

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Board of Directors of the College of Policing
held at The Kia Oval
on 23 February 2022 at 10:30**

Present
**Attendance
2020/21**

Nick Herbert	Chair	6/6
David Bamber	Non-Executive Director	5/6
Neil Basu	Non-Executive Director	2/3
Lyn Carpenter (via Teams)	Non-Executive Director	1/1
Jaspal Dhillon	Non-Executive Director	1/1
Paul Griffiths	Non-Executive Director	5/6
Andy Marsh	Chief Executive Officer	3/3
Suzanne McCarthy	Non-Executive Director	1/1
Stephen Mold (via Teams)	Non-Executive Director	5/6
Alexis Poole	Non-Executive Director	6/6
Rosemary Scully (via Teams)	Non-Executive Director	1/1

Executive in attendance

Nick Bayley	Director of Enabling Services
Jo Noakes	Director of Workforce Development
Bernie O'Reilly	Deputy Chief Constable (from item 09-COP-FEB22)
Iain Raphael	Director of Operational Standards
Rachel Tuffin	Director of Knowledge and Innovation

Staff in attendance

Oliver Cattermole	Head of Corporate Development
Kate Fromant	Head of Corporate Governance
Camille Giffard	Governance Manager
Thomas Grove	Acting Staff Officer
Martin Tunstall (via Teams)	Executive Policy Adviser

Part one – Preliminary items

01-COP-FEB22 **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. He welcomed the new Non-Executive Directors (NEDs) to the Board – Lyn Carpenter, Jaspal Dhillon, Suzanne McCarthy and Rosemary Scully.
- 1.2. No apologies for absence were received.
- 1.3. There were no declarations of interest.
- 1.4. No items were raised for discussion under Any Other Business.

02-COP-FEB22 **Approvals**

Minutes of the meeting on 17 November 2021

- 2.1. No comments were received prior to or raised in the meeting. The minutes of the meeting on 17 November were approved without amendment.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the minutes of 17 November 2021 without amendment.

Decisions under Urgency Procedures

- 2.2. One decision was approved under urgency procedures: Written Resolution 0005 – 2022/23 Capital Programme High Value Projects Approval Authorisation Request.
- 2.3. The Chair noted comments made by board members that it was not desirable for such decisions to be made under urgency procedures and that it had placed the new NEDs in a difficult position. Nick Bayley assured board members there had been an operational imperative which made it necessary on this occasion, but such procedures would not be used routinely. It was felt there was a deeper issue, in that requests tended to arise due to delays in Home Office (HO) decision making. The possible benefits of inviting a HO representative to board meetings would be discussed outside the meeting.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** Written Resolution 0005 – 2022/23 Capital Programme High Value Projects Approval Authorisation Request.

03-COP-FEB22 **Action points from the meeting on 17 November 2021**

- 3.1. The Chair noted that there were no longer any red actions. Actions 1, 2 and 3 were amber. An apparent similarity between actions 1 and 3 was raised but Rachel Tuffin clarified that they were distinct from each other. The remainder of the actions were green, being complete, suggested complete or not yet due.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

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

04-COP-FEB22

Chair's Report

- 4.1. The Chair reported that the key recent development was the launch of the Fundamental Review (FR). This had been delayed, but was quite well received and fed into the national debate on leadership in policing. A special board session was scheduled on 9 March 2022 to discuss translation of the FR principles into a corporate structure and Business Plan. Usual meetings had taken place with ministers, including with the Policing Minister in December at which the FR was discussed. The Chair had also spoken at a Cityforum event on 20 January 2022.
- 4.2. The Chair remarked that fulfilling the FR undertaking to become dynamic, relevant and connected would be a significant challenge within tighter resources. Although primarily the responsibility of Andy Marsh (AM) and the executive team, the Board had an important role to support translation into implementation. It should exercise more than a process-focused governance function and play an active role in guiding the College's strategic direction. The Chair also encouraged individual board members to engage with activities of specific interest to them.
- 4.3. Board members commended the level of honesty and challenge in the review, which had been welcomed by most policing organisations.
- 4.4. The critical response from Sir Tom Windsor was noted. AM advised that that the review findings were based on the extensive evidence gathered, with 15k responses. Sir Tom's response was part of an ongoing discussion and clarity was required on responsibility for standard setting in order for the policing system to function well.
- 4.5. The College's role in the policing landscape should be quite clear. As the professional body for policing, guidance and standards should be a College responsibility.
- 4.6. It was asked how the FR had been received internally. AM indicated that College staff were committed and hard-working and it had been a challenging read for them. He had held a series of constructive roadshows with staff to discuss intent and delivery going forward.
- 4.7. The Chair formally thanked Martin Tunstall for his work on the FR, and the executive team for their support.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

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

05-COP-FEB22

Chief Executive's Report

- 5.1. Andy Marsh (AM) welcomed the Non-Executive Directors to the Board.
- 5.2. AM was pleased with how the Fundamental Review (FR) final report had been received. His aim was for people to associate the College with being dynamic, relevant and connected. The NPCC and HMICFRS were prepared to enter into new relationships with the College. Policing culture had dominated recent significant events in policing, culminating in the resignation of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Commissioner. In this context, AM chaired two round table panels with stakeholders and the MPS about the recommendations made by the Daniel Morgan Independent Panel, which described the MPS as institutionally corrupt. He also met with Dame Elish Angiolini about the vetting enquiry following the Sarah Everard case. The Vetting APP was updated in 2021 but compliance was likely to be an issue. He was also linked in with the Louise Casey review of MPS culture following the Charing Cross IOPC report. The issue was not confined to the MPS and a handful of incidents, but applied more widely across policing. A letter from AM to chief constables and PCCs setting out the College's activities on culture, leadership, ethics, standards, VAWG and Race and Inclusion was well received. The College also made offers to support chief constable recruitment by PCCs and recruitment of the new MPS Commissioner by MOPAC and the Home Office (HO), which board members welcomed. The College had a significant role to play in rebuilding trust. The 5% cut in the financial settlement did not reflect the College's responsibility for professional development in policing or for 20k recruitment. Money would be generated through efficiency savings and income generation. The FR findings were being translated into a two-year Business Plan and a four-year strategy.
- 5.3. AM had visited Police Scotland and was building relations with PSNI. He hoped that a real time digital twin would help to understand how forces used College products and how they contributed to development of skills. He had joined a call with 60 Police Federation of England and Wales representatives to answer questions, as it was key to enhance connection with everyone in order to play a role in their professional development.

PEQF implementation update.

- 5.4. AM observed that PEQF was the College's most controversial initiative, with a lot of misinformation about needing to have a degree, when in fact the key message should be that the training is equivalent to a degree. It was not an academic degree but an applied-learning practice-based degree. The curriculum was agreed and set by the Higher Education Institution (HEI) and the force. The old routes had been due to close on 22 June 2022, but an extension was being

allowed until April 2023 to support the MPS in reaching its Uplift targets, which it was concerned it could not achieve without the initial police learning and development programme (IPLDP). Four other forces requested the same extension. Misinformation included that new recruits were all very young, when in fact 40% of new starters were over 25, and that retention was worse, when in fact there was 10% loss on old routes and only 5% loss on new routes. PEQF was far from perfect and needed further refinement, but it represented steady progress relative to the old routes.

Homicide prevention

- 5.5. AM reported that the College was supporting HO key deliverables on homicide prevention. A meeting was being held with PCCs and the Policing Minister to discuss this. Rachel Tuffin's team was focusing on identifying What Works in homicide prevention and developing strategic profiles of people who murder or are murdered to inform the evidence base.
- 5.6. Board members enquired how much of the College work on homicide prevention was aimed specifically at youth homicide. AM advised that homicide was one of the most difficult crimes to predict or prevent. Youth violence, domestic violence, child deaths and gang related murders were included in the wider work.

Promotion and progression final report

- 5.7. AM advised that the Home Secretary welcomed the Promotion and Progression final report. Leadership was the most critical factor in excellent policing, with everyone a leader. The leadership work would commence in April 2022. It was returning to Chiefs' Council in March to ensure the service could feel it had been listened to and involved in its development, to promote an element of ownership and avoid a repeat of the issues with PEQF.

Discussion

- 5.8. Board members asked how the College would ensure those recruited using IPLDP up to April 2023 would not be disadvantaged relative to those recruited through PEQF. Jo Noakes (JN) advised that it was preferable for forces to use the new routes, but the MPS were using IPLDP as a backstop due to pressure on numbers in the final year of Uplift. Forces were asked to use the new curriculum as a form of IPLDP+. The main issue was the inability for the College to monitor standards in the same way as PEQF.
- 5.9. New Board members were surprised that there were still five forces who had not implemented any of the new routes. AM commented that there was some disadvantage on the old routes and a twin track approach made dismissal difficult for forces. The only solution was for regulations to be passed, which was supported by the Policing Minister. Standards,

ethics and conduct were all applied elements of the curriculum, but some forces outsourced to HEIs with no track record of applied learning, giving rise to difficulties.

- 5.10. Board members expressed concern that the extension of IPLDP would be perceived simply as a College failure to implement its own initiative and would be reputationally damaging. It would not be seen as helping forces to meet their targets. Board members agreed this should be expressed more explicitly in public to minimise the likely negative response. It should be explained that, on the part of the MPS, the request was prompted by financial considerations rather than a lack of support for new routes. The delay in regulation change with regard to entry routes was also intended to allow chief constables time to adjust, but it remained unclear how a recruit would be exited if they failed PEQF.
- 5.11. Board members agreed that reporting was generally selective, not only in the media but also on the part of agencies and regulators. For example, steps already taken to address some of the issues raised by the IOPC in the Charing Cross enquiry, and referred to in their final report, were entirely ignored by the media.
- 5.12. Board members noted that Uplift was about enabling new skills as well as attracting diversity.
- 5.13. The Chair concluded by noting that communications would be key to mitigating the reputational risks to the College of the IPLDP extension in the context of PEQF. It was important to redirect the public argument about the new routes. The timing of regulation change should be kept under constant review.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the Chief Executive's update.
- ii. **Note** the work of the College on the high-risk priority area of support for homicide prevention.
- iii. **Note** and **discuss** implementation of the Policing Education Qualifications Framework (PEQF) to date.

06-COP-FEB22

Current issues in policing

- 6.1. Iain Raphael (IR) updated board members on a number of operational areas.

Hate Crime – Miller v College of Policing

- 6.2. The College's Hate Crime operational guidance was challenged after a tweet by Harry Miller was deemed transphobic and recorded as a non-crime hate incident by Humberside Police. The guidance was initially found lawful by the High Court, with Humberside's implementation at fault. Miller appealed to the Court of Appeal, which found that the guidance did interfere with Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. It found that perception-based recording of non-hate crime incidents was not per se unlawful but that additional safeguards were required.
- 6.3. A government amendment to the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill would introduce a statutory code of practice issued by the Home Secretary to govern the recording of non-crime hate incidents. A College/NPCC/Home Office gold group would develop the code, due to be issued in December 2022. Interim guidance had been issued, with no change to the definition of hate crimes but advocating a more common-sense approach to recording. Focus was now on what detailed guidance might contain, what response should be taken with previously recorded non-crime hate incidents, and if further guidance would be required following issue of the code of practice. The College had worked with the NPCC and HO to ensure there would be no conflict between the interim guidance and the subsequent final version.
- 6.4. Two other cases (Miss B and Phillimore) remained pending, focusing on slightly different issues. In terms of risk, the College was liable for Court of Appeal costs and half of the High Court costs, with the latter having been agreed as lower than the initial estimate.

Stephen Port Inquiry

- 6.5. Stephen Port murdered four people between June 2014 and September 2015 by administering fatal doses of GHB, leaving the bodies near his flat. The deaths were not regarded as suspicious until after the fourth murder. The inquest jury found failings in the investigation. The College role was to support policing and ensure the recommendations were integrated into College guidance. These focused on four main areas, to which the College could add value by giving national definitions and reflecting them in training and APP, and emphasising the need for an enquiring mind in the Major Crime Investigation Manual.

Manchester Arena Inquiry (MAI)

- 6.6. The Inquiry was established in 2019 to investigate 22 deaths in the 2017 attack. The College role was to support the inquiry and policing in the implementation of any recommendations. The First Aid Learning Programme

(FALP), based on Health and Safety Executive guidance, was owned by the College and licensed to forces.

- 6.7. Volume one of the recommendations focused on security in the arena. Volume two would focus on the response. The College was part of the national strategic group overseeing the recommendations nationally. It was linked in with the NPCC lead around strengthening compliance with FALP standards and to implement learning.

Violence against women and girls (VAWG)

- 6.8. This work was prompted by the high-profile murders of Sarah Everard, and Nicole Smallman/Bibaa Henry. A national plan to tackle VAWG was established in October 2021. The College had an influential role to play in leading and influencing the national plan as part of the national taskforce. Five secondees had been recruited to the programme from different forces, with salaries covered by the home force, the first time this approach had been adopted. The strategic intent document was built around the three pillars of building trust and confidence, pursuit of perpetrators and safer spaces, based on College work. The College co-authored the national framework for Year 1, which would be published by April 2022.
- 6.9. Completed College actions included publishing a toolkit repository of VAWG resources, publication of risk guidelines on responding to vulnerability, hosting a national knowledge sharing event and creating an academic advisory group in this area. By the end of March 2022, it would help formulate the national framework and create a national problem profile. It would work with 12 forces who had chosen to record misogyny as a hate crime and with University College London on behaviour change to address misogyny in police culture. The Code of Ethics work and implementation would be significant. The College was working with NPCC working groups on sexual harassment, inappropriate use of social media and tackling abuse of position for sexual purpose. It would host a national joint conference in October to share the national problem profile and learning to mark one year of work.

Discussion

- 6.10. Board members enquired whether the College monitored how its products were used. A priority product like the VAWG Toolkit should be accessed frequently by many people and actively promoted to avoid all the good work going to waste. AM advised that chief constables had expressed interest in the digital twin data. The unpopular NCALT had been replaced by CollegeLearn which had 400k users. The aim was to automate the digital twin and make it available to all.

- 6.11. The Chair updated board members on relevant debates in the House of Lords, noting that he was not permitted to participate in those discussions.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** and **discuss** the operational updates on current issues in policing

Rosemary Scully left the meeting.

Part two – Items for decision and discussion

07-COP-FEB22 **Live Facial Recognition Authorised Professional Practice (APP)**

- 7.1. Iain Raphael (IR) explained that the College had been commissioned by the NPCC to write Authorised Professional Practice (APP) to provide national guidance on the use of overt Live Facial Recognition (LFR). Its aim was to ensure deployment of LFR by forces was:
- nationally consistent
 - compliant with legal and ethical requirements
 - provided reassurance to the public, and
 - established governance arrangements around its deployment.
- 7.2. The APP took account of the Court of Appeal judgment in *Bridges v South Wales Police*, and guidance from the Information Commissioner's Office and the Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner. It was subject to extensive stakeholder consultation and legal checks, including a six-week public consultation. It remained contentious with privacy groups, whose position was that there was no statutory framework or support for the use of LFR, though this view was not consistent with the *Bridges* judgment. The APP had been through College quality assurance and product authoring and was ready for publication, subject to board approval. The APP would allow forces to deploy LFR within the current legal framework pending Home Office development of a statutory solution, but the College would not be promoting its use, leaving the decision to deploy as a matter for individual forces. The APP recognised the importance of community engagement when deciding to deploy LFR and stated that chief constables should establish governance arrangements that ensured independence and rigour. IR invited board members to approve the APP and its publication.
- 7.3. Board members enquired whether any changes had been made to policy as a result of discussions with privacy groups. IR advised that their views were reflected but they were quite polarised and not supportive of the *Bridges* judgment.

- 7.4. Board members observed that the public would be more supportive of LFR if concerns over algorithmic bias could be addressed. Paragraph 1.5.3 suggested that variation in accuracy was an ongoing issue, placing the onus on chief officers to consider accuracy of the algorithm as part of procurement. IR advised that the APP sought to allow for incremental improvements in technology to reflect ongoing developments.
- 7.5. A new board member enquired about consistency in the application of APP generally and how national consistency of approach could be assured for groups concerned with civil liberties and human rights. IR advised that there was variation depending on the specific area of APP. Areas like firearms and public order were more regulated. Guidance could be derogated from, but HMICFRS inspected against it so any derogation would have to be justified. Compliance was more likely in contentious and sensitive areas such as LFR. He acknowledged that the College's ability to enforce was limited.
- 7.6. Board members noted that an EIA had been undertaken but were concerned that no detail was provided of the equality issues identified or of the sufficiency of the mitigations listed in addressing them. They would like to see the EIA and would be content to approve if IR was able to confirm the issues had been identified and mitigated in practice.
- 7.7. IR agreed to share the EIA with board members. He was content with its thoroughness and was happy to further discuss algorithms outside the meeting.
- 7.8. Board members were content to approve the guidance on this basis, with the Chair noting that it was for chief constables to manage the risk around the algorithm they chose to procure.

ACTION: Iain Raphael

Share detailed EIA with board members and speak to Neil Basu about algorithms outside the meeting.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the Live Facial Recognition (LFR) Authorised Professional Practice (APP), as recommended by Professional Committee, and agree to its publication.

08-COP-FEB22

Information and Records Management Code of Practice, and associated Archiving APP

- 8.1. Iain Raphael (IR) asked board members to approve the Information and Records Management Code of Practice and associated archiving APP, approve publication of the APP, and agree that the new code would replace the 2005 Code of Practice on Management of Police Information. The Code would be recommended to the Home Secretary for approval and laying in Parliament.

- 8.2. IR explained for context that the Hillsborough Independent Panel recommended in 2012 that police service records be brought under legislative control. It recommended that forces be brought under article 2 of the First Schedule of the Public Records Act 1958, making them subject to supervision of the keeper of public records, to address deficiencies and inconsistencies in the management of police records. The Hillsborough Families Review in 2017 noted a lack of progress and Bishop James Jones recommended collective efforts to find an appropriate solution. ACC Rob Beckley was commissioned in 2018 to look at the issues and recommended that the MOPI Code 2005 be broadened to include corporate information, with the College to draft amendments to the MOPI Code. The new code codified good practice in record keeping and was to be considered in conjunction with all legislative requirements. There was also a lack of national guidance on archiving records in the public interest. The new APP addressed the type of records to be retained and the processes to support archiving. Development was overseen by a working group including the National Archives, NPCC, the Information Commissioner's Office, the Home Office and the College. Standard APP legal checks and a six-week public consultation were completed.
- 8.3. The Chair noted that potential risks were not addressed and enquired who in force would be responsible for implementation. IR clarified that the driver for the work was need rather than response to a risk. All forces had a designated lead for information management, recording and retention of materials who would normally be a chief officer.
- 8.4. It was noted that data management was included on the most recent Senior Command Course. Awareness of the penalties for failure to follow the legal requirements encouraged effective implementation.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Approve** the Information and Records Management Code of Practice and the associated 'archiving' Authorised Professional Practice (APP), as recommended by Professional Committee, and agree to their publication.
- ii. **Agree** that the existing Management of Police Information (MOPI) Code should be superseded by the new Code and the existing 2005 MOPI Code withdrawn

09-COP-FEB22

Update on Inclusion and Race Programme and College role

- 9.1. Rachel Tuffin (RT) provided background to the plan. She noted that the lengthy development phase represented a key risk. Similar recommendations were made 20 years previously in research looking at career progression in the police for those from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. The new plan focused strongly on governance and independent scrutiny, which slowed progress, but ensuring

independence of the chair and panel was key to establishing the scrutiny group. An initial plan was actively being worked on pending approval of the full plan. The College had created an outcomes framework in its role as evaluation lead and helped to set the four main areas of the plan, with the Uplift Programme providing much of the evidence. One consideration was what the organisation could do to address historical failings and historically poor relationships.

- 9.2. Board members raised the following queries and comments:
- Any themes identified should be broken down into separate groups rather than using the collective reference to BAME, to increase data consistency. This was not always the case in the Annex, but it was clarified that this was due to the way the information had historically been gathered, and it would always be broken down where possible.
 - The content of the plan was welcomed, with no gaps identified. Disappointment was unanimous that it had taken two years since the death of George Floyd for it to reach this stage. Publication should now be prioritised.
 - The low level of detail was queried as problematic, but it was clarified that the current version of the plan was a second iteration, and only new items were highlighted. The final plan would include everything.
 - It was felt that a number of points should be made clearer for the consultation –
 - Would the independent oversight body report publicly to make the public aware of its findings and recommendations?
 - Would the performance framework be published?
 - Workstream 1 indicators (internal culture) should specifically include retention of black officers.
 - Relative terms, such as increase or decrease, should be avoided in the absence of a baseline for comparison.
 - Measures, output and accountability would be key to seeing results.
 - The four pillars approach was welcome, in particular the ‘protected’ and ‘anti-racist’ pillars. It was suggested that workstream 2 (respected) be aligned with workstreams 3 (protected) and 4 (anti-racist).
 - Communication would be key to managing expectations.
 - The use of stop and search should be properly evaluated to settle the debate once and for all, about its usefulness or otherwise.
 - The joint nature of the plan limited the opportunity for ambition in approach.
- 9.3. RT clarified that the consultation document did not include outcomes, but the final plan would include a full set of deliverables and milestones. Work was ongoing with forces

to obtain better data, trying to link together this programme with the Uplift and VAWG programmes. RT agreed that careful communications would be required to emphasise what had already been achieved.

- 9.4. The Chair invited Andy Marsh (AM) to comment on the level of ambition in the plan, the language used in the plan, and the level of ambition for the College.
- 9.5. AM observed that something different needed to be done which was distinct from previous action. There was certainly a role for PEQF in addressing this. The four strands approach was notable. There were conflicting views on timescales for development and whether there should be a declaration of policing as institutionally racist to acknowledge the harm and facilitate an apology to the black community. This risked alienating the frontline as it had done at the time of the McPherson report.
- 9.6. The Chair noted that the judgement on whether to use the term 'institutionally racist' would be key and would give rise to problems whether it was used or not. Board members observed that much of what was in the plan was 20 years old. There had been change, but not enough, as evidenced by the lived experiences of newer recruits. There was no doubt that the terminology when first used had alienated the front line. The priority had to be implementing the plan so chief constables could be held to account, taking action rather than engaging in more research, and not letting reluctance to admit a wrong stop the service from moving forward.

Bernie O'Reilly joined the meeting.

- 9.7. Bernie O'Reilly updated board members on discussions at the Inclusion and Race Programme Board that morning. *[As these are internal discussions not owned by the College, the details of the discussion have been removed from this version.]*
- 9.8. The Chair observed that there was a general sense of the importance of the issue for the College. The College had part accountability for the joint plan with the NPCC. It was appropriate for the College to re-examine its role and push hard on this.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note and discuss** the current plans for the programme to inform the programme focus over the next three years.

10-COP-FEB22

Finance Report

CSR update

- 10.1. Nick Bayley (NB) advised that the new settlement had been confirmed subject to final sign off by the Home Secretary.

The College was asked to profile 5% savings for next year and over a 3-year period, as well as 15% capital savings, which it had done, while proposing an ambitious programme of work to support policing. The outcome was a 5% reduction in core budget and a 20% reduction in capital budget. NB was confident that this was manageable as inflation and increased energy costs had been foreseen in the profiling and it was anticipated income would continue to grow, alongside an efficiency and improvement programme.

- 10.2. The Chair clarified that, as a public body, the College did not have the opportunity to build reserves. Board members enquired whether this had been raised with the Home Office (HO). NB advised that this would form part of forthcoming discussions on the protocol review.
- 10.3. Board members expressed disappointment that the best new initiatives in the bid, such as College in My Pocket, had not been funded and enquired as to the level of risk associated with the capital reduction. NB assured that the capital budget would be manageable but hard choices would need to be made in terms of projects.

Forecast Budget Position

- 10.4. The Board received an update on the College's financial position. *[As the details discussed are commercially sensitive, they have been removed from this version.]*

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the outcome of the CSR21 and the proposed 2022/23 financial budget.
- ii. **Note** the forecast budget position for financial year 2021/22.

11-COP-FEB22

Online recruitment and examinations price increase

- 11.1. Nick Bayley (NB) invited board members to note the proposals for charging increases to online recruitment and examinations over a two-year period. Treasury rules required that services to other public organisations be charged at full cost (direct cost of delivery and overhead costs) unless there was a case for it to be less in the public interest, subject to Treasury approval. College policy was that highly sensitive products such as covert or firearms training, or products to enhance police leadership skills, would be charged at direct cost recovery. Products to support diversity and inclusion in policing would be at nil cost. Following a training cost review, prices for products and services were revised to identify true direct cost and price increases were instigated, without impact on demand for College training.
- 11.2. The Police Uplift Programme underwrote £1.8m in development costs for the College to move to online assessment and examinations. This was ending without core funding to manage the ongoing costs of supporting and

running the online platform and without capacity to absorb it into the existing College budget. Forces would previously have paid for exam and recruitment activity before the move to online provision. There was therefore a need to pass on the costs to forces through charges for the online process and for the investigators' exam, as well as for sergeants and inspectors on an incremental basis over two years. An impact analysis by force was conducted and assessed the sums as manageable for each and every force, with total direct costs for online recruitment in the region of £1.3m for all 43 forces, averaging at around £20k for each. For online exams, the total cost would be about £0.5m, or on average £11k per force.

- 11.3. Board members commented that the financial imperative for the College was clear but there were a number of issues requiring mitigation:
- Forces saw online recruitment as a cheap option. Would they move away from face-to-face processes because of the cost implications? It was clarified that the guidance recommended some face-to-face interaction but may need to be strengthened.
 - The promotion and progression review was not yet finalised and costs may be built into something that would change in the near future.
 - There was potential bias in sifting and introducing a financial charge may have unintended consequences in this area, in terms of prioritising monetary value over a skills match.
- 11.4. It was clarified that inspectors' exams cost more per individual due to having fewer candidates but fixed costs.
- 11.5. Jo Noakes added that exams would have cost money for venues and invigilators previously. With online exams, the cost was in the platform, and therefore borne by the College, while forces were being funded for Uplift add-ons as well as people.
- 11.6. The Chair observed that there were handling issues. Andy Marsh agreed, specifying that the College would not achieve its aims without connection. In mitigation, it was decided to introduce the changes over two years, which had been drawn to the attention of chief constables.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- Note** the proposals and underpinning approach to charging for College services.

12-COP-FEB22

Performance and Risk Report

- 12.1. Oliver Cattermole (OC) updated board members on risk, internal audit and performance. In terms of strategic risks there had been a reduction of one with the appointment of

the Non-Executive Directors. Two strategic risks remained red, Connection with the Service and Finance. Five strategic risks were amber. Four internal audits were underway. Twelve identified priority initiatives were being tracked, with force uptake of the domestic abuse risk assessment tool RAG rated red. Work was ongoing with the national lead to encourage greater uptake.

- 12.2. The Chair remarked that this was an encouraging update, with the College generally moving in the right direction.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

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

13-COP-FEB22

Business Plan 2021/22 - Performance review

- 13.1. Oliver Cattermole (OC) provided a summary of performance against the current Business Plan (BP). A two-year BP and a four-year strategy were being developed to assist with prioritisation and delivery against Fundamental Review ambitions. Indications were that the Home Office would support this approach. Board members would be engaged through a joint session and individual briefings. The corporate strategy would set ambitious system-wide objectives and the BP would capture key College deliverables against those objectives. Final drafts would be brought to the May board meeting, following which they would require Home Secretary sign-off.
- 13.2. OC remarked that the internal change programme had provided a clearer view of total demand and use of resources across the College, and it was in a better position to produce the corporate strategy and BP than previous years, and to be dynamic, connected and relevant. Better quality management information would facilitate better updates to the Board on delivery for future performance reporting. OC invited board members to note the update and approve the engagement process for the new BP.
- 13.3. Board members agreed it would be helpful to review the risk register format to make it easier to read and highlight key areas of risk, direction of travel and possible action to improve the RAG rating. It was noted that PEQF was rated as green, but the discussion suggested amber may be more appropriate. OC advised that it was a snapshot of the position at the end of January and was regularly reviewed.
- 13.4. The Chair welcomed the change in approach facilitated by the internal change programme, as mid-year sign off of the BP as in previous years was not desirable. It would be challenging to translate the level of ambition in the FR into the corporate strategy.

ACTION: OC

Reformat the risk register to make it easier to read.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the update on progress against the business plan as detailed in **Annex A**.
- ii. **Approve** the proposed approach to our College Business Plan and reporting to Board as outlined.

Part three – Conclusion of business

14-COP-FEB22

Items for Noting

14.1. Items for noting circulated consisted of:

- Committee updates (Professional Committee, Audit and Risk Committee and Senior Management Team)
- Stakeholder Information Bulletin
- VAWG Toolkit
- Promotion and Progression final report
- Promotion and Promotion presentation notes from 17 November 2021
- 9-month Governance Statement.

14.2. The items were noted without issue.

Decision: The Board resolved to:

- i. **Note** the Items for Noting bundle.

15-COP-FEB22

Any Other Business

15.1. No other business was raised.

16-COP-FEB22

Review of the meeting

16.1. Suzanne McCarthy reviewed the meeting on behalf of the new Non-Executive Directors as it was their first meeting. She remarked that the current lack of trust and confidence in policing posed a challenge, with the Fundamental Review underlying many of the discussions, emphasising the wide range of College responsibilities. She commended the quality of the papers and the open discussion with policing colleagues and the Executive. She welcomed the longer discussion on race and inclusion and looked forward to future meetings.

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: 25 May 2022