

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Board of Directors of the College of Policing
held via Teams
on 26 May 2021 at 10:00**

Present		Attendance 2020/21
Nick Herbert	Chair	2/2
David Bamber		2/2
Bernie O'Reilly	Interim CEO	2/2
Paul Griffiths		2/2
Clare Minchington		2/2
Stephen Mold		1/2
Alexis Poole		2/2
Dr Robina Shah	DEI Advisor to the Board	1/2
Jackie Smith		2/2
Ian Wylie		2/2

Executive in attendance

Nick Bayley	Director of Enabling Services
Jo Noakes	Director of Workforce Development
Iain Raphael	Director of Operational Standards
Rachel Tuffin	Director of Knowledge and Innovation

Staff in attendance

Oliver Cattermole (Item 11)	Staff Officer
Anna Douglas	Staff Officer
Kate Fromant	Head of Corporate Governance
Camille Giffard	Governance Manager
Martin Tunstall	Executive Policy Advisor
James Walker	Staff Officer

Apologies
Part one – Preliminary items

 01-COP-MAY21 **Welcome and administration**

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, noting that the meeting had been duly convened and a quorum was present.

- 1.2. There were no apologies for absence. Stephen Mold would join approximately 30 minutes into the meeting, Robina Shah would leave temporarily at times and Jackie Smith would leave at 1pm.
- 1.3. The Chair declared a new interest arising from his appointment as the Prime Minister's Special Envoy on LGBT rights. Paul Griffiths and Dave Bamber declared an interest in relation to action 1 concerning Central Services Allowance (CSA) for secondees.
- 1.4. No items were raised for discussion under Any Other Business.

02-COP-MAY21

Minutes of the meeting on 17 March 2021

- 2.1. No comments were received prior to or raised in the meeting. The minutes were approved without amendment.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the minutes of the meeting on 17 March 2021 without amendment.

03-COP-MAY21

Matters arising and actions from the meeting on 17 March 2021

- 3.1. Action 1, concerning Central Services Allowance for secondees, remained red. It was clarified that it was a legacy issue which arose due to variations in amounts over the years. Negotiations were ongoing, with Treasury approval required for resolution. It represented modest amounts and a detailed breakdown could be provided outside of the meeting.
- 3.2. Actions 2 and 3 were amber and currently paused awaiting outcomes of the Fundamental Review. In relation to action 2, Kate Fromant advised that a person specification for a digital advisor to the Board was being developed with Mark Osborne.
- 3.3. Actions 4 to 6 were green and not yet due.
- 3.4. Actions 7 to 11 were suggested complete and board members agreed they should be closed.

ACTION: CG

Close the actions suggested complete.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the 'Action Points' template.

04-COP-MAY21

Chair's Report

- 4.1. The Chair updated board members on CEO recruitment and appointments to the Board.
Bernie O'Reilly left the meeting
- 4.2. The Chair advised that approval for the salary of £170k had been granted and the recruitment process could begin at pace. The advert should be launched in the first week of June, to close by end of June and interview early July with a view to making a recommendation to the Home Secretary by mid-July. The lengthy delay in securing salary approval should not be compounded by excessive process, while remaining mindful of propriety.

- 4.3. Board members welcomed the progress, noting that any serving chief officer would have contractual obligations which would add to the delay and the proposed timetable would also depend on availability of the interview panel.
- 4.4. The Chair advised board members that an uplift had been agreed in relation to the interim CEO's salary, but in accordance with the rules applicable to civil servants rather than police officers. This would have implications if the interim CEO were appointed to the substantive post, as the salary would then be at a lower level than advertised. This seemed inequitable and further discussions would be required.
- 4.5. The Chair wished to formally record his gratitude to Bernie O'Reilly for continuing to hold the fort, confident that the College was in good hands.
- Bernie O'Reilly rejoined the meeting*
- 4.6. The Chair reminded board members that a preferred candidate had been recommended to the Home Secretary (HS) for the board seat reserved for a Chief Constable, with a response being awaited. Also awaited was HS approval for extension of the three independent non-executive director positions.
- 4.7. The July board meeting had been rescheduled to 20 July due to a diary clash. The September board meeting would take place face to face, subject to any further regulation changes.
- 4.8. Updating on the Fundamental Review, the Chair advised that good progress was being made and a report should be brought to the September meeting. More urgent actions could be initiated earlier where appropriate.
- 4.9. The Chair advised board members that the College was engaged in discussions around publication of the Daniel Morgan report. Bernie O'Reilly added that the senior team was working on a College position on the projected findings in light of the Code of Ethics.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the Chair's update.

05-COP-MAY21

Interim Chief Executive's Report

- 5.1. Bernie O'Reilly (BoR) had attended Chief Constables' Council (CCC) the previous week and summarised the updates he had provided there.
- **Hate crime** – BoR emphasised that the approach to hate crime sought to balance, among other things, the recommendations from the Stephen Lawrence inquiry, the Home Office Counting rules and free speech. The key concern was not to impact on the confidence to report incidents where someone is targeted because of who they are. The Court of Appeal judgment was awaited on the legality of the operational guidance. Some amendments had been made to make application of the guidance clearer but social media was fuelling a debate on free speech which had weaponised the hate crime guidance. The Home Secretary had written to reinforce the

importance of challenging hate crime without curtailing free speech. A meeting had taken place between the College, NPCC and Home Office where it was agreed the language around hate crime needed consideration to reflect that it was perception based. It was apparent at CCC that policing wanted the College to take a leadership role on this point.

- **DARA and digital extraction APP** – these were also pertinent to confidence of victims of rape and serious sexual assaults (RASSO) that they would not be digitally strip searched if reporting an incident. This was well received by CCC.
- **Fundamental Review (FR)** – interviews with Chief Constables were being worked through, and the survey being issued. Chiefs were engaged and open minded, acknowledging that it was in everyone's interest that the College as the professional body for policing was meeting their needs.
- **Leadership offer** – this was welcomed and the work needed to be amplified further. A concise and coherent offer of leadership for the service was needed, with CPD at different ranks and levels, for both officers and staff. BoR indicated that he provided mentoring for chief officers informally but that this needed to be formalised in light of the level of attrition at chief officer level, with the College having a key role to play.
- The Police National Assessment Centre Senior Command Course (SCC) had just concluded, with 43 successful candidates. Running it successfully during COVID-19 was a huge achievement and it would now be evaluated.

5.2. Board members observed that hate crime would provide the College with a good opportunity for strong leadership as the College could be independent and provide descriptors for how to tackle hate crime, and non-crime incidents. This was a complex area and it would be helpful to bring a paper to the Board outlining the offer, to enable board discussion to provide backing. Digital extraction, for example, would be relevant to hate crime. BoR indicated there would be further discussion around hate crime operational guidance and any fundamental change would come back to the Board. BoR also confirmed that issues were primarily around implementation and any review should be mindful not to suggest that reporting was no longer a priority, as it was key for victims to have the confidence to report incidents.

5.3. Board members commended the achievements of the recently completed SCC and urged that leadership be given more prominence in the College narrative.

5.4. BoR indicated that the Comprehensive Spending Review was reverting to a three year settlement and the College would need to be more robust and forthright in its representations. Money was tight and everyone would be doing the same. Demands on the College included commissioned pieces of

- work, unanticipated demands like the online assessment centre and the 20k Uplift, flagship items like the leadership centre and huge demand from NPCC. Current discussions with NPCC related to the role of the College in retention, and trust and legitimacy, for example. Board members asked that consideration be given to how they could contribute to taking a more robust approach. The Chair remarked that there was a link to the FR and that expansion in certain areas would have implications the Board would need to consider.
- 5.5. BoR advised that controversial coverage of the new entry routes on a police website had been picked up by the mainstream media, with the issue being once again focused on the reference to 'degree'. The old entry routes were out of date and into the final 12 months of decommissioning, with approximately 10 forces left to decommission. There was satisfaction overall with the new entry routes, with early indications of promising diversity outcomes. The College would continue to put forward the facts. A letter and detailed piece had been submitted to the Times to try and address the issues but only the letter was printed, and only in part.
- 5.6. Board members asked if there was a strategy to publicise data on a reduction in attrition and improvements in diversity. BoR indicated that this was being lost in the discussion on degrees and they needed to be relentless in putting forward the facts. The Chair suggested some front foot communications be considered.
- 5.7. Board members observed that the social media issues were specifically highlighting implementation issues around the age of new recruits. How could the College support those young in service who may feel undermined by the criticism from senior officers due to their age? Board members also observed that the College should be clear about the parts of the process that it owned and what was the responsibility of Chief Constables. If a chief had a young inexperienced workforce, they should look at their own force attraction and recruitment strategy. There would shortly be mass graduations, bringing an opportunity to demonstrate that the police continued to attract military and second career recruits. BoR remarked that recruitment of 50k officers in 36 months would inevitably result in a younger cadre and that the College would further push the importance of supervision and tutoring.
- 5.8. The Chair remarked that support was needed from Chief Constables to make these points and the continued absence of a Chief Constable representative on the Board was regrettable.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the Chief Executive's update.

Robina Shah left the meeting

Part two – Items for decision and discussion

06-COP-MAY21 Professional Committee matters

- 6.1. Iain Raphael (IR) reported on two matters referred from Professional Committee.

Digital Extraction Authorised Professional Practice (APP)

- 6.2. IR explained that the police had strong powers to acquire data and materials from suspects but their use in relation to victims and witnesses was less clear. It was being challenged by victims groups, the Victims' Commissioner (VC) and others nationally, especially in relation to RASSO, and the amount of data being extracted. A June 2020 report by the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) recommended Government develop a code of practice. Government intent was to legislate and the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill included the power for the Home Office to create a code. In the interim, the College had developed APP to inform policing nationally how they could legitimately and proportionately acquire material. The College had worked with the VC, ICO, CPS, Digital Forensics and staff associations. The product was supported by the Criminal Justice Committee, DPP and NPCC. It formed part of a wider suite of products designed to improve delivery of disclosure. If the Board agreed, the APP would be published the following day.

Stephen Mold joined the meeting.

Domestic Abuse Risk Assessment (DARA)

- 6.3. IR summarised the history of domestic abuse risk assessment. DASH had been used since the 2000s and had 27 questions. In 2014, HMICFRS raised concerns regarding its use. The College looked at the effectiveness of DASH in partnership with Cardiff University. They found good support for the use of risk assessments but issues around consistency in delivery and the identification of coercive control which could be a precursor to DA homicide. The DARA risk assessment tool was developed to address these issues in collaboration with policing, DA services and academic experts. It was piloted in 3 forces, West Midlands, Humberside and Sussex, and was now being introduced in Bedfordshire, finding that coercive control was identified more often and supervisors preferred it. It was accepted by Professional Committee, with strong support from AC Louisa Rolfe, the NPCC domestic abuse lead, who would be key to the roll out. The plan was to take it to CCC following Board agreement, to consider national implementation.
- 6.4. Board members were supportive of both requests and raised the following points:
- Achieving clarity in relation to digital extraction was key, considering the level of public debate.

- Had the IT implications of changing to DARA been costed? IR advised that this led to some hesitancy around making it a national model but discussions were ongoing with a company that worked with system forms, and the potential for a national app was being considered.
 - At what point should the College push standards if there was resistance? It was preferable to work collaboratively.
 - Documents needed to be practical and meaningful to the front line, including the police constable at 2am. IR indicated the 2am PC was a key driver, with an aspiration towards a 'College in my pocket' app.
- 6.5. The Chair advised that feedback from the Fundamental Review included consideration of potential for the College to mandate certain standards, but the notion was overall unpopular. It would need to be reserved for areas where there was strong agreement about necessity or value.
- 6.6. Board members added that the 'enforce or encourage' debate had persisted in healthcare with NICE guidelines and, 10 years after evidence for a change in practice, the new practice was still not being taken up by some. The NICE guidelines were available in an app which allowed professionals to refresh their knowledge before procedures if needed. Experience could be shared from health and other parallel professions dealing with the debate.
- 6.7. Rachel Tuffin remarked that the ToC programme was applying behaviour change science to implementation. This could be applied to implementation issues with programmes like DARA to look at all triggers and levers.

*Iain Raphael left the meeting.
Paul Griffiths left the meeting.*

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the publication of Digital Extraction APP, on or after the 27 May 2021, as recommended by the Professional Committee.
- ii. **Agree to support** the Professional Committee recommendation to police forces in England and Wales to adopt DARA as the preferred evidence based domestic abuse risk assessment tool.

07-COP-MAY21

Independent Ethics Adviser

- 7.1. Martin Tunstall (MT) advised that the pause in Independent Ethics Panel recruitment to align with the Fundamental Review had provided an opportunity for the College to be bolder in the space of ethical leadership in policing. Professional bodies could play an important role in developing communities of practice. This would dovetail with the Code of Ethics refresh. The next step would be to discuss the development of an Independent Ethics Adviser job specification with NPCC colleagues.
- 7.2. Board members generally took the view that there continued to be a pressing need to act and the proposal had merit but lacked clarity. It was confirmed that those interviewed in the

- first recruitment exercise had been informed there would be a pause for review.
- 7.3. Board members considered that the governance arrangements needed more clarity. It was unclear if the role was executive (a member of the executive team) or non-executive (giving advice to the Board) in nature. Care would be needed when drafting the job description to avoid creating a hybrid role. MT confirmed that the role should remain under board governance and be empowered to act by the Board and policing more widely. It was also observed that the independence of the advice would be as important as the executive/non-executive status of the adviser.
- 7.4. The question of time commitment was raised in light of the volume of ethics work pending, with the review of the Code of Ethics, the Daniel Morgan Independent Panel report and the Undercover Policing Inquiry. Four days a month were suggested. It was observed that NPCC was trying to embed ethics by setting up regional and force level networks and there may be more confidence in a group than an individual.
- 7.5. MT indicated that the College should not seek to replicate other work being done by forces, PCCs and the Home Office, and the gap seemed to be in relation to coordination, a role bringing everything together rather than trying to own it. A panel meeting four times a year would not achieve this. Four days a month should be sufficient as the adviser would not be expected to undertake the ethics work themselves.
- Robina Shah rejoined the meeting.*
- 7.6. Board members remarked that the College would not be deciding ethics for the whole of policing but rather taking a leadership role. The concept of co-ordinating advice coming into the Board seemed like the right direction of travel and would not preclude setting up an independent panel as well. More questions were being asked which would ultimately help to establish the right focus. Too many ethics panels were dissolved due to not achieving the right outcomes.
- 7.7. The Chair commented that the proposal had evolved from the original IEP proposal with a view to strengthening the role.
- 7.8. BoR indicated he was supportive of the principle on the basis it would give the College a leadership role around ethics. The proposal should be refined with more detail and may well be too modest currently.
- 7.9. The Chair noted that the resource proposal was greater than in the previous proposal but consideration should be given to whether it was sufficient.
- 7.10. MT indicated that he would rework the proposal on the basis that the direction of travel was supported but more clarity was needed on the status and exact leadership role.
- 7.11. The Chair confirmed that board members were in agreement and that the proposal should come back to the next meeting.

ACTION: MT

Develop the proposal further to give more clarity on the role and its status.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Decline** the creation of, and appointment to, the role of Independent Ethics Adviser to the College Board, requesting further clarity on the role and its status.

Paul Griffiths rejoined the meeting.

08-COP-MAY21

Estate Strategy

- 8.1. Nick Bayley (NB) explained that the Estate SOC was the first step of a three-stage process, making the case for change and setting some courses of action and preferred ways forward. The next stage would be a detailed evaluation of the options, followed by a Full Business Case. The request at this stage was to establish the level of ambition for the future estate, rather than selecting a specific option.
- 8.2. *[As the details discussed are commercially sensitive, they have been removed from this version.]*
- 8.3. Board members agreed to proceed as recommended.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Discuss** and **agree** the current version of the Estate SOC.
- ii. **Note** that any strategic estate planning is likely to be influenced by the outcome of the ongoing Fundamental Review.
- iii. **Note** that further investigation into the role of the Estate and flexible working in promoting a diverse workforce is required
- iv. **Agree** that a revised Estate SOC is brought to a future Board meeting for consideration following the publication of the Chair's Fundamental Review and investigation undertaken into the link between the Estate and workforce diversity.

Part three – Items for decision and discussion

09-COP-MAY21

College People Strategy

- 9.1. Nick Bayley (NB) indicated that board members were being asked to approve the strategy and note the implementation plan. The strategy was looking at internal aspects of the College in terms of attraction and retention but also ensuring people had the right skills, in an inclusive environment. People were encouraged to be dynamic and responsive, as this was key to enhancing the College's connections with policing.
- 9.2. There were six strategic objectives reflecting the College's priorities:
 - Attract and recruit
 - Develop and grow
 - Reward and recognition
 - Diversity, Equality and Inclusion (DEI)
 - Leadership

- Engagement and culture.
- 9.3. The implementation plan was ambitious but grounded in the reality of delivery against a backdrop of change. The priorities would be refined further. There would be a focus on delivering the transformation programme and its linked people aspects, improving the use of secondees and delivering a hybrid working approach, while remaining cognisant of the ongoing Fundamental Review (FR).
- 9.4. Board members welcomed the document but felt it underplayed in places and overplayed in others, agreeing that further work was needed to achieve a more balanced strategy. The issues raised were as follows:
- The priority for the College should be on capability, competence and professionalism, with a dynamic and responsive culture. Initial feedback from police leaders in the context of the FR was that responsiveness was often an issue. This should be balanced against the undisputed need for a diverse workforce.
 - The strategy should build in indicators to enable the measurement of success. The same concern applied to DEI, which needed the ability to measure and evidence how the College was on track.
 - DEI – two of the strategic objectives, one and six, related to DEI. These should be combined to avoid creating an impression of disproportionality. There was a need to be mindful of precision in terminology. The aspiration to recruit the ‘best’ people was subjective and should be more precise, for example by reference to merit. Reference to creating an ‘inclusive environment’ also lacked the descriptor to evidence what would be delivered. The tone seemed hesitant in places and should be more confident, particularly in terms of what had already been achieved. The College was progressive and proactive in this area, and should be able to evidence that it was on a trajectory to meet its DEI objectives. There should be more focus on the ‘how’, as using the same methodology as before would result in the same failures.
 - Leadership needed to be enhanced, with behavioural values intersecting with capability and professionalism.
 - When referring to prioritising in the context of recruitment and talent development, the offer should clearly include existing staff as well as external audiences.
 - Historically, the College had drifted into some of its existing policies and the new strategy should avoid this by remaining mindful of co-dependencies, ie, the FR and the Estate Strategy.
- 9.5. The Chair summarised the discussion by concluding that board members were not minded to agree the strategy as currently drafted. He asked for an indication of timing for revision prior to publication.

- 9.6. NB indicated that comments had been noted and the team would update the strategy to achieve the right balance and tone. It would be circulated out of committee and return to the next board meeting.

ACTION: NB

Update the People Strategy to reflect the discussion.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Decline** to approve the People Strategy pending revision

Robina Shah left the meeting.

10-COP-MAY21

Governance matters

(a) Board/Committee Effectiveness Evaluation

- 10.1. The NRC Chair explained that this referred to the Board's annual review of its own effectiveness rather than the three-year external review completed in 2020 in line with Cabinet Office guidelines. Each of the committees would be asked to complete a questionnaire which would be reviewed at its next meeting. This would then be reviewed by the Board in November.

(b) Governance Update

- 10.2. The NRC Chair introduced three strategy documents that NRC was recommending to the Board for approval.
- **Inclusion and diversity strategy** – NRC was content with this, subject to it coming to board and the title being changed to Diversity, Equality and Inclusion. It would be discussed further with the DEI Advisor to the Board outside the meeting.
 - **College Values** – these had been in operation since November 2020, were popular and had been developed with staff, so no significant amendments were proposed beyond anything needing to be added, such as responsiveness. It was an iterative document which could be adapted as required.
 - **Workforce Strategy** – this was an outline strategy, with the transformation programme having identified demand, capability and capacity, and any corresponding gaps.
- 10.3. Board members observed that there seemed to be a proliferation of strategies and queried whether there was any hierarchy among them. The NRC Chair advised that NRC would be considering this point to assure the Board the strategies were coming to it in the right order.
- 10.4. The Chair enquired whether the management team would take to the Board an assessment of the workforce issues confronting the College, such as capability gaps, inclusion issues and implications of homeworking. Looking at the issues would enable understanding of the problems to solve, as well as the ambitions.
- 10.5. BoR indicated that strategies should come to the Board earlier to enable the Board to have sight of the problems being addressed and to seek board engagement with the

strategic direction. He assured the Board that there was coherence to the strategies and undertook to address this at the next board meeting.

- 10.6. The Chair emphasised that he wanted to avoid a proliferation of overlapping strategies and his preference would be for gritty plans with outcome measures.

(c) Annual Reports to the Board

- 10.7. Nick Bayley (NB) introduced the annual reports to the Board on committee activities.
- 10.8. The NRC Chair summarised his committee's work as not appearing to advance greatly in spite of a significant amount of work for most of the year, but progress was finally being made.
- 10.9. The ARC Chair indicated that a light touch review had been carried out in November 2020 which identified a gap in relation to digital capability. She requested that any digital expertise acquired by the Board be made available to ARC to strengthen capability in relation to cyber risks and digital working. The review had also suggested strengthening the committee's relationship with the Home Office ARAC, and the ARC Chair had observed a meeting recently, which had been enlightening but highlighted the difference in size. She would shortly be attending a meeting of audit committee chairs of ALBs of the Home Office which would enable a more rounded perspective and information sharing.
- 10.10. As Professional Committee (PC) Chair, BoR advised that the process in the revised Terms of Reference (ToR) for the PC had been tested in relation to the Digital Extraction APP (agenda item 6) and had worked well, having been recommended for approval at PC, taken to Chiefs Council for socialisation and now being approved by the Board. The ToR had been revised due to a concern that the PC was signing off decisions for which the Board was responsible without board members being sighted. It was good to see the revised process working well.

ACTION: BoR

Take to the Board an assessment of the workforce issues facing the College, to ensure understanding of the problems the strategies are trying to solve, and reassure the Board there is coherence to the multiple interlinked strategies.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the process by which the Board and its Committees will evaluate their effectiveness for the year 2020/21.
- ii. **Note** the content of the Governance Update report
- iii. **Approve** the
 - Inclusion and Diversity Strategy, subject to using the language Diversity, Equality and Inclusion (DEI) (detailed at paragraph 4.4.)
 - College Values (detailed at paragraph 4.5.)
 - Workforce Planning Strategy and implementation plan

- (detailed at paragraph 4.6.)
- iv. **Note** the reports to the Board on its committee's activities for the year 2020/21.

Part four – Items for discussion

11-COP-MAY21 **Transforming our College Update**

*Iain Raphael rejoined the meeting.
Oliver Cattermole joined the meeting.*

- 11.1. Jo Noakes (JN) provided a comprehensive update on the transformation programme, initially reminding board members of the reasons for the programme and its earlier phases. She reiterated that the aims and expected benefits were to provide the organisation with clarity of purpose, a focus on delivery and greater relevance and impact in the policing landscape.
- Robina Shah rejoined the meeting.*
- 11.2. JN set out how this would be achieved, through the new operating model presented as three layers. The first related to connection with policing, communicating and engaging with stakeholders and working with them to agree joint priorities. That engagement informed the second layer, the new corporate development function. This would set out priorities and have line of sight on the resources available to deliver all incoming work requests. The third layer provided delivery through portfolios and professional communities.
- 11.3. Portfolios would deal with all externally facing work, including reactive work, strategic programmes and BAU. They would be arranged according to outcomes with clear accountability for delivery. Professional communities grouped people by capabilities to allow a focus on skills and common standards needed to deliver, and to ensure the development of capabilities within the organisation.
- 11.4. Enabling Services provided a foundation for the other layers, encompassing areas such as HR, legal and corporate governance.
- 11.5. JN provided additional detail on the new corporate development function. This would provide oversight across the organisation and clear direction, establishing a planning process including thorough scoping to understand root causes of problems and how they could be addressed. The current system would use a resource on a single product rather than focusing on a structured programme of work, reducing potential impact. An example was undertaking a wholesale review of promotion and progression processes rather than focusing on sergeants and inspectors as initially requested by the NPCC. Better diversity at senior levels would only be achieved by looking at the whole system rather than piecemeal. A new process was being established

- to manage in-year requests through the Tasking, Coordination and Delivery Group (TCDG) to facilitate understanding of problems, resource requirements and wider implications before making a decision to take on the work and how to approach it. The corporate development function would also include a continuous improvement team to manage ongoing change, and establish and improve analysis of management information. A policy function would keep abreast of key topics in policing and ensure the College held clear positions on them.
- 11.6. Communications and engagement required improvement and better alignment with strategic priorities. New ways of working included a corporate communications calendar and a standard plan for each project so communications were built in from the outset. Those in delivery roles across the College would be upskilled in communications and engagement, and the engagement team function would evolve into one of coordination and support, as a lot of engagement was being achieved through SMEs.
- 11.7. Delivery portfolios would be grouped by outcome rather than departments so there was a clearer focus on delivery, with oversight, accountability and consistency. This would align with initial findings of the Fundamental Review (FR) on the need for speed and responsiveness.
- 11.8. Staff working on projects would be arranged in seven professional communities, each led by a dedicated head of profession. This structure would help increase capability.
- 11.9. JN summarised progress with linked strategies – the Digital Strategy and the underpinning work on the Values and Behaviours Framework to ensure alignment.
- 11.10. Director responsibilities had been revised to align with the delivery portfolio and professional community structure. Rachel Tuffin would be responsible for professional communities and the diversity and inclusion portfolio, as well as What Works and Library Services. Iain Raphael would lead on the operational public safety and risk portfolio and JN on the leadership portfolio. Nick Bayley would retain responsibility for Enabling Services and the Deputy CEO would take responsibility for corporate communications, corporate development, corporate governance and the College improvement portfolio. The latter responsibilities would be shared until the appointment of a substantive CEO.
- 11.11. JN set out the next steps as follows:
- Values had been launched in November 2020, leadership behaviours and expectations were being shared over the summer, with formal launch in September.
 - The communications and engagement structure should be set up by the end of May, with new processes starting in June.
 - The Corporate Development team was being stood up, with interviews for vacant roles in June.

- Recommendations for strategic priorities would be ready for board discussion and approval in the autumn.
 - Validation of the portfolio delivery structure would be completed by end of May
 - Professional communities would be set up in stages by end of September.
- 11.12. Regular internal communications had taken place throughout the programme, with many staff involved in secondments and attending CPD events on change. Moving out of the implementation phase into BAU meant leadership responsibility for change would shift to the Executive and SMT, with change activity moving into the continuous improvement function enabling closure of the ToC programme in the autumn.
- 11.13. Board members had requested clarity on what the College was getting from its investment in the transformation programme. The aim had never been to achieve savings or reduce headcount, but instead to develop into an organisation:
- with clear agreed priorities,
 - able to understand and articulate demand on its services
 - with understanding of the skills and capabilities required
 - supportive of its people
 - focused on delivery and responsive to the needs of the service,
 - making best use of resources,
 - communicating better with stakeholders
 - with decision-making based on accurate management information
 - transparent and fit to respond to the findings of the FR.
- A 'route to success' benefits tracker had been developed which would be made available to board members.
- 11.14. Successful delivery depended on behaviour and culture change, requiring effort and commitment from everyone. The Executive and SMT were committed to leading the organisation to achieve its potential and gain the reputation it deserved.
- Jackie Smith left the meeting.*
- 11.15. Board members commended the exemplary presentation and remarked that some had joined at different stages in the process and it was useful to reflect on history. Keeping staff involved during the COVID-19 restrictions and increased agile working must have been a challenge but should be helped by now being on the cusp of going live with numerous aspects. JN acknowledged that this had been difficult due to the unavailability of opportunities for informal conversations, but that time was being invested currently in reinvigorating enthusiasm among the wider SMT and their teams.
- 11.16. Board members remarked that organisational transformation required not only clarity of purpose but also the ability to

- press pause when appropriate. The DEI piece was very clear, with language at the right level, and represented good evidence.
- 11.17. Reassurance was sought that responsiveness would be at the forefront of the organisation's operating model and that the introduction of a gatekeeping and coordination function would not slow processes down. It was evident from initial FR feedback that this was of central concern to the service, with the quick turnaround of the online assessment centre being seen as exceptional.
- 11.18. JN indicated that although it appeared as if more steps were being introduced, the current arrangement whereby work requests were made to individuals meant that some got lost altogether or took much longer to deliver. Discipline would be required to ensure the process was used and all requests driven through TCDG. Some things would remain out of the College's control and the swift turn around on the online assessment was partly facilitated by an absence of procurement rules and layers of governance.
- 11.19. The Chair remarked that the ambitions of the programme did reflect initial feedback from the FR. Internal organisation of the College was a matter for the Chief Executive, supported by board oversight. One point which would be picked up in the FR would be whether additional commercial experience on the Board would be beneficial, increasing the Board's ability to interrogate plans. The Chair indicated that board members agreed with the ambition and noted that the programme was the responsibility of the CEO.
- 11.20. JN clarified that stakeholder communications about the transformation programme had been limited to liaison with NPCC which was also changing its operating model, on the basis that how the College organised itself was an internal matter.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the update provided during the meeting on the progress of the Transforming our College Programme.

Oliver Cattermole left the meeting.

12-COP-MAY21

Performance and Risk Report

- 12.1. Nick Bayley (NB) provided the following updates:
- **COVID-19 dashboard** – Sickness levels remained down, a benefit of home working. There had been a reduction of 70% in site events and 86% in delegate numbers, but an 80% increase was being forecast. A cross-College planning team was looking at increasing training delivery through a blended approach of face-to-face and online training, which would take place both on and offsite to deal with backlogs.
 - **Risks** – Ten strategic risks in total, 6 red and 4 amber rated. There was positive movement on CEO recruitment.

- **Internal audit actions** – 32 open actions, with six new from the Business Continuity (BC) audit and three completed. Five were rated red, with the remaining 27 green and on target.
 - **Internal audit programme** – Final report on the BC audit had been received and was awarded a substantial opinion, the highest rating. Of the six recommendations arising, two were medium priority and four low. An action plan had been agreed. The first audit of 2021/22 was underway on debt management, assessing alignment with the Government Functional Standard and best practice.
 - **Priority initiatives** – 16 priority initiatives, seven amber-rated and two red. The Metis initiative was red due to tendering compliance issues causing a six-month delay, with the risks being manageable. SEARCH was red on account of delivery timetables and capacity issues but progress was expected. Microsoft 365 had moved to amber but progress was continuing towards delivery.
- 12.2. The Chair enquired as to the reasons for risks remaining red. NB advised that some of the risks had progressed and a periodic executive risk review was pending, following which they would be updated. The Chair requested that a short narrative be included with all amber and red risks explaining the reason for their rating.
- 12.3. Board members requested an update on the Hive employee engagement platform. NB reminded board members that the last major employee engagement survey had been undertaken with Durham University, giving rise to timeliness issues and being benchmarked against police forces which were not easily comparable. Good practice was considered to help choose an agile survey tool. Hive HR was widely used in comparable organisations, allowing hot topic surveys as well as general employee engagement surveys, with analysis available within a month so more agile and responsive.

ACTION: NB

A short narrative to be included with all amber and red risks explaining the reason for their rating.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the updates to performance, risk and internal audit.

Part five – Conclusion of business

13-COP-MAY21 **Any Other Business**

- 13.1. There was no other business.

14-COP-MAY21 **Review of the meeting**

- 14.1. The meeting was reviewed through the prism of College Values.
- **Inclusive** – everyone had a voice, it was well-managed using the hand-up function, there was discussion around DEI and it was central to the Board’s thinking.
 - **Innovative** – there was a feeling of progress, with a number of initiatives on the brink of delivery, eg the ToC programme and a number of strategies.
 - **Open** – board members felt able to say if they were uncomfortable with a proposal, politely conveying different levels of support.
 - **Collaborative** – there was now an established culture of thanking colleagues for their work before suggesting ways to make it better.
- 14.2. The balance of papers and presentation was good and conversations ahead of the Board meeting had been beneficial. There was also a good mix of focus between the short and long term, with discussions feeling equally comfortable in both.
- 14.3. The meeting had been constructive from an executive point of view. Where there was push-back, it was in order to ensure the right approach was adopted, and feedback could be taken away to improve the proposal without any defensiveness.
- 14.4. The Chair reminded board members that the Fundamental Review would consider board composition and ways of working and it was important for them to think about themselves collectively and provide feedback. He thanked the executive team and board members for their contributions.

Camille Giffard, Governance Manager

Signed by the Chair as a true record of the meeting

The Rt Hon. the Lord Herbert of South Downs CBE PC (Nick Herbert)
Date: 13 August 2021