College of Policing

Independent College Advisory Panel

Date:	**12 Oct 2016**	
Meeting time:	**16:00 -19:00**	
Venue:	**Committee Room, Ryton, London**	

Attending College Representatives	
Rachel Tuffin (RT) Director of KR & E	Rachel Claughton (RC) ELCA Manager
Jo Smith (JS) ELCA Secretariat	Lucy Stewart Winters (LSW) – Ethics & Standards Development Manager
Jonathan Calver (JC) – Planning & Performance Manager	Ama Dixon (AD) – Project Manager
Ruby Chahil (RCh) -Actions / Minute Taker	
Attending Panel Members	
David Carrigan (DC) - ICAP Chair	Suzanne McCarthy (SM)
Laura Costello (LC)	
Dialed in	
Gavin Thomas (GT) – Board Member	Abigail Lammas (AL)
Gurvinder Sandher (GS)	
Apologies	
Vaughan Willmore (VW) Strategic Planning Lead	Mohammed Basharat (MB)
Anne Taylor (AT) Company Secretary	Shindo Barquer (SB)
Florence Agyei (FA) Head Of Human Resources	Ray Marley(RM) Policing Standards Manager

OPEN SESSION			
No	**Title**	**Action**	**Action Owner**
1.	**Welcome and Introductions**		
1.1	The minutes of the 13 July 2016 were an accurate record to the meeting.		
1.2	**Actions from 13 July 2016 meeting** **2.2 Board recommendations** What does success would like.	Chair and Panel to provide examples	
1.3	The CoP has been looking at HR performance data. DC noted ICAP meetings open up opportunities to look at specific measures that would open the CoP to transparency in the area of Equality, Diversity and Human Rights.		
1.4	**2.4 Public Sector Equality Duty**. A meeting		

	took place with HR looking at metrics and the workforce report.		
1.5	**2.5 Recruitment of CoP Chair**. Interviews are planned late October. RT confirmed Home Office responsible for the recruitment process, with College input. DC asked whether ICAP considerations on essential criteria will be included in the competencies or interview.	AT to provide feedback	AT
1.6	**4.7 Equality Impact Assessment** DC asked about the College's capacity and approach. RT noted a programme team were developing proposals to increase capacity and would keep ICAP informed. Members' ideas were welcome.	Secretariat to note updates from Coordination and Development Group. Members to provide examples and views	JS All
1.7	**5.2 Staff Survey**. DC expressed frustration and disappointment that feedback request was time limited, given the importance the ICAP attached to the survey. He asked for confirmation feedback had been included in the final survey and asked to see a word version.	HR to update on how feedback used and provide survey questions	HR – FA
1.8	DC recommended the HASC response was discussed at a future meeting. GT noted the comments from the HASC, it was important to reflect back on the development and achievement of the College to date.	Secretariat to put on agenda	JS
2.	**Follow up to Board Recommendations (standing item)**		
2.1	Annual equality information, recruitment practice, equality objectives (1,2,3) - *Scope and range of equality information*- on-going - *Diversity Survey* –Published - *Recruitment* There has been a review of CoP practices and updated training and awareness workshops which included Equality and Diversity have been rolled out.		
2.2	Karen Guerin has currently been working on the People and Organisational Development Strategy and the first draft will be sent to the Director of Corporate Services in November. An update of the draft copy will be given in the next ICAP meeting in January 2017.	KG to share draft	JS
2.3	The CoP is identifying data gaps (Public sector		

	Equality Duty). This work is progressing and a further update will be provided in January 2017.	HR to provide update	HR
2.4	*Staff Survey (4)* The staff survey will launch on 6/10/16 to the CoP and will close on the 27/10/16. The results will be analysed by Roberston Cooper followed by providing a briefing to the Chief Executive and Directors in November. The survey results will also be shared out to CoP staff also in November. SM asked if staff would be able to view the same report that will go out to the Chief Executive and Directors. HR will confirm.	HR to send ICAP final question set and consider how feedback used. ICAP to offer support on formulating College response. analysis	HR
2.5	*Board engagement (5)* GT was representing the Board at the meeting	AT to confirm for future meetings	AT
2.6	*International Engagement (6)* International have been inundated with information requests on international work and so as a result the team are constantly reviewing their approach process.		
2.7	*Board Paper - section EDHR* (7) ICAP had no comments about the template issued at the July meeting. JS asked members if we should close this section.	JS and AT to have follow-up discussion.	JS
2.8	The CoP notes colleagues might need more guidance to help complete this section. Panel and Board members were asked for ideas and opinions, or examples. DC suggests this can be kept under review.		
2.9	*Vetting* (8) The vetting code was sent to the Home Office in December and went to the Ministers in September 2016, CoP expecting feedback. Once the code is laid, the CoP can release the vetting Authorised Professional Practice and finalise training. Ray Marley can provide a further update early in the new year.		
3. 3.1	**College of Policing Ethical Health Check** The healthcheck will help the CoP understand how we are embedding the Code of Ethics. The check will; - establish a baseline for how CoP is currently performing against the set		

		objective measures. CoP needs to evidence how it's doing at the moment, where the gaps are and where we can build on in those gaps. - help identify where CoP ways of working can support and encourage ethical working practices. - think about how CoP is working and not just how its delivering.		
3.2		Once the Health check is complete, CoP will be able to establish an Ethical Framework, working with Business units to embed any changes needed and measuring performances, like a pulse check going forward. The Board representative was particularly supportive and ICAP noted they would like to see the outputs		
3.3		The next steps are now to get the results from the staff survey to move forward. LSW confirms the Ethical Health check will be completed by January 2017.	Update on progress at January meeting	LSW
3.4		The Panel liked the approach and raised the following issues;		
3.5		CoP leaders need to be active in this area, DC asked if there CoP is a 360 degrees appraisal system. LSW noted there is one available but as a separate activity.		
3.6 3.7		SM was keen to see what contractual issues there were for suppliers, what checks did Home Office perform in this area? LSW confirms that the current number of contracts that are within the CoP'S control will be identified clearly.	LSW to check Home Office contractual measures on ethics are and update members on recommendations	LSW
3.8		LC thought a related PDR question on the impact on daily work would be helpful. The new PDR system would focus on how things are delivered, move towards embedding practice.		
3.9		LC felt that clarity was needed on what would be done differently as a result of the work, how was feedback gathered and used?		
4.		**Business Planning 2016-7 update and plans for 2017-8**		
4.1		The Business Plan for 2016-17 has been produced by consultation with a number of		

4.2	stakeholders, the Home Office, Tier 2's and Directors within the College. CoP is looking at priority areas, sustainable activity and benefits realisation.			
4.3	Both financial and resource elements of a Programme will be included in the plan, so CoP can consider substitutions and impact. AL noted any Project Initiation Document (PID) needs to be workable so people from all levels in the organisation can use it.			
4.4	SM asked about the clarity of 'Outcomes' and 'Measures of Success'. The PID needs to be			
4.5	clear on the output and measures of success. RT encouraged the ICAP to think of the CoP as a "mission organisation", seeking to value difference and diversity.			
4.6	LC asked how much of the plan was generated in and by the CoP. RT noted items were agreed with national stakeholders, not commissioned directly. SM felt the CoP needed to take account of Home Office priorities.			
5.	**PEQF Update**			
5.1	The PEQF Board met on the 5th September 2016, The key points covered were; - A number of work projects have now been consolidated into 3 work streams; 1) Recognition of prior leaning 2) Education Qualification Framework 3) Communication, Implementation and Transition			
5.2	The draft framework includes. *Apprenticeship* The apprenticeship levy was discussed and how the funding was released. It was also discussed if the funding that was on offer would deliver the new number of recruits required. *Recognition of Prior Learning* there will be a directory and an on-line portal, which is currently in development. *Communication* Team making effort to keep the framework simple, to reduce complexity. Implementation and Transition			

5.3 5.4	Quality assurance and Standards are in development alongside the regulators. Next steps are for CoP to talk to Chief Constables about timescales for implementation, a meeting is planned for the CEO on the 12th October. AL has found her PEQF Board membership an interesting experience, but struggles with the purpose of the Board, outcomes need to be shared, clarity needed on what the Board wants to achieve and how feedback is captured and used. RT asked if AL had talked to the Project team and offered to speak to the team herself if helpful.	RT to talk to SP regarding feedback from Abi on the meeting	RT
6. 6.1	**Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)** The members were asked to respond to four statements in the room. 1.) What are the hallmarks of an organisation where valuing difference and inclusion are well embedded into everyday ways of working? 2.) What are the greatest areas of diversity risk for an organisation? 3.) Are there any quick wins to raise awareness of valuing difference and inclusion for those new to the concept? 4.) In your experience what lessons have you have learned about valuing difference and inclusion in a corporate services context?	RC agreed to share the feedback separately from the four questions to the ICAP Board members, CDG Group and Giselle Lockett. She will also add some next steps.	RC
7. 7.1 7.2 7.3	**PDRs** Members discussed how they could measure performance and effectiveness as a panel. Each panel member is to view their own performance. DC would be interested to know what views the CoP staff have of the ICAP Board across the organisation. SM expressed her views about what would be a success to the ICAP and whether by evaluating what they are currently doing can actually deliver that. DC questions the influence that the CoP can expect the ICAP panel to have, given the fact		

	that this is an advisory panel.		
7.4	DC and the Board agree that the PDRs can be directly linked to the ToR.	Members agree to review ToR at next meeting, linking ToR to effectiveness	Members
7.5	Each member will assess their own personal behaviours (contributions etc.). Each member is to make an assessment of their own individual contributions to the ToR.		
7.6	It would be useful if the ICAP papers sent to each member highlight the issue and the panel discussion which the paper should trigger.	Secretariat to send papers with covering page and highlight key discussion aims	JS
8.	**AOB**		
8.1	_ToR review- ask the panel their reviews_ DC noted a number of members from the ICAP Board had stepped down. Going forward, CoP and DC would draw up a structure of what the panel should look like and how it should relate to CoP work streams		
8.2	_Proposed Dates for 2017_ Dates for the future meetings have been agreed. - 26th January - 4th May - 3rd August - 2nd November	Dates for 2017 meetings agreed Meetings will be held RSH at 4pm	
8.3	SM added she found the site tour really useful, as she now had a more informed understanding of the CoP.		