

**Minutes of a meeting of the
Professional Committee
of the College of Policing
held at Broadway House
on 6 October 2021**

Present

**Attendance
2021/22**

Andy Marsh	Chair	1/5
Helen Ball	Metropolitan Police Service	3/5
David Bamber	Police Federation of England and Wales	3/5
Val Harris	Metropolitan Police Trade Union	3/5
Pam Kelly	National Police Chiefs' Council	3/5
Paul Griffiths	Police Superintendents' Association	3/5
John Partington	Police Federation of England and Wales	3/5
David Pedrick-Friend	Association of Special Constabulary Officers	3/5
Debi Potter	Police Staff Council Trade Union	3/5
Andrew Tremayne	Association of Police and Crime Commissioner	3/5

Executive in attendance

Bernie O'Reilly	Deputy CEO
Iain Raphael	Director of Operational Standards
Rachel Tuffin	Director of Knowledge and Innovation

Staff in attendance

Ray Clare	Head of Education and Professional Development
Anna Douglas	Staff Officer to Bernie O'Reilly and Jo Noakes
Kate Fromant	Head of Corporate Governance
Thomas Grove	Regulations Senior Advisor
Louise Hodgson	Head of Workforce Development Enablers
Gill Sims	Senior Practice Developer
David Tucker	Crime & Criminal Justice Faculty Lead
Jayshree Vekria	Governance Manager
James Walker	Staff Officer to Rachel Tuffin and Iain Raphael

Observer

Jo Strong	Police Federation of England and Wales
-----------	--

Part one – Preliminary items

01-PC-OCT21 **Welcome and administration**

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, noting that it had been duly convened and a quorum was present.
- 1.2. Apologies for absence were received from Gemma Fox, Martin Hewitt, Matthew Horne, Jim Lunn, Stephen Mold, Jo Noakes, Sue Steen and Lisa Winward.
- 1.3. All participants consented to the discussions being recorded for minuting purposes. The recording would be disposed of once the minutes were approved.
- 1.4. A declaration of interest was made by Helen Ball who stated that as well as occupying a seat at the Professional Committee for the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), she was also a Board Member for Police Now.
- 1.5. No items were raised for discussion under Any Other Business.
- 1.6. The Chair introduced himself as the College's new CEO and Chair of the Committee. He acknowledged the importance of PC, which he felt was a powerful and influential forum that needed to be more dynamic and responsive to better meet the needs of policing. The Chair felt that PC forum provided an opportunity to engage right the way across the service through efficient consultation, socialisation of ideas and encouraged members to engage with their wider networks to support the College in co-creation.
- 1.7. The Chair touched on some current policing issues including raising public confidence around race and gender and stated that the work the College was undertaking in these areas was crucial. He also highlighted that the College needed to develop skills and standards to enable continuous professional development and to identify leadership best practices to better develop the police culture. The College also needed to support the service in tackling violence against women and girls and develop the APP for vetting.
- 1.8. The Chair recognised the College's achievements but felt that further work was needed to meet the challenges across policing. It would need the support and permission of the service in its widest context and, in addition, the support of Police, Fire and Crime Commissioners, Staff Associations, Police Officers, Police Staff and Volunteers. He also stressed the importance of maintaining public confidence through transparency and consistency and felt that this would be achieved through both short- and longer-term programmes.
- 1.9. He added that the Uplift Programme in line with the Police Education Qualification Framework (PEQF) process was a good opportunity to not only increase the workforce but recruit

the right candidates to meet the current demands within policing. He encouraged forces for embrace the PEQF process, which was designed to train and equip candidates with the culture, skills, and standards to live up to public expectations. PC was informed that a review of the curriculum was being undertaken to ensure that both the needs and expectations of the service and the public were being met.

- 1.10. The Police Superintendents' Association (PSA) supported the importance of PC and added that, as a member of the College Board, he felt reassured that items being discussed/ approved at the Board had previously been through the right level of scrutiny and rigour at a PC meeting.
- 1.11. MPS Police Service echoed the importance of PC committee but felt that further improvements were still required, particularly in relation to how College business is filtered through Chiefs' Council. It was suggested that early initial discussions as well as ensuring that Chiefs' had the right visibility in the development stages would be beneficial to both the College and Chiefs.

02-PC-OCT21 **Approval of Minutes of previous meeting**

- 2.1. The minutes of the meeting on 23 June 2021 were reviewed and agreed.

Decision: The Committee resolved to:
Approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2021.

03-PC-OCT21 **Action Points**

- 3.1. PC reviewed the action points and noted that all items were closed.

Part two – Items for decision or discussion

04-PC-OCT21 **Promotion Frameworks and Progression Routes:
Consultation Findings / Recommendations**

- 4.1. PC was asked to note the summary of progress to date including the planned schedule for presentation of the review report, which would be circulated for feedback in circa mid-October.
- 4.2. PC was informed that the paper provided an overview of where the recommendations may be directed and proposed several short-term reforms of the National Police Promotion Framework (NPPF). It was also noted that the longer-term reform of the NPPF was also being considered and would be undertaken by the College's leadership centre.
- 4.3. The paper also made recommendations on the requirement for a national promotion's framework for all ranks from Inspector to Chief Superintendent level and the future of the College's

National Fast Track Direct Entry Programmes.

- 4.4. PC noted the governance route of the draft report which included the College Board, NPCC Workforce Co-ordination Committee and the NPPF Governance Board, with a view to it being discussed at the December Chiefs' Council meeting.
- 4.5. The Police Federation of England and Wales (PFEW) was supportive of the direction of travel and the approach adopted by the College in both early population and discussions through focus groups.
- 4.6. The PSA supported the work and the comments made by the PFEW and highlighted the importance of socialisation.
- 4.7. The NPCC recommended that the College undertake some prior engagement/discussions with Chiefs to minimise any surprises at the December Chiefs' Constable Council (CCC) meeting. It was also suggested that the College needed to make timely contact with the NPCC to ensure the item was both accommodated and allocated the appropriate time for discussion CCC meeting.
- 4.8. The PFEW questioned if a regulatory change was needed for the NPPF and if a timeline had been considered? It was confirmed that a change in the regulation would be required once a recommendation had been approved.

ACTION: AD

College to request for the Promotion Frameworks and Progression Routes item to be discussed at the 8/9 December Chiefs' Council meeting.

Decision: The PC resolved to:

Note the summary of progress of work to date.

Note the planned schedule for presentation of the review report (October to December 2021), and

Note that a full draft of the report will be circulated to members of the committee for feedback, circa mid-October.

05-PC-OCT21

Assessment and Recognition of Competence (ARC) Process

- 5.1. PC was requested to recommend to the College Board the decommissioning of ARC as a process, giving authority for the College to work with the Home Office to remove ARC from regulations (Regulation 24 Annex F), and to notify forces of this professional intent.
- 5.2. PC was informed that the ARC process was introduced into legislation in 2017: Regulation 24 required that a constable must complete an ARC assessment to move from pay point 3 to pay point 4. Since ARC was introduced, the Police Education and Qualifications Framework (PEQF) had been developed and superseded ARC, which would naturally come to an end in 2025 as the final recruits via the 'old entry programme' (IPLDP) completed their probation

- 5.3. PFEW supported the option to decommission the ARC process and had previously raised concerns about its operation. They suggested that, if this was accepted by PC as the preferred option, removal of the ARC process should coincide with the introduction of the pay progression standard. If this was agreed, early correspondence with the Home Office was advised, to ensure co-ordination of timescales
- 5.4. The College agreed with the suggestion made by the PFEW and added that forces would formally need to be notified of an imminent regulatory change if both processes were aligned.

ACTION: TG

The College to inform the Home Office that PC had recommend to the College Board to seek approval for the decommissioning of ARC as a process.

Decision:

The PC resolved to:

Recommend to the Board for approval for the decommissioning of ARC as a process.

06-PC-OCT21

New proposed Detectives and Specials assessment process

- 6.1. PC was asked to note the development and progress of the newly proposed national pre-sift process and recommend to the College Board the approval of these two new national standards.
- 6.2. PC was informed that in 2019, the Police Uplift Programme's (PUP) Readiness Assessment showed that officer recruitment processes consisted of multiple and varying activity applied locally pre and post assessment. It identified not only differing processes, but little monitoring in place to track impact to inform any equality impact assessments. It resulted in differing processes between forces, candidates therefore having different experiences, and individual processes having varied adverse impact, but all cumulatively impacting ethnic minority candidates.
- 6.3. PFEW raised concerns relating to the proposals tabled and felt that that the paper was merging two separate issues (detectives and special constables) into one. They supported the recruitment proposal for the Special Constabulary as it was a development to an existing process but felt that the Detective process needed further consideration as a new process was being proposed.
- 6.4. The Association of Special Constabulary Officers supported the comments made by the PFEW and was supportive of the Special Constabulary route in achieving better consistency and standardisation.
- 6.5. MPS suggested that the College needed to consider separating the Specials from the Detectives and envisaged

- some debate if the Police Constable educational qualification was applied to Specials recruitment.
- 6.6. The College accepted the concerns raised and explained that it was seeking to standardise the recruitment process of Detectives whilst supporting the Investigator Resilience Programme (IRP) and the PUP to address the shortage and lack of consistency in recruitment processes for Detectives.
- 6.7. The PFEW added that their concerns were particularly targeted at the introduction of a requirement for detectives over and above the general recruitment requirements for Police Constables. Both groups are constables as defined by the regulations and as such the requirements are the same for both groups. They also raised concerns in relation to the inclusion of Regional Organised Crime Units (ROCU) and PFEW suggested that this group be removed from the proposed process.
- 6.8. The Chair summarised discussions, noting that the Detectives assessment process was in its early stages of scoping and welcomed the PFEW to work in partnership with the College to develop the process. He felt that PC had noted the relevant items and heard the specific concerns raised and recognised that the service had further work to undertake to address issues relating to Detective recruitment, retention and modernising the routes into policing to better meet the recruitment market.

Decision:

The PC resolved to:

Recommend the new proposed Specials assessment process to the Board for approval. **Decline** the presentation of the new proposed Detectives assessment process to the College Board for approval.

07-PC-OCT21

Effective Supervision Guidelines

- 7.1. PC was asked to note and provide views on the information provided on the remit and purpose of College guidelines, and College plans for implementation support for the Effective Supervision Guidelines. In addition, the Committee is also asked to support their presentation to the College Board.
- 7.2. PC was reminded that the Effective Supervision Guidelines was discussed at the previous meeting, where the committee felt that further clarity was required on status of the guidelines and requested the College to produce a clear and concise implementation plan to support the guidelines.
- 7.3. PC was informed that the paper addressed the concerns raised at the previous meeting. The College confirmed that the guidelines had the same effective status as Authorised Professional Practice (APP) and could be drawn upon by the

Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) and the Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue (HMICFRS) to inform an investigation or inspection criteria. It was also noted that forces were not mandated to follow the guidelines but were encouraged to move towards implementation.

- 7.4. The College provided further clarity on implementation and explained that work was being undertaken to better connect the existing leadership and supervisory programmes to develop a cohesive set of initiatives to support leadership within the service in which the Effective Supervision Guidelines would be embedded. A dedicated implementation team had also been appointed to support the College's work to unify the leadership and supervisory programmes.
- 7.5. Both College Ambassadors and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) events would be utilised to socialise the guidelines with both Chief Officers and forces. In addition, the College would ensure that an appropriate review process was implemented to ensure the guidelines remain up to date and reflect good practice.
- 7.6. The PFEW was supportive of the publication and highlighted the importance of both the implementation and evaluation process but were concerned about protected learning time being dedicated to Supervisors.
- 7.8. The PSA supported the guidelines but questioned if they were achievable primarily for front line Supervisors/Sergeants. The College acknowledged the concerns raised relating to protected learning time and explained that work was underway to better connect existing leadership and supervisory programmes which also considered the Performance and Development Review (PDR) process which would help to address the issues raised.

Decision: PC resolved to:

Note the Effective Supervision Guidelines and support their presentation to the Board.

08-PC-OCT21

Informal Consultation Procedure

- 8.1. PC was asked to approve the Internal Consultation Procedure and agree a process to ensure policing partners, PFEW and the PSA, had sufficient time to input on informal consultation.
- 8.2. The College felt that paper was appropriately timed to support the feedback received in respect of further engagement, co-creation, and timely socialisation, but noted that further improvements were required particularly relating to how College business is filtered through Chiefs' Council.
- 8.3. PC was informed that an initial informal meeting between PFEW and the College had taken place and the next meeting was scheduled for 20 October 2021 and members were

encouraged to participate.

- 8.4. MPS suggested that the College should consider extending the invite to NPCC leads to promote co-creation and early engagement and suggested Gemma Stannard as the appropriate contact at the NPCC.
- 8.5. PFEW supported the direction of travel but raised concerns that various consultation processes were documented over a number documents, which could cause confusion. They requested that the College produce a single document with a combined process. In addition, they requested that the informal consultation timeline needed to be increased from two weeks to a minimum of four weeks, although six weeks was preferable and consistent with normal consultation practice. The staff side agreed with PFEW that a two-week deadline for responses to informal consultation would also be unworkable for them.
- 8.6. The Police Staff Council Trade Union and the Metropolitan Police Trade Union were supportive of the process and requested the invite be extended to them.
- 8.7. The College concluded and confirmed that the invite would be extended, and a draft combined consultation process would be presented for discussion at the December PC meeting for approval.

ACTION: KF

The College to produce a single combined consultation document further presented for approval at the December 2021 committee meeting.

Decision: PC resolved to:

Decline the Informal Consultation Procedure.

09-PC-OCT21

Committee Effectiveness Evaluation – Analysis of Responses

- 9.1. PC was asked to note the results of the PC Annual Effectiveness Review and agree a plan of action to address any issues that had been raised.
- 9.2. The College thanked members for their contribution, PC was informed that the evaluation would be undertaken annually and encouraged additional members to respond next year.
- 9.3. The College explained that the analysis of findings had indicated that PC was concerned about its relationship with the Board and the visibility of Board members at PC would be discussed with Board. Findings also indicated that members wanted the opportunity to contribute to the PC agenda, which would be discussed with the Chair outside of the meeting.
- 9.4. The two lowest scores (at 2.43 and 2.29) expressed concern that members lacked understanding of the College's overall control environment, including its governance structure. PC

was informed that a briefing note to provide further clarity on the role of the Board and its relationship to PC would be prepared and presented to the December Committee meeting.

ACTION: KF

The College to produce a briefing note that provides members with clarity on the role of the Board and its relationship to PC and to be further discussed at the December Committee meeting.

Decision: PC resolved to:

Note the results of the Annual Effectiveness review and agree its findings be reported to the College Board.

10-PC-OCT21

Professional Committee - Business Pipeline Document

- 10.1. PC was updated on the College business pipeline and informed that the document provided a summary of the College proposals for regulatory change, which were either in process or in the pipeline.
- 10.2. PFEW acknowledged and supported the work the College was undertaking on regulations and indicated their appreciation.

Decision: PC resolved to:

Note the update on the College Business Pipeline.

11-PC-OCT21

Items for noting: College Business Update/Chief Constables' Council update

- 11.1. PC noted updates provided for both the College business update and the Chief Constables' Council.

Decision:

The PC resolved to:

Note the update provided for the College Business Update/Chief Constables' Council.

Part three – Conclusion of business

12-PC-OCT21

Any Other Business

- 12.1. The PSA questioned the status of the Code of Ethics review committee. The College explained that a committee was being formed and welcomed the PSA to be a part of it.
- 12.2. The Academic Member questioned if review of the PEQF process focused on how PEQF was embedded in practice to ensure the process was consistent. This was specifically related to the impact upon students undertaking the process and if the learnings would enable candidates to perform their role more efficiently.
- 12.3. The College advised that the review focused on the syllabus, however a review recently conducted by the Home Office had indicated that candidates undertaking the programme were significantly better equipped and confident to perform their role

as a Constable and had received an appropriate level of coaching.

- 12.4. The Chair suggested it would be beneficial for PC members to be sighted on the PEQF review/findings and suggested it be included on future agendas where appropriate.

ACTION: RC

The College to include PEQF agenda at future meetings where appropriate.

Signed by the Deputy CEO as a true record of the meeting

Bernie O'Reilly

Date: 18/11/2021