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**TRUST, INTEGRITY AND ETHICS COMMITTEE**

**Thursday 4 February 2016**

**The Willison Room, Hindlip**

**Attendees:**

**Warwickshire OPCC:**

Debbie Mullis (DM) Policy and Research Officer

**West Mercia OPCC:**

Barrie Sheldon (BS) Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner

Andy Champness (AC) Chief Executive

**Police:**

Martin Jelley (MJ) Chief Constable, Warwickshire Police

T/ACC Steve Cullen (SC) Temporary Assistant Chief Constable, Warwickshire & West Mercia Police

Sean Paley (SP) Detective Chief Inspector (Item 10 only)

**Independent Members:**

Col. Tony Ward (TW) Chair

Chris Cade (CC)

Susanna McFarlane (SM)

Clive Parsons (CP)

Jane Spilsbury (JS)

**Apologies:**

Ron Ball (RB) Police and Crime Commissioner

Bill Longmore (BL) Police and Crime Commissioner, West Mercia

Neil Hewison (NH) Chief Executive, Warwickshire

**1. Welcome and Declaration of Conflicts of Interest (Chair)**

TW welcomed the Committee Members and asked for declarations of interest. Members advised that they had no further declarations in addition to those previously declared.

Apologies were noted.

**2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 29 October 2015 and Matters Arising (Chair)**

The minutes of the meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.

The actions from the previous meeting had all been completed, of note:

Joy Preece had been invited to attend the April meeting to provide an update on the HMIC Crime Data Integrity review actions and in addition, would provide an update on the rape no crime review recommendations.

Members had been provided with Warwickshire Police staff identification badges. Members asked if they also required a West Mercia badge? AC confirmed that a second badge was not required. MJ noted that there were different security arrangements at different police stations. A degree of flexibility would be borne on that.

**3. Complaint Dip Sampling Report / Lessons Learned (CP / TW)**

TW had been conducting complaint dip sampling on behalf of West Mercia for a number of years. The Terms of Reference had been rewritten to reflect the additional work carried out as part of the Committee role.

CP questioned whether the role is deeper than that outlined in paragraph 5 of the document? AC felt that it was about judging the reasonableness of the decisions that had been made by the Professional Standards Department when dealing with complaints. CP asked if further clarity of paragraph 7 was required, that referred to the Professional Standards Department raising cases with Members, that could have significance for public confidence or reputation. AC said that this could cover many different areas and advised leaving the paragraph as written.

JS stated that the complaint dip sampling report and annual summary was helpful and felt that it would be useful to have an annual report for strands of ongoing activity.

TW asked for thanks to be passed to Tracy Hudson for producing the report and supporting this area of work.

**ACTION: Thanks to be passed to Tracy Hudson.**

TW raised concerns about disproportionality in misconduct cases against PCSOs. He had asked the Professional Standards Department to provide statistics on the number of cases. TW had established that the vetting for PCSOs was the same as for police officers. He suggested that perhaps mentoring for PCSOs was not as it should be. He was aware that some PCSOs had access to police stations with no warranted officers present.

SC stated that this was not just a matter for the Professional Standards Department but that quarterly reviews were centred on values, standards and inclusivity. If standards were to be raised, it was not wholly concentrated on officers but also PCSOs as well. PCSOs were often less supervised and could work different shift patterns to their supervisor. There was work to do but each police area had spent time with SC on values and standards, which included all officers and staff in these teams. SC felt that the figures on PCSO misconduct cases would be useful in terms of context.

CC suggested that this area of work could fall under future work of the cultural change programme.

BS mentioned that the latest HMIC PEEL report was due for publication the following week. The report would identify issues in the Professional Standards Department, including timeliness. MJ highlighted that there had been a particular concern in the Department twelve months ago. He stated that Supt. Gary Watson was doing a good job of taking the Department forward. The staffing levels were not appropriate to get the work done. There had been resource changes and a tightening of processes and procedures. The Department was still not where he wanted it to be, but was starting to move in the right direction. SC supported this and advised that the Department was trying to streamline and adopt a more proportionate approach to dealing with complaints. There was a focus to concentrate efforts on the cases that needed the time.

TW noted that there had been a large improvement over the last twelve months. There had been issues with the move to Stratford, leaving knowledgeable people behind, but the backlog was now being picked up rapidly. He was pleased to see how quickly cases were being recorded but was still pushing for improved recording timescales and keeping the complainant updated. The letters going out to complainants were good.

**4. Complaint Statistics Report**

Members requested some narrative around the figures be provided for future reports, to include any areas that Members should be aware of.

**ACTION: DM to request attendance from a Professional Standards Officer for the next report, due at the July meeting**.

TW raised questions about the vetting income statistics. MJ explained that the Warwickshire Force had run the national vetting contractors’ scheme for a number of years. If contractors were going into a number of forces, the Warwickshire Force conducted the vetting on behalf of contractors and other forces.

**5. Work Plan and Agenda Items for Next Meeting (Chair)**

A discussion took place around what the completed column on the work plan meant. Members said that the area of work was not completed. DM advised that a new line is added for each piece of work and the completed column is ticked when each individual piece of work has taken place.

TW explained that the members had each selected an area of work that they would like to scrutinise. The areas were as follows:

CP – Police corruption to include the HMIC Police Integrity and Corruption Inspection. The Committee had received briefings on the report and CP would delve further into this and follow up in more detail. In addition, CP would continue to participate in dip sampling.

CC – Drones, to include becoming a member of the user group, and Use of Force.

SM – Stop and search.

JS – Child sexual exploitation.

TW – Would continue to dip sample and would consider counter-terrorism, once a briefing had been received at the April Committee meeting.

MJ advised that he was content with the work areas selected by the Members.

MJ asked Members how they anticipated gaining access to the Forces to pursue these work areas? TW suggested getting the agreement of the two Chief Constables and two PCCs that those items specified above were to be looked at. Then for Members to be provided with an ACC who would arrange direct access.

**ACTION: DM to provide the work areas listed above to the CCs and PCCs for agreement.**

MJ asked about police presence at Committee meetings. He offered Members a nominated ACC to attend the meetings and to be the liaison for the Committee, being the police point of contact. MJ and DS were happy to nominate SC to do this. AC supported MJ in what he had said. This was agreed as a positive way forward by Committee Members.

SM asked if the above were approved, could Members have direct access to contact details? MJ agreed.

CP sought clarity on whether the Chief Constables would be kept updated on contacts the Members had with the ACC about their work areas? SC confirmed this would be the case. In addition, he highlighted that if the work area came under the remit of another officer, he would make contact with the relevant officer.

TW asked how the workforce would be made aware of the Committee, so for example, when an officer attended the Committee, they would understand the purpose of the group. SM suggested a meeting with the Head of Communications. SC advised that there was a requirement for more awareness-raising in the Forces in general and that the Committee could be part of this.

BS raised his view that the Committee should have an independent voice in the media. BS would raise this with BL and ask if there should be a statement from this group to the media and proposed a statement on the PEEL Inspection reports, due for publication shortly.

AC pointed out that it would not be routine but where the Committee had something that they wanted to say publicly, either PCCs’ office could facilitate this and it would be independent should the Committee wish. AC explained that the Forces were likely to know what would be in an HMIC report immediately after the inspection and quite often the action plan was well underway before the report was published. When Members looked at reports, they may wish to comment but this should be considered on a case by case basis and a decision made whether it be public or within the organisation.

MJ advised Members to be cautious about putting anything in the public arena. He observed there might be times when the CCs or PCCs would value public comment from the Committee. AC pointed out that there may also be occasions where the PCC or CC wanted to say that they had referred a particular matter to the independent Trust, Integrity and Ethics Committee. This would reference the Committee, rather than Members responding to the media themselves. JS asked should the protocol be that if Members wanted to make a statement it went through police communications? AC responded that it should go through the PCCs’ communications. JS felt more reassured by this.

Members discussed the timescales for their work areas as outlined previously. TW proposed an interim report be provided at each meeting, with a full report provided as appropriate. JS suggested a rota for reporting.

TW confirmed that Joy Preece would be attending the April meeting to provide an update on the HMIC Crime Data Integrity inspection action plan and an update on the rape no crimes review recommendations. In addition, there would be a presentation on terrorism and the usual standing items.

It was pointed out that one of the actions in the work plan was to monitor and have oversight of the Code of Ethics in the Alliance. Members had all attended the Alliance Cultural Change programme training. JS reminded the group that following the session she attended, she had raised concerns at the following meeting regarding low morale which had been picked up on at the training. JS was concerned that a lot had been invested in the training and would like to see evidence of the impact of the programme.

MJ provided an update on where the Alliance was at, but with the caveat that it was difficult to see the impact at this stage. He advised that one of the things that would help was the staff survey that took place last year. The intention was to run the survey annually and, if the Forces got it right around culture and staff welfare, then some improvements should be seen going forward. The survey would be run again this summer, and it would be useful to see the change. Other forces had similar responses. MJ asked SC to find out where the Alliance was at in terms of delivering the Cultural Change courses.

**ACTION: SC to establish where the Cultural Change programme courses were up to.**

SC informed the Committee that both Chief Constables led the Health and Wellbeing agenda. There was a Board driving activity, responding to feedback from staff, and each Local Policing Area had its own health and wellbeing plans. Work that had taken place included additional health checks and some minor local activity in response to issues raised by officers and staff.

TW suggested waiting for the report to come back after the survey had taken place. MJ advised that the survey would not be analysed until the autumn due to this year’s survey taking place in the summer.

JS questioned whether the cultural change programme had made an impact on ethical behaviour in the two Forces? She would expect to see evidence of impact, not just in survey outcomes but in behaviours manifested in interactions with the public, levels of complaints and other types of behaviour that the Code of Ethics would have an impact on.

SC said that initially they would need to see how much of the workforce was exposed to the programme and to establish if there had been any evaluation.

**ACTION: SC to provide an update on the cultural change programme and to establish if there was any evaluation.**

SM asked at the training course last January if there was follow-up training and impact assessment, but nothing had been thought of at that stage. She felt that one day of training was not enough. MJ responded that there were many areas that staff and officers could be trained on, but that they needed people to be doing what they needed to do. MJ thought that there were other ways to make staff and officers aware, without the necessity for formal training, and that other work was taking place. He advised Members of the ethical dilemmas being posed to the workforce by the Professional Standards Department, which would be followed up to keep it in peoples’ minds. He advised that cultural change took a long time. SC confirmed that there had been approximately 1,700 responses to the ethical dilemma in the first week, demonstrating a general interest in exploring ethical issues such as that.

CC attended the Warwickshire Police and Crime Panel the previous day, and there was a lot of talk about the transformation programme. He felt that a lot was taking place with what had been done already. MJ thought that there should be a formal evaluation programme in place. JS offered support for the process and was happy to be involved if it would be helpful.

**6. Date of Next Meetings**

The next meeting would take place at 10:30am on Thursday 28 April, 2016, in the Conference Room at Leek Wootton. The following meeting had been scheduled for Thursday 14 July 2016, in the Allsop Room at Hindlip Hall. Future meeting dates would be determined following the PCC elections in May.

**7. Any Other Business (Chair)**

Committee Members would like to meet with the two newly elected PCCs in June. AC advised that it was already provisionally planned for both new PCCs to meet with the Chairs of the Trust, Integrity and Ethics Committee and the Audit Committee in June. A joint meeting had been planned to allow the new PCCs to understand the different roles of the two committees. The new PCCs would be invited to attend the Committee meetings. SM said that all Members would like to meet the new PCCs prior to the July meeting. AC asked if Members were content if they met with just the Chairs first? It was agreed that the Chairs would meet with the PCCs first and in addition, all Members would meet with the PCCs prior to the July meeting.

**Action: Members to meet with the new PCCs prior to the July meeting.**

**Closed Session**

The following items were deemed restricted and members of the public were not able to attend this part of the meeting.

**8. Exempt Minutes of the Meeting Held on 29 October 2015 and Matters Arising (Chair)**

The exempt minutes of the Committee meeting held on 29 October 2015 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

**9. Stop and Search (T/ACC Steve Cullen)**

SC provided an update on stop and search.

TW thanked SC.

**10. Cyber Crime (DCI Sean Paley)**

SP thanked the Committee for their invitation to present. SP provided a presentation that would be circulated to Members.

TW closed the meeting.