**TRUST, INTEGRITY AND ETHICS COMMITTEE**

**Thursday 27 October 2016**

**Conference Room, Leek Wootton**

**Attendees:**

**Warwickshire OPCC :**

Philip Seccombe (PS) : Police and Crime Commissioner

Neil Hewison (NH) : Chief Executive

Debbie Mullis (DM) : Policy and Research Officer

**West Mercia OPCC:**

John Campion (JC) : Police and Crime Commissioner

Andy Champness (AC) : Chief Executive

**Police:**

Amanda Blakeman (AB) : Assistant Chief Constable

Berni Gaughan (BG) : Head of Learning and Development (Agenda Item 3 Only)

**Independent Members:**

Col. Tony Ward (TW) : Chair

Chris Cade (CC)

Susanna McFarlane (SM)

Clive Parsons (CP)

Jane Spilsbury (JS)

**Apologies:**

Tracy Onslow (TO) : Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner, West Mercia

**1. Welcome and Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**

The Chair welcomed everybody to the meeting.

TW declared that he had been reappointed as a Lay Member to the West Mercia Police and Crime Panel.

**2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 July 2016 and Matters Arising**

The minutes of the Trust, Integrity and Ethics Committee held on 14 July 2016 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**Matters Arising**

Matters arising had been completed, with the following updates provided:

1. TW had requested information on the vetting procedure for Special Constables which he confirmed was the same process as for warranted officers.
2. SM advised that she would provide a written report on Stop and Search to the January meeting.
3. CC had only just received a report on the recommendations for the use of drones and would provide a verbal update at agenda item 7.

**3. Police Cultural Change Programme**

BG provided a presentation on the Alliance vision and values cultural change programme.

The work was about bringing the Code of Ethics to life through a programme of Cultural Change workshops delivered to managers who then delivered the session to their team. The workshops provided space to talk about the change and to have the debate. Evaluation took place after the training and would be followed up through the staff survey, currently taking place. It was agreed that BG would present the results of the staff survey to the April Committee meeting.

**ACTION: BG to be invited to present to the April Committee meeting.**

SM questioned if the staff survey questionnaires were anonymised? BG advised that the survey did collect demographic data and diversity information but that respondents did not have to answer these questions.

CC asked when the training evaluation took place? BG responded that an evaluation is sent out a week after the session and confirmed that the follow up questionnaires would be through the staff survey, conducted annually.

JS highlighted that it was important to catch the quantitative data and questioned how the Forces captured the actual impact on what happened out there when people did their daily job. JS asked if it would be possible to have some case study approaches, for example, where practice had changed as a result of the programme? BG advised that the Alliance had a Learning the Lessons Board that looked at a key theme, for example, the Code of Ethics not being used correctly. The Board would then have a debate about this and considered where it had also been used well. BG agreed to bring some case studies to the April meeting.

**ACTION: BG to bring case studies to the April meeting.**

CP asked how far through the training the Alliance was? BG confirmed that approximately one third of staff were left to be trained, with the aim to complete the training by December 2016. BG saw the training as more of a rolling programme. Intelligence would be gathered from the sessions to see where the Alliance was up to and what more needed to be done.

JS suggested that it would be helpful for a Committee Member to meet with BG to determine how the statistics were evaluated. It was agreed that JS would contact BG to take this forward.

**ACTION: JS to meet with BG to discuss how the statistics were evaluated.**

**ACTION: Presentation to be circulated to the Committee.**

**4. Police Ethics Board**

AB explained that she was the Alliance and regional lead for ethics. She had undertaken research on how to embed the Code of Ethics to make it ‘real’ for officers and staff in their everyday work.

As part of this work, ethical dilemmas had been sent to Inspectors to go through with their team at the start of their shift to generate discussion.

The Professional Standards Department had e-mailed ethical dilemmas to the workforce, with a link to vote for what they believed to be the correct approach in the situation outlined. This had received good engagement with real buy in from the workforce.

AB looked across the country to see how the Alliance could demonstrate how they had embedded the Code of Ethics. One of the themes was to hold an internal Ethics Board. Of particular note was the work that had taken place in Kent to set up a Board. This would not in any way replace the work of the Trust, Integrity and Ethics Committee.

The Board would allow the workforce to submit a real ethical dilemma they were going through, raise an issue in a policy or practice that did not fit the message the Alliance was putting out, or to raise an unjust issue.

The Board would comprise a small membership including those who worked in ethical areas. It would meet quarterly and feedback would be provided to officers and staff through the intranet. All questions asked would be highlighted, with a précis provided of the one selected for discussion at the Board meeting.

The Board might come to the Trust, Integrity and Ethics Committee about an issue that had been discussed and what would be changed as a consequence of the discussion. The Committee might be asked to consider policies as a result of issues raised.

The Board would provide the workforce with a forum to ask questions, anonymously if they wished, and for the feedback to be provided to all officers and staff.

JS asked what types of dilemmas would be considered? AB responded that both daily issues and ongoing matters would be discussed.

SM questioned if there was any merit to both committees meeting annually to see if there were any areas that might overlap? AB could go through dilemmas at the Trust, Integrity and Ethics Committee to give a synopsis of what had been discussed.

JC raised concern about the connection with this Committee which he viewed as a public ethics safeguard. He feared duplication between the work of the two groups and would feel more comfortable if the link to this group were stronger. He suggested that perhaps the Forces should invite a Member of this Committee to the Board. AB would welcome a Member of this Committee on the Board.

CP made two points about the membership of the Board. Firstly, he highlighted that the Human Resources Department played a key part in integrity work and he would think were needed on the Board. Secondly, CP questioned if AB thought an academic could make any useful contribution? AB explained that other forces had found an academic useful to explore a subject and challenge the thinking of internal staff and officers. CC suggested that the College of Policing might be able to provide an academic.

AC questioned if the Trust, Integrity and Ethics Committee was being as useful as it should be and was it fulfilling the role as it should? He continued that this Committee was intended to help the Forces become more trustworthy and ethical. Is the Alliance’s decision to set up an Ethics Board an indication that the Committee was not hitting the mark? AB advised that the landscape of policing changed at a rapid rate and that none of us could stand still in terms of what we contributed. The real challenge was to take the Code of Ethics off the wall and to use it on a daily basis. The Alliance wanted to provide a platform for difficult conversations. This Committee did not fulfil that but it was a vehicle to put this on the table, to influence policy and practice, and to charge AB to go away and make changes.

JS stated that if the Trust Integrity and Ethics Committee did have a representative on the Police Ethics Board, it would make the link much stronger between the two. She also felt that the Head of Learning and Development should be represented on the Board. JS suggested calling the Board ‘Ethical Practice’ rather than ‘Ethics’. JS questioned what evidence the Kent Police Ethics Board had of impact? AB advised that she would go back to the Kent Board to obtain some qualitative data and would bring this back to the Committee. She advised that the Kent Board had received real engagement but that it would need to go through a year’s cycle to demonstrate the outcomes, such as a reduction in misconduct etc.

AC asked how the Ethics Board would make change happen? AB advised that the recommendations from the Board would for example, lead to a policy being withdrawn and reviewed if an issue had been identified. Another example was if poor behaviour was identified, this would feed into the PDR priorities and should come into the themes of the PDR process.

PS thought that the Board was a good thing and saw it as an internal conscience that would improve policing as a result.

NH raised that the Committee Members had previously highlighted that they were concerned about their visibility and the understanding of their role internally in the Police Forces and externally. When the Police Ethics Board was to be launched, NH suggested that this Committee could be promoted alongside to show how ethics was being improved through both groups across the Alliance. A review of the Committee Terms of Reference could be completed and used in the launch. This would also demonstrate the difference of the two groups.

JC felt further assured by the information provided by AB.

SM stated that she had attended an event where the Avon and Somerset Police Ethics Committee was discussed and that Committee had an academic that they found useful. AB had looked at the Avon and Somerset model in her work.

AB advised that she would do some work on the Police Ethics Board Terms of Reference to make it clearer and would review the name of the Board. AB would come back to the Committee when this was completed.

**ACTION: AB to come back to the Committee when further work had been completed.**

**5. Complaint Dip Sampling Report / Lessons Learned**

The report from TW and CP was noted.

CP had handed the role to CC going forward. SM and CP had volunteered to sit on the Complaints Appeals Panel for the Alliance Professional Standards Department.

Tracy Hudson from the West Mercia PCC office had now left and TW wished to record his thanks for the excellent work she did for the complaints dip sampling process.

PS expressed that he would like to attend a dip sampling session going forward. TW would provide the dates.

**ACTION: TW to provide the dates of dip sampling sessions to PS’s office.**

**6. Members’ Annual Report**

The report was noted and Members thanked for their work. Particular thanks were given to JS who had compiled the report on behalf of the Members.

**7. Member Protocol Verbal Updates and Reports**

**Susanna McFarlane – Stop and Search**

SM advised that she had met with DCI Cannings who had been helpful. The whole process for Stop and Search had changed. SM confirmed that she would provide a written report to the next meeting.

**ACTION: SM to provide a written report to the January meeting.**

**Chris Cade – Drones**

CC reported that he had attended two oversight meetings, in July and October. The first meeting provided information on the deployment of the drones during the trial period and gave some preliminary findings around the use of drones to support search work. A number of technical issues were reported and the group agreed for the trial to continue for its original term until August 2016, with a formal report to follow. This report has now been received and would be circulated to the Committee.

**ACTION: Drones trial report to be circulated to the Committee.**

CC advised that the Alliance already paid a significant amount of funds and provided staffing to NPAS for helicopter use and therefore any funds spent on deploying the drones would need to be balanced with a value for money approach in the Alliance’s financial dealings with NPAS. The matter was ongoing and a further update would be provided to the Committee at the January meeting.

**ACTION: CC to provide an update on drones to the January meeting.**

**Chris Cade – Use of Force**

CC had attended the police Taser requalification training in May and reported his surprise at the level of paperwork and control in terms of the use of Taser, even if the Taser were only drawn, aimed or the red dot used and not actually deployed.

CC had attended an officers’ firearms requalification training session for authorised firearms officers. The level of detail was extremely high.

In addition, CC had visited the Taskforce to be briefed on their work and was shown practical demonstrations of ‘close protection’, storming a building and covert surveillance. CC noted that he was impressed with the level of training for officers and the professionalism of the unit as a whole, which was available to be deployed at almost a moment’s notice.

All officers who were authorised to use Taser or firearms volunteered to do so.

CC had found in each area he visited that it had come down to officers being well trained, and carrying out their roles in accordance with policies, procedures and training. CC would have confidence in the officers when provided with statistics and information to review in this business area.

**Jane Spilsbury – Child Sexual Exploitation**

JS had met with a Barnardo’s Support Worker from the CSE Team, and CI Nigel Jones and D.Supt Steve Ecclestone from the Police Force. She had found it difficult to get into this area of business. JS proposed to follow up on the contacts offered and to pursue the issues associated with building up expertise within the team, for staff to then move on and the process to start again. JS felt strongly that the people dealing with this type of work needed support themselves. AB confirmed that for police officers and staff working in this field, psychological support and counselling were available.

JS suggested that this area of work could benefit from some examples of changing practice and the impact of the cultural change programme. She would include some case studies in her written report. JS also hoped to develop a line of enquiry in to lessons learned and how these might influence work elsewhere.

**ACTION: JS to provide a written report to the January meeting.**

AB advised that Telford had lessons learned which were public through the Local Safeguarding Children Board. An independent group in Telford had worked with police for some time on this work in a similar way to how other policing areas worked in partnership with Barnardo’s locally. AB would send the report to JS.

**ACTION: AB to send the report on the work in Telford to JS.**

PS informed the Committee that he funded two Barnardo’s posts in Warwickshire and would look into any concerns about staff changes.

**Clive Parsons – Police Integrity**

CP provided an overview of his written report. He stated that he had found the subject of interest. CP had found people were helpful and open in sharing their views with him.

CP asked if the HMIC PEEL Legitimacy report for 2016 was available? AB advised that it had not been published but the Warwickshire and West Mercia reports would be provided to the group once available.

**ACTION: HMIC PEEL Legitimacy reports to be shared with the Committee once published.**

CP highlighted the key recommendations in his report. He advised that the Alliance were awaiting the Athena computer system to be in place to meet the requirement in the 2014 HMIC report on Police Integrity and Corruption to be able to view and record information accessed by officers.

CP reported that 30 – 40% of complaints work was on complaints that would not go any further. There was a statutory obligation that every complaint should receive a proper reasoned reply. CP gave an example of a complaint that has been ongoing for a number of years and took up a considerable amount of resources.

PS advised that the Policing and Crime Bill was currently going through Parliament and contained a section around recording of complaints, finalisation and so forth.

SM questioned why it could not be decided locally? NH responded that the rules and obligations were set nationally in legislative framework.

CP spoke of the disciplinary procedure and the length of time that this took. He understand that it did take time and was not always internal but thought that the internal issues could be progressed and that there could be a more targeted approach in terms of time. AB responded that the Alliance did take up issues of timeliness with the Independent Police Complaints Commission and had raised this on a number of occasions.

CP concluded that he had been greatly encouraged from looking into area of business.

JS provided an example of a serial complainant to another organisation being provided with a nominated single point of contact. TW advised that this could be a good idea but in some cases had caused issues when used by the Police.

**Tony Ward – Historical Sexual Abuse**

TW had attended a Critical Incident Management meeting to determine how with finite resources, ethical judgements could be made whether to investigate the current or historical cases. TW had been persuaded that despite the rise in cases, the workload was currently tenable. Some of the additional pressures came from perpetrators under Operation Trident moving into the police area and the investigation then being the responsibility of the residing Force area.

Concern was also expressed at the welfare and wellbeing of the officers and staff involved in the investigations as it often meant reviewing a considerable number of indecent images. It was confirmed that counselling arrangements were in place.

TW reported that the government initiative to set up an independent investigation on child sexual abuse had been beset with problems. Police Forces continued to act as a conduit for investigations to the Enquiry through Operation Trident.

TW advised that the College of Policing had emphasised that they would not name a suspect until such time as they were formally charged with an offence.

TW noted that victims did not like the term historic sexual abuse as so many of them continued to live with the consequences on a daily basis.

TW had two further meetings to attend and would submit his written report to the January meeting.

**ACTION: TW to provide a written report to the January meeting.**

**8. Work Plan and Agenda Items for the Next Meeting**

TW reported that the work plan showed that a lot of work had taken place over the last two years and that the majority of work had been completed.

CC pointed out that the first year was finding the way and then in the last year the Committee had achieved a lot.

AC questioned if there were anything that should be communicated from the work plan?

NH responded that it might be helpful for the Chair of the Committee to link with the Media and Communications Officers for both PCCs to see which areas of coverage would be helpful. He also highlighted the earlier conversation about using the launch of the Police Ethics Board as an opportunity to promote this Committee.

**ACTION: Chair to link with PCCs’ Media and Communications Officers.**

SM questioned the item in the work plan to dip sample rape reports. DM explained that this was a piece of work that was recommended from the rape no crimes review and it was for Members to decide if and when they would complete this.

The following agenda items were agreed for the next meeting, in addition to the standing items:

* A presentation on the HMIC PEEL Legitimacy reports for Warwickshire and West Mercia.
* An update on the Professional Standards Department’s work.

JS raised that the PCCs had reviewed the terms of employment for Committee Members. The Members’ Annual report suggested that it might be an idea to review the terms of engagement, so for example, the number of meetings and activities Members undertake. TW advised that the PCCs’ offices would look at the Terms of Reference and review them.

**ACTION: PCCs’ offices to review Committee Terms of Reference.**

SM raised that Members received the Warwickshire PCC newsletter but did not receive the West Mercia PCC one. AC would arrange for Members to be added to the circulation list.

**ACTION: AC to add Members to the circulation list for the West Mercia PCC newsletter.**

TW thanked Committee Members and DM for work their work.

On behalf of the Members, CC thanked TW for chairing the meeting for the last year.

**9. Dates of Next Meetings**

1.30pm, 11 January 2017, Willison Room, Hindlip

10.30am, 27 April 2017, Conference Room, Leek Wootton

1.30pm, 19 July 2017, Allsop Room, Hindlip

**10. Any Other Business**

SM mentioned that there had been press activity about body work video and asked where the Alliance was with this? JC felt that it was integral for building the confidence of the community in officers’ actions. There was also a swiftness of clearing officers when it had been worn. Both Chief Constables had asked AB to bring a business case for introducing it in the Alliance.

AB stated there was a clear legal framework around data retention, which was not quite there in the Alliance and had delayed the development of this. The Forces could not legally retain everything recorded. The Alliance was looking at building specific criteria for incidents. It has been deployed successfully in other Forces and there was now enough information to look into its introduction for the Alliance.

The Chair closed the meeting at 12.05pm.