is how they are used. I mean, it is quite a complicated, if you like, an algorithm or approach to this. So we are going to be on the detail, if that makes sense, if HMIC start to make assumptions on this, which are not bound or in line with the data that we have, we will gently push back against that. But it is a change, as you said, there's no perfect system. But I'm not sure this is in any way more accurate than what was there before. So but we have no, we have no, you know, what they've decided in the Home Office and we'll do our best to provide the data and if there are reasonable assumptions we can make from the data, obviously we'll take that on board.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 10:44

Thank you very much indeed. Our next item is the board and domestic abuse update.

Yeah, so this is contained within the performance pack itself. So I don't know whether you want to wait until I get into the kind of that summary because I can then touch on that in detail with those slides if you're happy. Yeah, that's fine. We can do that within the pack.

Yes, so there are two strands of. One is when it's applied for routines and youth diversionary schemes and that the PCC office have kind of the main profile within. and oversee that work. The other is in adults. So I reached out to a number of places in the force for this because there's a kind of 2 balances. This officer is the essentially covers the strategies within which we undertake our approach to knife possession and knife legal crime. The profile of our knife possession of knife legal crime. figures and our outcomes against those is something that we track in force PG. You'll see it in a force pack, so I'll touch a little bit on what that has looked like for our life labour crime and we get there. In terms of the how it's run by the adult scheme, there was already an assessment made of our approach to talk to turbine. I think it was

the Cambridge Evidence-based Policing Centre. And one of the key issues that they found was it was very difficult to articulate.

from the data that was captured where a certain activity or tactic was used and what that then led to. What they could articulate is the success of our reduction in knife crime and knife enabled crime. And you'll see that through the performance pack, that's been very strong for us. But trying to anchor

the causational link between exactly which tactics were not to turn, that proved far more difficult. In terms of the feedback from Frontline and from the approach of doing not to turn, that's been a very live and focused thing in force, and it's very much BAU. Speaking with John Batty,

He's been approached by the Home Office for our approach to that, and because our life-enabled crime figures are so low. So in terms of that side of things, there's good confidence, but drawing data out of exactly which tactic is then causational to that lowering of our crime profile is more challenging, which is where we really sit on it.

That said,

We've seen some subreduction in session of made obstacle offences in force in this early part of this year, so year to date this year, which is good to see. Our knife-enabled crime has risen slightly this year, and I'll come on to that when we get into the performance pack. So just slight profile.

I think that's it in terms of the opposite side of things, Matthew, unless you've got

any other questions for me. So, I mean, the only question, Ruth, I'll pose to Jason, but it may come back to you. So, I actually take the point about the statistical challenges around individual cases now and identifying causation to those. I think that is entirely fair. And they sit within a wider suite of tactics and some very good evidence in terms of productions in terms of it. I think for me, and Jason, that you were definitely time when we were doing all of the yacht stuff and had some of those challenging conversations. about process within the force. The real issue for me is about mitigating the risk and the fact that we had some individuals prior to this who were simply being IUI'd or even FA for what the public would consider to be quite serious offences. when there was an opportunity to have some sort of custodial restraint on that person, whether that just be remanded in police custody or a greater chance of getting them remanded through the courts. I guess the reassuring time of one is that those processes are still understood and in place and that that approach still remains within TVP, that subject to the usual constraints of custody and all those rules that apply, that actually we are still taking that approach. So when you've got someone, they're over 18, they're caring organised, we are seeking childhood demand for those cases straight away. Is that still the you provide the reassurance that's still the approach we take.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 15:18

Yes, very much so, Matthew. I think we have got, it's one of the things we, even though we know we were in a really good place around knife crime, it kind of the national rankings, it continues to be on an area focused on forced performance and probably always will, because it's a really important area. So, Matthew's mentioned, we have a few extra knife crime offences, which he'll cover in the performance pack, a tiny number.

but we continually monitor it and compliance and what works. And just covering that point which Matty made around that independent review couldn't work out which tactic as part of the pair was better than another, I'm not sure how necessarily relevant that is. I mean, it's very often, isn't it, where we try to fix a problem and we try lots of things, and we, it's like a suite of you know, of a response. And if that works, that's great. Even though we're not clear exactly which of the tactics having the most effect, doing everything we're doing around deter is continue to be effective. We regularly share in good practice with

other forces as well. We obviously have much higher rates of knife crime than Townsend Valley.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 16:21

No, agreed. That's helpful. Thank you. In which case, I'll let you move on the rest of the performance pack highlights and then we'll move through the rest of the agenda. We'll take items five and six after the performance pack, because that will give the opportunity for you to

your next meeting. OK, so I'm happy to share my screen in this.

if I can manage to do it.

Justice.

Good.

Let me know if you can. I'll try to see what happens with them.

OK, I think, Kirsty, you're ahead of me. Can we see that? Is that OK? Is that definitely the public version? Yes, so this is one slide removed. I think the public agenda, I've got only 52 slides. So this is from the agenda.

That is attached to the meeting. That's the TVP only there. OK. Do you want me to share that? Why do you share? Why do you share that one there in that case?

They just released.

While we're doing that, Matthew, given that we are good at the public meeting, do you want to explain what's been removed from the pack? Those who will be now desperate to see what is on page on slide 53. Yes, so the only things that, so in essence, the pack that we share in this meeting is exactly the same performance pack that we use in force for our force performance meeting.

That runs once a month. And actually the things that we need to remove from this pack are very, very minimal. The only reason we would do so is if the data is not publicly available. So there are some areas in force that we compare ourselves against other forces in terms of some data.

That is not necessarily publicly available data, and we do not have the authority to share other false information, so that would be why something is removed from the fact.

Thank you. OK, thank you. Yeah, thanks Kirsty. So if you stay on that slide a little. So we put a rag status against each of our aims under our four pillars at the beginning of each month, and then we also have the trajectory against each. These

Fair to say that we started off this year in a really positive space for most of our aims,

even those in red, they will be in red because we are right at the start of the year. We want to make improvements and some of those will take time to build through the year. However, our performance at the early start of this year, and you'll see it articulated on some of the slides, has been

much stronger than we have been able to achieve in the early parts of previous years. Typically, it's been very difficult for us to gain huge amounts of traction in the early months, and that's then made life slightly difficult to gain that performance and then improve things as you move through further in the year. But we've already started off strongly in some of these areas. So I'll come to some relevant slides, and Kirsty, you have to just bear with me, because it's quite a long pack, so I don't even...

internal touching on every slide. Can I just go back up to that? Of course, yeah, that one for a moment. And I won't stop on every slide, I promise. But to reject again, for the public understanding, you've got three that are red, which are static, so they're not actually getting worse.

but they are static. How do you differentiate from those that are orange and static? Yeah, it's a really good question. So the RAG status, the red, amber, green colours is defined on how close or far away we are from the aims that we have set for our full year performance. The trajectory

is based on where we have moved since the last month, because this pack is designed to operate on a monthly rhythm within our false performance group. And so if we have improved in those areas since last month, you may well see something that stays red because we've not hit our aim that we want to get to for the whole of the year. However, you might see improving against that trajectory.

If our performance is relatively stable, and the same as it was last month, then you'll see static, and if it's regressing, then you'll see regressing there. So that's the differentiator between those two things, and it helps our monthly performance rhythm, senior leaders in those areas, get a feel for not only how are we doing against our two claims,

But where does the more peaceful performance feel like we are tracking? So members of the public might question the fact that there are so many statics against particularly the Ambers, because that feels quite middle of the road static. What is being done to

try and improve those areas. Yeah, so I mean, I'll take the point around there being a lot of statics first and what's being done second. In terms of the static, I don't know Jason's view, I would define myself as a very harsh marker. My intent is to try and

improve performance in the force, and that's always where I am driving.

If I've seen a marked shift in a marked difference month or month, then I will put it to improving. However, there are some elements within here. If you look at something like improved retention, retention figures month or month are very rarely going to move so significantly that you could make a fairly reasonable claim as to that longer term direction of travel. That's something that does just take longer to articulate through. And then there are other periods of performance that actually achieving static is a very good thing. It depends on what the last month's performance is like.

So if you were performing incredibly strongly last month and you hit static again, I might be delighted about that important performance group this month. However, if we were at a fairly low level for the previous month and we were static, it's a different conversation. So the importance about this whole pack is that it is aiming to get us into a place where we're really focusing on the things we want to improve.

but also it's got the context and the detail in it that we can understand our performance to that level. So we understand where we need to put our effort. And that second part, I suppose, to answer the question around how we drive that improvement. There may be areas in here that static I'm comfortable with for the time being. There were other areas I absolutely wouldn't meet, and we will have these conversations based on what the performance looks like in.

Is there a way of highlighting that on this overview page, the areas that are static and you're comfortable with them being static in the area? Because it just feels as if it's all the same at the moment as a, and it would be interesting to see that.

It's an interesting question. I suppose the purpose of this page is to give a feel and a flavour for where we are. It is not designed to be a standalone document. Were it to be, I think it would be totally valid to add more context, more detail, potentially a description against, you know, what forms of being like against each of those out.

The pack in and of itself is geared to do exactly that, so that's why we gear in that. I mean, from from a Chief Officer point of view, I pre-brief the Deputy Chief Constable ahead of each performance group using this pack, and we always collectively decide on those areas that

that we are going to have as focuses, the areas that we're comfortable with, and that's how we always start the meeting understanding. So I think the danger of, excuse me, the danger of putting a huge amount of nuance on this slide is that you

lose the ability to get into the detail as you move through the pattern, which is how
Despite what is actually saying.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 24:30

Can I just come in this point? Apologies, I can't put my hand up on some reason on this feature of Teams. I think there's a couple of points which Matthias has made. One, firstly, we are, and I've worked in a few forces, and TVP is very hard on itself in terms of standards of expectation.

So you could easily rewrite that first chart and put lots more greens on there. But we specifically are not prepared to put something green unless we have got demonstrative improvements, which is sustained. A month, a couple of months of doing well is not enough.

And at the start of the year, you would expect ambers and greens, sorry, ambers and reds. If it's green at the start of the year, we are not focused on the areas that we need to improve upon or we're not setting our expectations high enough, if that makes sense. So I don't think we should be concerned by the reds and ambers. An obvious example would be the improving response times.

And Matthias is being very hard on us, I think, on this. We are shown as red and static. At the end of the year, so January to March, with the course of the year, our response times were getting better and better and better. And I think the last three months of the year, and we've continued, we've hit our 70%



Matthew Barber (C2871) 25:38

Play.

Yeah.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 25:50

Target for the first time since I've been in TVP, I think, is that right?



Matthew Barber (C2871) 25:55

That's right, we we're about 70% for for grade one.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 25:56

Yeah, yeah. So our response times are better than they have been in the last 10 years today, right? But we're still shown as red. Why is that? Because I've set a target for

this year. I want another 10% added to that, which is really, really hard and really ambitious and stretching. But that's why we read, even though

 **Matthew Barber (C2871)** 26:15
Yeah.

 **Jason Hogg (P0010)** 26:15
Today our response times are better than they have last year and last year and last year. Does that help, if that makes sense? Even though it looks red, the context behind that is very different. What the red says is this year we need to do a lot more work in this space and a lot more to get to the target which I've set for the force.

 **Matthew Barber (C2871)** 26:32
OK, that's good. Thank you. Rob, I'll let you make a bit of progress in the fact, sure. Thanks. Thanks, Kirsty. Do you mind just putting it back on the main display and then I can track through? Thank you. That's great. So these first slides focus on our workforce. I won't put on it too much other than to say that we are but again tracking really positively in this space. So our resignation profile is down, our attrition volumes are down. This is an area that we've had a challenge with against other forces in the country. We've got a very good track record of keeping people in TVP and so our retirement rate is among the best in the country. We keep people, they like working for us and when they're doing a brilliant job, they like to stay on, which is great. But our resignation rate is a bigger challenge. There are some demographic, geographic issues with that. Our force is always at risk of that to a higher extent than some other forces will be just by virtue of the forces that are around us. However, really positive track on this. Kat Mackay, you go to workforce planning, has done a huge amount of work with my team and our comprehension around this and the priority work we're doing is seeing us bear fruit on this fund, which is good to see. We move to the next slide. This is our sickness profile, which we monitor very regularly. We had an increase in the winter months. You can see towards the end of that chart that has started to come down again now. So you'll see there that in May, we've seen a reduction on April and similarly from March in terms of the number of sickness incidents we are having per 100 officers and staff, of course, really seasonal. Nothing

to highlight of concern.

And.

Staff attractions. I think we are among the best forces in the country for understanding our neighborhood officers' time and where they are spending their time and what attractions can look like. You see, it's gone up slightly to 2%. Just caution here, we will move from 1% to 2% to this is still fairly low in terms of plan distractions.

A large scale incident in force was behind some of that rise of 2%. However, this does rely on some manual input by officers. And one thing that my team has found is that there have been some errors of officers putting in the wrong start and end stages for their abstraction. So we've got a couple of officers that were abstracted for 300 hours.

in one go. I can reassure you that as challenging as some of our shift patterns are, we are not asking officers to work 300 hours in a stretch. So there is something within that 2% that we are now articulating back out of that recording because there have got some clear errors. So raise that enforcement performance group this month. That list is going to all those few commanders so they can sense check those longer term abstractions.

correct recording, which will bring that back in line with what we expect. So nothing. I think that does fit with conversations that I've had that people are finding it much better than two, three years ago. But starting to feel that there's a bit more pressure, perhaps. And I think the critical instance, everybody sort of understands.

You can't miss get against anyway, but it's the it's the ICR come and see watch and the risk of a drift back to the position where we were previously with more and more results being for its neighborhood, which is very good, but as Home Office limits, so there is also that we can put elsewhere.

There's a risk we end up with people with the neighborhoods badge on. They're badged as neighborhoods, but they end up doing more and more of other things. It's a risk. And it's a really interesting balance in terms of how we use our offices and what we use them for.

What I would say is that, and you'll see it less in this pack, you may well see it in the next.

meeting. We had an intense period of demand last month. That's continued slightly into this month, the Heatwaves, the World Cup. You know, things drive, and we are not alone in forces across the country. I've seen that 909 level increase dramatically.

That, I think, is probably part of that pressure that you are hearing being heard back, Matthew. And then for us, it's about trying to find that balance and all forces are trying to find this with, if you are needing to extract your neighborhood officers, can you extract them in a way that they're still serving their neighborhoods and they're doing work that is serving that profile? For example, can they respond to incidents within their neighborhood?

That feels like a very simple thing for neighborhood officers to be doing. So it's about trying to find that balance, but it is a balance. But you do have to say, Jason, you and I have had this conversation without being too prescriptive, because ultimately you need to deal with the departments going in. I agree. I think the public would expect neighborhood officers to be able to respond to those incidents in their communities if you've got a...

shoplifting on a co-op and you've got an enabled officer who's available to attend. That's exactly the sort of stuff they should be doing. However, picking up a load of volume of domestic abuse, because it's in their geographical patch, is probably not within their aid, their specialism, but also is going to actually withdraw them from. the more public facing roles of so that says a little bit about crime type potentially to put in there. Just so I'm understanding the numbers and make sure we sort of properly counting stuff. So this is described as unplanned abstraction. Yes. So if we went back to where we were.

two, three years ago, where neighborhoods were having, you know, there was a strategy of saying we, response is under resource, people are going to be moved through to response for three month periods of a time. That presumably encounters a planned abstraction because it's part of that strategy. So whilst I'm comfortable with these figures, and I know there isn't an approach of large scale planned abstractions, but I'm just trying to make sure we're counting the right thing so that this is, Sanju comes in this morning and says, actually, for this shift, you and I are doing that. Yeah, that's fine. That's the bit we need to manage. But what I wouldn't want us to do is to find actually, there's a whole other category of stuff where

people are actually now moved for two or three months at a time, won't show these figures because it's planned. Yeah. Yeah. Just to jump in, I think this is an area that probably Rachel, it would be worthwhile just having a conversation with Rachel and helping her to understand from the performance monitoring because the planned abstractions was something that was in my mind.

And you've already said, Matty, that you're doing things to make sure the planned abstractions are not removing people where possible from the geographical area, but I think it's an area of interest to the PCC and worth us having a bit deeper dive into. Yeah, so Rachel will already have access to the SIPO.

So, so in the search agreement portal, you have your unplanned abstractions, your neighbor profile, you also have your planned abstractions, and that goes more broadly than just neighbor teams. So, you can see those in Ascot, running festival, those things that we plan for as a natural course of the rhythm of the year. Those things are articulated and we have recorded as well, so you can see where those are.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 33:41

The.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 33:49

going and when they're not going. The only thing I'd say about the importance of this on that profile is the clarity of definition and guidance that enabled officers are given about when to record in this space and when to report when they've been abstracted for a planned operation. And that's a known element. John Batty, I know, is always

Very keen on reinforcing those, the character and guidance, and is there on the app for them when they are recording abstraction. So, I know John's got a very strong hand about that. Coming action from Rachel Gilbert to have a look into that, and I'll brief him.

Thanks back to you. OK, thanks, Steve. So you can move us down. Victim satisfaction, I think I've spoken about this in the past previously. We survey victims at four different touch points when they first call through to us, when we send an officer, if that is the response that's required.

when we triage their crime if it goes to the AIU and then further on down the investigation route. This we profile out in more detail on a rolling basis through Force Performance Group. If you go to the next slide, Kirsty, you can see there that investigations are 58%.

It's remained fairly stable in terms of that satisfaction level. We had a detailed conversation about this in the last four to four groups. We were also talking in detail about investigation quality and where you see the real kind of key things that we are in control of with investigations. The things that victims are most unhappy about is

when they don't get a positive outcome for their investigation.

I think we could all understand that. And there is a healthy amount of that that's within our gift as a police force and there's some of that that's not within our gift. Not every investigation can lead to a positive outcome for a victim if the evidence and the lines of inquiry just aren't present. However, there are things in there that do affect that.

score as well, with things like quality and frequency of contact throughout the investigation. That's something that's definitely within our gift, and that's something that we focus on very much in forced performance groups. So we had quite a detailed conversation this month on that front. And you can see where the officers are performing really well in that space, contacting victims.

on a regular basis, you can get much better satisfaction from victims regardless of the outcome of their case than you do where we can see that dropping off again. So we keep a watch of our night. Can you just scroll back up for a moment? The 3 reds there, time waited for officer arrival, taken seriously and felt reassured. Yeah.

What's happening in those spaces to improve those scores? So I think that you've got to be aware of what percentages you're looking at there. So 87% of people feel taken seriously. 87% felt reassured. I think it's 83%.

So this is just the top three and the bottom three. So there will always be a bottom three, but you can see there that our satisfaction with officer attendance is 83%, which is very, very strong. And those bottom three are there by virtue of being the bottom three things that are responded to. However,

To the uninitiated, it could read 83, 87% didn't feel taken seriously. If you know what I mean, that might be worth just a little note somewhere on there. An explanatory note, because again, this is everybody in the portal performance written understands this. And again, it's a profile you can get at through your social proven portal. But it's for the public. For the public view, we can add them.

Yeah, perfect, just to give reassurance. Yeah, perfect. Thank you.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 37:30

Can I just come in that point and because of that, if we had the resources, I would like us to attend every single victim of crime, because we know that when we do, the officers provide a good job and that touch point and proving trust and confidence is really important, unfortunately, just because of other demands. I'm not sure if you're covering

kind of some demand at any point on this, probably not Matty, because it's kind of backward looking at three months. But we can't do that at the moment, which is why if you, those calls or crimes that we take over the phone and not selling an officer, don't get the same level of satisfaction when we actually do, which is a challenge for us.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 38:08

Yeah, that's very good. Thanks, Kirsty. If you move through, yeah, if you pause on this. So this is our ball handling performance. We've been a really strong place with this for a long time. This is one of only two numerically defined targets the government have set in the new policing performance framework. David, They expect forces to answer 90% of 999 calls within 10 seconds. We have been well within that performance very long time. Matthew, you remember, you can see on the far left of that chart, we were not in that space two years ago. It was a challenging time for us in the contact centres and through better resourcing, the staffing, technology, innovation, we've moved into a really strong space. So our performance is excellent. One thing I will say is that you won't see it articulated in this panel, you may well in the next, is that the demand that we've been seeing over the last couple of months has been extreme. And that's presented a significant challenge for us in that space.

and the sickness profile within our contact centres has also been challenging for us. So I'm expecting a tough couple of months in that space and we need to make sure that we're on top of that. We've got good reassurance from James Sullivan, who is superintendent in contact management for us now. He's running regular sickness silver meetings to make sure that they keep on top of that profile.

So it's one that we understand very well. We've performed brilliantly in for a long time. We will struggle if you have such peaks in demand, as Jason just mentioned, to keep at that level of service. So that's one that we're keeping a watchful eye on for the next meeting.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 39:43

And just and just to put and just to put that in context, the during the hot weather, the core demand and instant demand has been similar to New Year's Eve, which is our busiest day of the year. And because of the hot weather is, you know, over over a number of weeks, the

the contact centres are running red hot in terms of the demand coming through the door. Like I said, we have had some quite significant sickness in there, which is making it more difficult. And that bleeds into previous discussion about neighborhood abstractions as well, because demand is so high because of the warm weather, we're having to abstract neighborhood officers more than we would like, if that makes sense, but the whole, it's a whole force response to deal with this and it's a national issue as well. When it is hot, sadly, more people call the police for assistance.

KS **Matthew Barber (C2871)** 40:31

And of course, we're just the starting scoreholders as well, which puts more pressure off our things in TVP, but also means you've got more things going on, more antisocial behaviour, all those things, which will generate more demand, unfortunately. Yeah, and just to give some numeric context of the challenge that James was talking about there, the first three months of this year, we've had 12,000 more 999 calls than we did in the first three months of last year.

 **Jason Hogg (P0010)** 40:34

Exactly, yeah, yeah, yeah.

KS **Matthew Barber (C2871)** 40:55

Um...

So just to kind of relate to the real context of our full demand, at this point last year we had 92,000 999 courses, but this year it's 106. So it's a really significant change in our demand on the 999s.

Thanks, Kirsty. So our instant response times, I will whiz through a couple of slides because it's kind of a collective context and I'm very happy to swing back to any slide that you may have questions about. So Jason said that I'm a little bit of a harsh taskmaster of this side of things. I think that's probably fair.

Getting over 70% of grade one calls attended within 20 minutes for TVP for a long time was a significant challenge for us. However, we are there and we've been there consistently. The reason that you see red on these dials there is, as Jason prefaced at the top of the meeting, we have set our aim at 80%. This is in response to

Our desire to improve in this area always, however, the reason that we've set such a stringent target this year is because the target that the home officers have set in the police white paper is 90% for grade one instance 10 within 15 minutes in an urban

area and 20 minutes in a rural area.

That is incredibly stretching. The vast majority of forces across the country are meeting that. And so we took the informed decision in TVP to make sure we built on really strong improvement in performance in response.

as Jason's already mentioned, in a way that is staged and we can apply ourselves to aim for stringent targets, building towards that national expectation that keeps our officers in the right spaces. Matthew, to your point around the neighborhood profile and ICR, but also keeps the force engaged in improving.

in this space as well. So it's definitely a challenge for us in this space, but we've been ambitious in where we set our aims this year. And we started off the year fairly well, most do always. But if you look at the comparison to previous year, a little column of three figures there, you can see there that we've attended over 1000 more incidents within our

agreed SLAs that we did last year. So a good start to the year for what to be done as we move through and it's a stringent target for us.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 43:20

And the other thing I think that, Matty, it's fair to say is, if we compare ourselves with some of the forces, some of the couple of other forces might look a little bit better than us, but they actually manage, they monitor this target differently, if that makes sense. And there's a lot of work. We got that this morning, didn't we, Matty, around the Home Office trying to really define effectively when the clock starts,



Matthew Barber (C2871) 43:20

But...

Yes.

It's.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 43:41

and when the clock ends. The good news in TVP, we've done a lot of work on this already and we are characteristically harshing ourselves. So whatever the national target is, we will already be compliant in the way that we're doing it. Or in fact, it might even be easier for us, if that makes sense, depending on how they're putting this together, if that makes sense. Some forces that you would a queue waiting with a message.

Some crime prevention advice, and they're, you know, they're not they're not starting the until you spoke to somebody, and we are we are much more strict in terms of when the call comes in and actually when we get there.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 44:15

Even that noting the improved 101 response, which admittedly is unlikely to carry a huge number of grade ones. But if you're, even if you're within the target and you're only waiting a minute, that's another minute off of your 20 minutes, if you don't count that wait time.

which are the Forces won't be doing. So, you know, and yeah, so it's a really important point that actually we got this morning from the MCC around this was was.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 44:35

Yeah.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 44:43

Kind of.

A steer to forces to please try not to make too many sweeping changes to the approach you take to responding to incidents, because naturally they are trying to work out one of those definitions that Jason just mentioned. When you start the clock, when you stop the clock, what you...



Jason Hogg (P0010) 44:58

And just on this, as Matthew said, the great performance, end of the performance year, we've maintained that performance, but actually attending what, an extra 1000, did you say? So demand is going up, but we're still maintaining performance. And I got a deep dive briefing on this last year.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 45:10

Yeah, yeah, just say that.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 45:17

My 80% this year is going to be really hard. But we might get there, you know, I mean, there's some quite innovative stuff. Great example, Matthew, we start to trial drone as a first responder, so sending drones to some of these jobs rather than, you

know, get there quicker. You know, when there's a fight in the street, for example, we get a drone up straight away within a couple of minutes.

If it's all gone and everybody's there, we can downgrade the call if that makes sense. So there's a lot of innovation in this space, and we're working really, really hard to try to get that 80% this year.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 45:48

Good. Thank you. So I'll touch briefly on the grade 2. We made a huge amount of improvement in how quickly we got to our grade 2 incidents last year. This was before that national stringent target in grade ones. And so we knew that we wanted to improve our service to the public here. And we have done that really significantly. You can see there.

that we are now close to 70% of grade twos and within an hour, which is the time scale that we set for those calls graded at two. I think it's fair to say that we were, well, last year we were hoping to get 60%, so we outstripped that by a significant margin. My aim here is to maintain this level of service for the public whilst we try and attain that really ambitious target for grade ones. And I'm very pleased that in the start of the year, we've been able to do that. So it's one that we will keep monitoring, but a real improvement. You can see there on the chart on the left hand side where we were and where we are today. So I'm pleased that's been able to be maintained in the face of that.

Significant large increase that we spoke about.

This is our grade 3 and 3M profile. So the 3M and 3s are where we understand that there's a need for attendance. However, there's no urgent or immediate time pressure necessary on that attendance. So we look to attend those job sites within 72 hours and book an appointment with the victim or 24 hours.

And again, our performance in both is fairly robust. You'll see the green line just dipping down on the grade three. That's actually not reflective of our performance. That's a system problem with our appointment booking system where it's not picking up appointments being booked. So that's with ICT to fix that.

then come back to a rational place.

This is ARU Court, so I touched on them asking victims about their experience when they get triaged in terms of crime, and this is what that looks like. We've seen a dip off in the speed at which we're able to triage those crimes that come through this service. That is coinciding directly with ARU 2.0 going live, so it's been a very

significant

change in how ARU is structured. We were expecting a performance dip at that point. Our challenge now is to make sure that we get that back as quickly as possible. So that's with Ed and Ed being the head of ARU to look at and to monitor because it is challenging. And ARU triage timeliness is directly impacted by all of our demands. That I spoke about.

This is prosecution time limits. So this is one of the actions earlier on in the meeting. You can see here that we are 5% down on the number of cases that we have recorded as exceeded prosecution time limits. And you can just see on the chart at the bottom there that we've started off below where we were.

two years ago, and we had quite a high number in the first month April of last year. So we're below by 5% on where we were, which is really good to see. In terms of the proportion of our unfiled investigations where there is an active SLA, that's around 20% of our cases. So this is a big profile for us, where you have than SLA. But you can see there that we are tracking a really good space. And if you look at the comparison of numbers there, you've got approximately 6,000 active statutory time limit cases, and we missed that statutory time limit in 43.

sorry, maybe 34 in the first and 34 in May. So a very small portion actually get to that point where we miss those time limits. There are some cases which we would always miss those time limits. So there are some instances in where a crime will have a statutory time limit on it for us to investigate and then get that through to a point of charge or where we

we get an outcome for. If it's not being reported to us within that time frame, there's nothing we can do to miss that profile. So there are profiles within that code 17, which is the code we give to a case exceeding those prosecuting times is an absolutely valid thing to apply, which is why it exists. And then there are others where we are in control of that time limit and it's been reported in time, which is where we focus our efforts. And of course, there's a grey area where you're relying on a third party to do something in the meantime, which they haven't done, which is not directly into these control. But there's a question about how much TVP have actually pushed for that. Those are the middle ones, I guess. So those figures of 54 May.

that correctly, out of your 5000 cases, that will include those that are reported after. So, yeah, yeah. So, there will be something there that we would never be able to meet that type of it, because the reporting nature of them. The other thing that

happens on a regular basis in force forms group, this is a good example of data that isn't in the public pack.

because we can't and we are not allowed to share it, is those cases that are currently ongoing that are reaching the point of that sanitary timing. So we monitor that very clear, very carefully. And we also have that available to every single officer. So as an officer in TVP, if you have an investigation caseload, and that's your of your role. On your screen that service agreement have built for you, you have all of your cases that have statutory time limit there in front of you, and you can see how much time is left on those cases so that you can be progressing those at pace. So, that's some of the practical work we do to make sure that that keeping certainly doing it, obviously some of that work developed in recent. Months and years, and that certainly seems to be what led to some of this improvement. Yeah, yeah, I am curious. So, so go on Jason.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 51:33

Martin.

Matthew can just ask, one of the things I'm a little bit frustrated about with this data, and I do regularly speak to CPS about this, of those cases we're missing the target. Which ones are in our gift of fix, if that makes sense? Because you're absolutely right. Six months to get a case to court, if somebody reports that case to us, I don't know, after five months,



Matthew Barber (C2871) 51:51

Yes.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 51:56

that has happened and the digital devices to examine. And of course, these STL cases, by definition, they're the lowest threat, if that makes sense. The serious of the offense is going to be low, which is why there's a six month time scale to get them there. We're never going to get there. Is there a way of identifying which ones we, you know, how good are we at making improvements?



Matthew Barber (C2871) 52:05

Yep.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 52:16

And which ones can we simply can never get there?



Matthew Barber (C2871) 52:18

The.

Yeah, so it's a really good question, Jason. So at the really clear end of that in terms of if a case is being reported to us and the statutory time limit is already passed, we might take that out of our officers' profiles around those cases that they need to be on top of and making sure they are driving towards because that is that is wasted effort on our officers' part. We need to be very clear with the victim about the profile of that case, but in terms of trying to drive that investigation, you are never going to be able to meet that time limit. So those we articulate already now, and you can see that profile in and out of SIMO and tempo when you need to. Those cases, Jason, that fall in that grey area where you have, you are relying on other things, digital devices,

but also the interaction with CPS. So CPS are a crucial partner for us in this. They have to be doing their job to make sure these cases get to where they need to be. That's something we track really carefully in force performance groups as well. So what we do is we don't just track when the time limit is hits that kind of final deadline. We track how many cases we are able to get to CPS within a certain amount of time before that time limit hits so that we are providing CPS with as much time as they

it could possibly need, and they can then have sensible conversations with us. So that profile is tracked in force PG, but it's also tracking the joint with your guests, so they track those cases as well, and we can hold each other to account for how well we are doing those. But it's a really good point, Jason. And to reassure you what we are not doing in force performance group at all,

is holding officers to account for cases that they were never in control of. Those are articulated out, but we focus on once them. That was my curiosity was what happened in May, June last year that led it to be so low. And was that something that TVP were doing or was it something CPS was doing? And just to help us to understand. So the difficulty.

in a question like that, in terms of the answer back, when you're dealing with numbers that are so low, is that the truth of it will be in the nuance of each case. And

some of it will be because we didn't have as many that were already past their title when we came in. Some of it will be the really practical work we're doing to drive that better approach.

The thing that I'm really keen on and I'm really geared for, and this goes a bit back to that rag status, is where do we track through the year in this profile so that we are confident that the steps that we are taking, the information we get to officers, the scrutiny to be applied, is making a meaningful and lasting difference. And I think that's where you can see my confidence will sit.

as we move through the whole year and we make sure that we're on the right track. So you can see actually here the rank status for each slide that we talked about at the top is on the top right, that little red triangle. We have this in red, we are on, we are green, we are, we are, we are tracking really well. But to Jason's point, we need to make sure that we're tracking really well, collectively and consistently through the year. And so that's where the balance comes.

OK. Thank you. Right, so we're moving on to our outcome profile now and some really good starts to the year here, as I mentioned earlier on in the meeting. We've set an aim for a sold rate of 16.5% for all crime, and we've hit that in the first few months of this year, which is where you can see. You can see the dark.

blue line is the volume of our solved crimes for the start of this year. You can see we have started in a much, much healthier position than we did in the last two years, which is excellent to see. Our charge rates, so within the sold rate, you have out of court disposals as well. The charge rate is just focusing on our charges.

that we've set a quite ambitious aim of 9.5%. We're at 9.2%, so not quite where we would want to be. However, over the course of our first couple of months in the last three years, we are in a much stronger position. So you can see there that through each of those years, we've tracked upwards as we've gone through the year and our performance has gone steadily better. If we continue that, which I hope that we will, we're starting from a much, much stronger baseline.

and I've got confidence that we'll be able to be in that 9.5% by the end of the year. So I'm really encouraged by those as it starts to the year. We've had a much stronger start than we've been able to in the previous few years. This is our out of court profile. So we also track the out of court rates and you can see there that our out of court rate is above where we set our aim. So if you want to get an out of court resolution rate of 7% this year,

We are at 7.2% so far, and you can see that in terms of the resolutions there, we are

again starting the year in a really, really strong position, that dark blue couple of points, which is really, really great. Knife Crime, this is 1 where Jason has made the point that we have seen an uptick.

in the volume of knife crimes that we've seen this year. So there are some things to just pick out on this slide. It's in red, quite rightly, because we've seen an uptick in the volume. However, that 67% increase in knife crimes, if you just caution a bit of calm on that front, because we're dealing with such low numbers in Thames Valley Police on this front.

You can see here that the numbers we're dealing with are under 100 per month. And when you deal with the scale of demand that we've spoken about with 106,000 calls coming into our 999 centres so far this year, we are dealing with very, very low crime numbers here. The other thing to note is the middle blue line, so this sort of royal blue line, that started down at 50,

in April last year was a significantly low period. We've been operating at a very low level of knife crime compared to other forces for a long time now. And you can see there in the top right chart where you can see the bars. We are absolutely in line with where we've been in 2023, 24, 24, 25, but the 25, 26,

start of last year was very, very low and it normalized a little further into the year. So that's what we're seeing in terms of that difference. And nationally, the Home Officer set an expectation that we are held to account against the profile that was in 2023 for the volume of knife crime.

That's what all forces are being held to account for, because that represented a lower threshold of life crime that we've seen across the country. We have increased by seven crimes when you compare us to that point in that year. And we've got very robust kind of governance around this led by our Baillie force. So

We are up, however, confident that that is a very comfortable position for us to be able to manage, and each area are very aware of their knife crime profile. And just to be clear, that that definition by the Home Office excludes possession, isn't it? Yes, this is a really good point. Yes, this is knife-enabled crime, and what we mean by that is where a knife.

has been used in some way or a threat of a knife has been used rather than somebody, for example, being stopped and searched and they have a knife on on their on their person.

Serious organised crime, I won't touch on in too much detail. We track the number of disruptions against serious organised crime. We also have a much more detailed

profile that comes into Force BG, which we had this month. Again, that is all, it straight into the Covert world of policing, so that's something that needs to be held within force.

but our disruptions information can be public. The bars kind of dropping off as you get kind of closer to the right hand side of that chart. That's something that just takes time. So that normalises it over time because it takes quite a long time to score and then rationalise the disruptions we have. They had to go through a scoring system, which we're not

totally in control of the timing around. So, that's one thing that we monitor, but we give time in for support group to allow for the recording to happen. So, yes, I won't say too much more on that. So, we go into a bit more detail in force PG. This, these purple slides focus on our outcome profile for Borg and DA. That was an action from last Pam.

So, cover that here. We set a name for an outcome rate of percent in fall. That's quite a stretching rate. We are at 10.1% so far this year. You can see there that again, the dark blue two dots on the chart, we started off stronger than we did last year by quite a margin. So that's good to see. And what we need to see is that keeping on. on track. Solve rape for rape and sexual offences. We set an aim of 12.5% in this space, and we are above that at 13.2%, which is really good to see. Much lower volumes in this space. The crime profile is not much lower than the large violent skins women and girls profile, as you would understand.

as you would imagine. But I'm again encouraged by the strong start we've made in this year and we are above where we were in the last two years, so above that rate. And if we move to the next slide, this covers the domestic abuse profile. Again, we set the aim for a centre for domestic abuse, which is quite a challenging aim, but we've set a good start to the year, as you can see there.

in the dark blue dots, we are above where we were in the last two years for the start of the year, which is good to see. And then down at the bottom, our code 14 and 16. So what that is reflecting is where we are losing victim engagement in our cases, where a victim is declining to engage with us in the investigation space.

So what we do is track.

the volume of that and the volume of cases where we don't have victim engagement through the year as well. It's sort of the offset of the way we're getting a positive outcome and the victim is engaged in the process all the way through with us. And you can see there that we are seeing fewer people disengaging cases so far this year

than we were last year. We're 135

down and eight down in domestic, sorry, in Vorg and eight down in domestic abuse. So that's one that we always track. There is a little bit of that same sort of profile as the SDL cases in there. There are some cases within domestic abuse within Vorg that are reported by third parties that the victim is never intending on engaging with the police.

and we will not have the opportunity from the start where a victim is totally engaged necessarily. We do work to try and engage that victim, but there are differences in profile with that. Would this cover a scenario where not you referenced a third party reporting, but perhaps a victim has come forward?

with a domestic abuse complaint, dealing with a crime and domestic abuse. As part of that investigation, officers are required to recall things like previous rapes. That will give you essentially three more offences. And the victim says, I just want you to deal with this. I don't want to go through the trauma and go through that.

You asked me about it, but that's another thing. That would appear within this as three in my scenario, 3 instances of a victim not engaging, despite the fact they may actually be fully engaged with another investigation. Yeah, absolutely would. Yes.

Yeah. So in that case, that prior, that investigation, need to be recorded with a code 16, for example, which is that the victim has disengaged. That's the definition of that code. And that would cover those cases as well. OK, thank you.

Vulnerable children and adults, we track the profile of capturing the voice of the child in TVP. So that's been on a good upward trajectory all the way through, which is good to see, one that just needs constant rhythm and constant reminders. But what this is trying to track essentially is where a

officer comes into contact with a situation. If there are children involved, we are capturing the voice of those children where that is possible. It's not possible in every case, but we need to be considering it and recording it. So that's a regular rhythm that we track. And the one and two charts there are a profile of the children that we are most concerned about within the Thames Valley that may be coming into harm. And we've got a really mature approach to that now that in our meshes, our multi-agency safeguarding nubs, we identify that cohort of children, we track them, we understand what their pattern of contact with the police looks like, and then they are passed to our harm reduction units to actively manage and monitor.

all the way through. Within a PG context again, but also within our local performance

meetings, we have much more detailed information about each child and how they are being managed, how long they're being managed for. That's obviously not appropriate for a public forum, but that's a well established now route that we take with those children that we are most concerned about. Thanks, sorry about you.

What's the difference between re-entry and repeat? So repeat and re-entry is where if you are repeat, it means that you are coming into contact with the police consistently and you are staying within that top profile of concerning children. Re-entry is where you have been within that profile at a past point.

You have dropped off that profile and we can see why that might be. There's been a gap. So your contact with the police has lessened, you've done some drugs, work to manage you, safe drive you, and then you've re-entered for whatever reason. Yeah, well, that was going to be one of my questions actually, but

This is an incredibly difficult area to deal with. It's not just down to policing, let me know to resolve these. I mean, there is a very pressing message in some ways that there's 1200s of children who are repeat offenders. And I was thinking of it differently, though, actually, if you it does.

it does show what we all know, because it's saying about the adult cohort, that actually of those offences being committed by children, it's actually a relatively small number of all of the children who are committing all of the offences. Does that make sense? Because they are repeated, the new entrants into the system are relatively small.

Very much so, yes, you are dealing with a smaller cohort. The other thing to note is when we are showing that, what you're not seeing is just offending by these children. You are also seeing where they are coming into contact with police for various different reasons. They may witness domestic abuse, they may go missing. So we consider a really broad range of factors to understand the vulnerability that child might be facing and their pattern of interaction with the police. So yeah. I think because we take an action work, the conversation with Rachel, just have a look at the data because it fits in the conversation that we've had separately in the liaison meetings about.

how the force deals with those children who come into contact with us, but that might actually pose a greater risk than sometimes is recognised. And I just think it might be worth thinking about what more we might be able to do with other agencies in terms of identifying and capturing that Covert. There's no easy solutions to it, but as I mentioned.

Thanks, Rob. Thank you.

Next slide is again within the vulnerability space. So this looks at our response to fraud and one investigating fraud, but also safeguarding potential victims of fraud. So the top profiles look at the profile of fraud investigations that we've got and our sold profile as well.

And we've got a really strong approach to this with our central fraud unit. Again, it's something that would be recognised by the Home Office for our approach. We've got a really good handle on our fraud cases and British from now, who hands up that side of things, Duncan win. We've got a

very mature approach. In terms of banking protocol currencies, what that is tracking is where a bank will have contacted us because they are concerned about activity either within their branch or potentially online at their points that somebody with vulnerability is being asked to withdraw significant amounts of money or has asked you individually themselves to have some sort of bank activity that falls outside of what they would normally do. And we track kind of how we attend those. The interesting thing about those is we say 64% of incidents have been attended within 24 hours. There are some that we will never attend. So it's a difficult thing on that because there are some that are online based and we deal with that in a slightly different way. So just on that, because there's a

The case that I came across has raised with me, I'm just waiting for a bit more information to follow up on it. It might just be one of those outliers that is a bad case, but potentially frank for me a potential gap. So we talk about this as the banking protocol when a bank gets in touch. So the instance in question, a gentleman has been taken to

a branch of Tesco to withdraw some money from a cash machine, seemingly under some element of duress. Exactly the sort of thing which the banking protocol would pick up if it was a branch of Barclays. Exactly those sorts of things where you would expect staff to call and I think would constitute a grade one attendance. You've got someone there now.

And...

Now, in that case, there wasn't a Swift attendant, probably was within 24 hours to be fair. But I guess, is there a risk there a gap probably in the control room on the, well, this is just someone from Tesco is calling up. Is it trigger the same process somewhere? Because there's obviously lots of different locations.

We could have almost exactly the same scenario. And as our physical banks are

significantly less on the high street these days, I think the performance on this has been really good. I wouldn't want us to lose it because we're a little bit restricted in terms of the process. It's a good question. I think one maybe to take it away for Bruce.

to reflect on, because I suppose there are two things that spring to my mind. One is how it was reported in those instances, where these individuals within those institutions that are banks understand, know what to say and what they understand what to look out for, and then they'll say in terms of that report. So that's one question. And then the second is,

If it is reported without the usual banking post for routing, what would our response be? Now, my feeling would be that one of our call handlers, if they heard that scenario, would probably approach that in an urgent response kind of framework.

They deal with opportunity of risk, you know, in that determination.

that are constantly for that individual case and just how we service. But I think that's one that we can we can ask Bruce about whether or not those are expected for supermarkets and things like that. There may be an opportunity for us to do more through through my office as well as before. So actually whether if if that process works well, and we simply need to be doing more in terms of educating other businesses in terms of what to look out for, but also how to report. And that's a relatively simple action.

Thanks, Kirsty. This looks at our antisocial behaviour. There are a couple of different points on here that we look at our crime profile here. But again, we're fairly content with where our crime profile sits here. We've actually, further into this year, we've seen actually a reduction in our

in our social behaviour and our ASB levels are fairly low across the country. We actually did some work in the past couple of years to try and increase our ASB recording to make sure that we would definitely keep getting everything in from the public. I think you probably remember those conversations, Matthew, in previously. We're content with where our level of recording is now.

and we're looking for reduction to year on year, but we're fairly comfortable with how we are so far. As you might be aware, this work that my office is doing, along with John Batty's team and local authorities, to try and bring that data together in one place if possible, so that we get a better understanding, because there's been a real effort made by TVP, I agree.

Well, I still feel that there's quite a lot of reported or under reported, and if that's

going to local authorities, if they're dealing with it, that's fine. But there's that risk that people don't walk because they don't know who to go to. Yeah, yeah.

This is a newer profile for us. We did talk for the last few years about neighborhood crime, which is a certain collection of crime groups that the Home Office were driving forces to be really focused on. They've changed that profile slightly in their approach for neighborhoods.

of policing. So they are looking at retail and St. crime now, and within the Safe Streets Mission, and this is the growth of outcomes that we are getting against those crime types. So you can see here that we are at 18.1% sold rate, that is above where we were potentially expecting to be in the early parts of the year, and it tracks the similar performance in outcomes that we've seen in other areas.

a really strong start to the year for us on that front. And you can see on the right hand side there, the types of crime that we're talking about there and how much we've improved against last year. The dark blue bars are our outcomes this year against the light blue last year. So a really strong start to the year.

This tracks our neighborhood visibility and visible activity. So you can see there that the neighborhood guarantee of those stipulations that we outlined for the public are in green, most predominantly where they're in a slightly lighter green, they are still almost at 100%.

This is tracked really carefully by each area and what it does is it takes the specific expectations that are set out in the guarantee by the government and make sure that we are abiding by them. Again, this is something that John Batty has had a lot of conversation in the Home Office because we were a trailblazer in how we record this and how we make sure that we are tracking it.

Um, actually.

And then I think this is the last slide, our stop and search and use of powers profile. Stop and search outcome rate remains very, very strong. We've been very strong in that area for a long time in TVP. And you can see there that the volume of stop and search has gone up in the first three months of this year.

And then in terms of use of powers and our recording of use of powers forms, again, we are on an upward trajectory. You see the light blue line there is on the app, and the volumes are remaining fairly stable in that space. So nothing of concern in those profiles.

Good stuff. Thank you very much. No more questions. Thank you already over time for your previous meeting. OK, but it was your items are made. Thank you. Thank you

very much. Indeed, I'll let you go.

Will do, Adam.

Jason, can I come to you to do the, or on the agenda that from 5 to 6, which will take as one, basically your operational highlights that you want to raise with?



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:15:08

Yeah, I think I just focus on the transformation portfolio up to date, the operational staff very much, nothing by exception and clearly we've been through performance in some detail with 90 there. So in terms of police force fit for the future, I'll focus briefly on key achievements in the last 12 months, current activity, and looking ahead what our priorities will be. So some highlights. Now our 4th change programme, the new restructure of 11 stroke 12 local policing areas into local command units is now fully embedded and the project has finished. So it's definitely created greater flexibility, improved consistency.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 1:15:28

Okay.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:15:48

and efficiencies worth of 400 police officers in terms of the amount of savings we've been able to make from that. We've delivered 27 million pounds worth of savings over the last three years, whilst, as Matthias said, maintaining operational performance and investing in future capability. And the good news is, despite the fact that we've taken the equivalent of 400 officers out, performance in the key areas that matter most of the public, which are answering the phone, responding to incidents, solving crime, all the three areas have improved during this time and continue to improve. So we are in a good place there. We continue to invest a lot in robotic process.

automation. We now have 37,000 operational hours of productivity delivered through those robots. And you're aware, Matthew, of the work ongoing, a proposal to either increase the size of our team by between 50 and 100% because of further opportunities to make savings and manage our demand more effectively.

We're making good progress in relation to our forensics improvement programme and last week we were given the keys to our new forensic building in Bicester, 40 million pounds worth of investment there, to put us in a good place to manage the

changing nature of forensics, particularly in the digital space. So we are invested in this area, as you're aware, to improve the timeliness of examination devices to get cases to court quicker. We are, as you're aware, investing in the AI space through our Bobby app. Police AI went live in May, which is a new national body which will affect overseas for the whole of the police service. cases where the police servers can use AI most effectively and test those cases before forces roll them out. We are the partner operational partner with Police AI which will sit in the Thames Valley and we were the force that really helped support getting Police AI up and running and momentum does continue. We see in the coming weeks and month test cases that we'll be going live with around using AI more proactively in TVP as well. We continue to have a very strong approach to innovation in TVP and we are well known for having an innovative approach in trying new things. So Ben Snuggs, my depth.

Deputy is the he chairs the National Science and Innovation Board, so we're able to, through Ben's chairing of that, any good practice in the forces, bring them into TVP early, and we also the regional lead for innovation, and we for the forces in the Southeast as well. In terms of current activity, the three...

three key areas we're working on is, one, transforming the investigation journey to give a better service to victims, but also solve more crime, building on forensics intelligence and investigate capability, like I said, to deliver better outcomes.

Secondly, future communities, and Matthew, you'll be aware of that.

scanning ahead and planning particularly in Town Valley, the changing increase in population where the population, just for Oxfordshire for example, is increasing it 50% higher than the national average increases to population and that involves greater investment in technology. So our rapid video response work through domestic abuse,

has gone really well. So victims of DA in certain categories can see a police officer on a screen within a minute of calling the police. We're now in the process of looking to extend that further to all crime types. And that again, that will assist our response times because some victims do not need an officer at their home addresses and if it takes 20, 30, 40 minutes to get there, actually we could deal with more crime through teams meetings like this. So we're investing in that area. And finally, investing in our workforce for the future through our new people strategy as well. So in terms of looking ahead, key priorities for the next three months. Like I've said, expanding the use of automation, AI and digital

technology to improve our productivity. Building on the success of the rapid video response, like I've said, the next thing is called enhanced video response, which is effectively the same as rapid video response, but other crime types other than DA as well. And finally, continuing to develop the Bobby app and a growing range of AI agents now

control room to provide a better service at that front end. As you're aware, 77% of people who contact that initial contact give feedback that way that is good, 77%. I would like to do that the same as officer attendants. That is that is kind of the aim, the vision, what we're all trying to get to is being able to have contact with the public have really high levels of public satisfaction where we don't need to send an officer. That's where that is costly and it takes time. And again, if we free more officers up, they can get quicker attending those 999 instance, but also more time to investigate crime and hopefully include our solved crime rate as well. So effectively, those are the areas

That we are focusing on the next period.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 1:21:00

Thank you, Jason. One just one question for you, which is not one you can necessarily answer now, because there's a lot of speculation in it. But you started off talking about the merger of the LPAs, local policing areas into LCUs, mind you, just to confuse the



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:21:14

Yeah, yes.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 1:21:20

the jargon even further, what the government are now talking about these LPAs, but they mean the same thing, I think, as our LCU, what's the command unit? And we obviously haven't seen what Lord Hogan Howe comes out with as yet, but all the talk I've heard, and it was reiterated at meeting with Louisa Ralph and civil servants in London.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:21:24

Yes.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 1:21:41

on the Wednesday of our week, is they are looking at upper tier local authorities as the geography for an LPA. That would mean that having saved millions of pounds going from

12 LPAs to five LCUs, TVP could effectively be forced into having 10 LPAs under the new local government model. Now, I think that would be a retrograde step, and I think that many of our local authorities geographically would be incredibly small.

And that is part of the problem with the old LPA models. But where, what's your take on that? I mean, that will presumably set the force back millions and potentially have some operational impact as well.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:22:32

Yeah, I think there's a bigger issue here with, there is simply, as you're aware, in real terms, the policing budget reduces year by year because of inflationary pressures and a lack of investment. And to be fair, choices made by government where to invest in priority areas, and policing is not a priority area at the moment.

In that context, when we haven't got enough resources to meet the demands coming through our front door from the public, we need as much flexibility as we can. And the great thing about the LC model, bigger teams with a single chief superintendent on a day-to-day basis can move those resources around to meet that demand. If we have to move from 5

to 10, it takes away some of that flexibility and I do worry it will have an impact on our performance with building in more barriers that we've just taken away. And as you say, it would cost certainly millions, millions and millions to, you know, change is difficult and complex.

in an organisation as large as TVP, it would cost a significant amount of money to do that. And I'm not convinced there would be any benefit to the public. Like I said, there'd like to be delayed, the delay is certainly in responding to incidents moving into that model. And certainly, we, our LCU is currently led by chief superintendents. We have 5.

we will not be having 10 local policing areas led by chief superintendents because we simply do not have the money. So I do worry a little bit about that. I did feel the more the centre demands you have to deliver your service in a particular way, it gives less flexibility locally, more difficult.

to meet those government targets.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 1:24:19

Agreed. OK, that's helpful. I think it's just something we need to continue to review with our local authorities in September now. OK, thank you. We'll move on to Ali, if we may, please. Yeah, I can do it if you'd rather.

Yeah. I think the first thing I'll just say before, you probably have some questions about it, but we are still trying to work through how we present this in the best way. We present it to JIAC, we present it here, and so there may not be some comparison numbers that you've got in here that we do.

that we do have and are collating. So I suppose that's the one caveat. But with our audit, so these are the joint internal audits that come from the likes of Neil and Amy. We are focusing our efforts on the, you know, the priority one actions. We've done loads of work to reduce those.

I think, yeah, we're still doing some work around prioritisation of where, which ones we might want to focus our effort on as well. But this one is around the over, you know, the overview of who's got what.

And this is the table on the right hand side that I'm saying. It's not as mature as Matty's data that you've got. But we, you know, we will have more data that's going to be in there as time goes on. And as I say, we are prioritising our priority one actions. It actually looks like we haven't got any from our last quarter.

We have got some, we just didn't pull that data in that last quarter.

And this information is about our AFIs and recommendations. This does not have our peel inspection data in. So on the left hand side, we've got the bar chart with our previous peel AFIs and recommendations. We now have 14.

new ones. So all of those have been superseded from our previous one. So that will show up in the next Pam. So I will move on from this reasonably quickly because you say it's been taken over just to understand. So at the moment there are...

to 17 areas for improvement, they will all effectively be superceded, the new number being 14. Yes, correct. Yeah. And then on the right hand side, those are all our other ones that we have from thematic national inspections or spotlight reports.

When, so our next thing is October. So the next will reflect the latest appeal report. So we'll obviously have a conversation behind the scenes about the latest appeal for that, because I need to.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:27:16

I.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 1:27:18

Do my response for HC. OK, lovely. That's it.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:27:23

Matthew, could I just come into that point there? Ali, does that include that letter I'm going to be sending to Roy Wiltshire this week, those AFIs?



Matthew Barber (C2871) 1:27:30

Um...

That letter is not specifically relating to AFIs, it's some of the other narratives that's within something, so yeah.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:27:37

Fine, OK.

Yeah, just on that, Matthew. I'll be writing to HMIC this week from the last peel inspection. There's certain areas of it they've commentary in there, which I'm going to be very, very explicit around areas which we will not be pursuing, shall we say, just because it's not a priority for us and we'll be focused on those areas, which I think will make the most difference to improving our service to the public. An example would be, they've said in there that we need to have a project manager for every change.

programme and process that we have in TVP, we simply haven't the resources for that. And I think if I came to you and said, can I have another 10 project managers, please, Matthew, you'd say, actually, you'd rather me spend another 10 neighborhood officers, shall we say, rather than on people we don't necessarily need. So that's an example of an area we're saying, you've made this observation in the report.

we won't be actioning this because of other priority areas that will impact the public much more.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 1:28:30

Yeah, to agree with. We'll have that on the agenda for our next liaison anyway, so we

can reflect some of those issues in my formal response. We're working behind the scenes with Ali to work out the informal response and anything that needs to be included in.

Alright, thank you.

Um...

Right, Tim, over to you for the finance items. Sorry for making you wait so long. So we've got all the finance items together then. So we've got budget position update and then we've got scheme delegations, which is nice and simple, and Charity Management, which is

And then Martin, you might have. I think Mike was just given that. OK, over to you then for item 4, please. Kirsty, would you please kind us just to pull up page 6 of the. So this is mainly a verbal update of the table of page 6, which might might help.

Thank you. Right, so, yeah, so it's still early in the financial year, but we have now got the results for the first quarter. And sorry, if you just scroll down to the table there, yeah, thank you. So the position at the end of the first quarter is that we are projecting a 1.1 billion under spend. As I said earlier in the year, still plenty of risks and lots of opportunities. So to explain that, that forecast result then, essentially what's driving that is the pay area for both police officers and police staff.

So, dealing with the officers first, actually, as at the end of June, we were actually over our budgeted establishment by 24 officers. But we also had a corresponding, we were under establishment on our protection grants, which is separately funded. So that is, we do have plans in place where the 24 will go down, but we will also increase the protection group. So it is a bit of a sort of counterintuitive that we are kind of over at the moment, yet we are projecting an underspend. So the reason for that is

Essentially, the at the moment with the average cost of an officer is slightly lower than when we budgeted. So, obviously, when we set the budget is based on establishment and the rank mix, but depending on sort of length of service, that that there is some sort of fluctuation in that. So, at the moment, with the current average cost of an officer is about 210 pounds lower.

when we set the budget towards the end of last year. Now, obviously, that doesn't sound a lot, but when you extrapolate that, that's close to 1,000,000 pounds. So that's the primary reason at the moment where we're in. Just because it's relevant to some of the other comments about Home Office funding, broadly speaking, what's the average figure that you're looking at?

The average cost per option. I don't know if that's haven't actually, sorry. That's something that didn't be put out. From memory around 60-65 1000 is obviously my 5000 range is vastly bigger than your 200 pounds variance, but I think it's in those in that ballpark.

So, get that for you. So, police staff then, where we're also understanding. So this one's a bit more straightforward to explain, hopefully. This is essentially just the number of vacancies we've got, which is higher than the budgeted adjustment we do every year. We obviously do

do budget for a number of vacancies, but we are seeing more at the moment. We've seen a bit of an uptick, actually, a bit of a trend since right about midpoint of last year. And one of the reasons for that is it's linked to our savings activity. So at the moment, we're obviously looking for efficiencies and many targets, many departments of the force do have targets to reduce spend on police staff. So what we're finding is some departments obviously in preparation for this are kind of holding vacancies where

where they kind of arise until they actually know what they've got, what their super plans are for their savings. So that's the main kind of factor there. Talking of the savings work, we did

So last year was the first year of our efficiencies programme and we did see quite high redundancy costs last year associated with those savings. So we have now put provision in for this year based on a sort of similar level. So that's where you're seeing that increase in other employee costs, the main factor for that.

Obviously, the two things are potentially related, so that is something we'll kind of monitor closely, whether that provision is necessary this year. It could be that if we're holding more vacancies, we don't have time redundancy costs, but the plans for the year 2 savings are being sort of firmed up over the next few months, so that's something we'll...

we'll kind of watch closely. So essentially those two, the police staff and the police officer under spends on pay are kind of offsetting some small overspends. You can see there in sort of the non-pay, where we do still see a few challenges. So transport, for example,

is obviously an area we've targeted to savings over the last couple of years, particularly around higher car usage. But we've seen an increase this year, which is almost entirely related to the HMRC uplift of the mileage rate to 45p to 55p, which we project about half a million extra costs for TVP.

So obviously that is essentially inflation, because obviously the inflation we're seeing due to the external factors. So in summary, that's probably the position at the moment then, as I said, still only in the year, but looking underspent at the moment. OK, lovely. Thank you. And I don't think there's any other particular questions for you. So I guess my observation and the reason why I was asking about the cost per officer is the variance we get from the Home Office. So I note with some interest that the public might not.

I entirely agree with the fact that protection group officers are fully funded by the government. So those who are keeping the great and the good safe are fully funded by government. Those who are keeping the rest of us safe are only 40% funded and we've got to chip in the other 60% locally for those. And also the anti-Semitism grant.

Though welcome is a significant sum of money, which seems to have come out of the blue, and frankly, if there's that much money in the Home Office, it would be nice. We just got that in our court grant, and those officers are funded about, I think, 150% of what we would normally expect as an officer.

to cost. So there seem to be some different different calculations being used in the Home Office, but that's not a problem for you.

OK, in which case, we've got the delegated decisions. Sorry, what was one other thing I was just going to mention, one or two things you covered the anti-service grant, so the only other thing was just the payable. So, we have we have now received notification that the...

pay will be 3 1/2 percent, but we also received at the same time news for anything above 2 1/2 percent we would receive additional funding for. Again, you know, this is the calculation I use.

As we've seen in the past, many things we do, we do kind of lose out a little bit because I use that funding formula rather than national resource element. So, but overall, it is positive news because we have budgeted at 3%. So what this means is following the calculations we've done, that we can afford 3 1/2% uplift applied to officers, Southeast Allowance and police staff, and we will still see a benefit this year of 800,000 pounds. Also, it has been confirmed funding applies for the next two financial years as well. So again, that just provides a bit more

That is important to get some certainty. Undoubtedly, that is good news for the force. I wouldn't want to do down equally as bad news for the people who have already been taxed to pay for that little bit of a pay rise and we're able to put that

money to good use.

But arguably, we wouldn't have needed to if we'd known what government's attention was previously. OK, good. Sorry. Anything else from you? No. OK, good stuff. If we can go on to the delegated decisions.

It's page 17, I think is the key one. A relatively short list this time. thing on there to raise just to formally approve those.

Thank you very much indeed. The Treasury Management quarterly report, we've got an update in writing on that. Not your remit, Tim, but as the Finance Manager, if you want to add anything or Gillian, if you've got anything else to describe. Okay, good.

Thank you. We will note that report then.

Um, Jason, any other business from you?

OK.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:39:00

Nothing for me. Thank you, Matthew.



Matthew Barber (C2871) 1:39:02

Thank you very much all for your time. Next meeting of this particular group is in October. Thank you.



Jason Hogg (P0010) 1:39:10

Thank you.