



Independent College Advisory Panel

Date:	13 July 2016
Meeting time:	16:00 -19:00
Venue:	Tate and St Paul's, Riverside House, London

Attending College Representatives	
Vaughan Willmore (VW) Strategic Planning Lead	Anne Taylor (AT) Company Secretary
David Buckle (DB) Director of Membership, Business Development, Marketing Comms & Training Delivery	Alan Smart - Education Partnership Development Manager, Curriculum, Assessment and Accreditation
Rachel Cloughton (RC) Ethics & Integrity Manager	Ruby Chahil (RCh) -Actions / Minute Taker
Jonathan Hubbard (JH) Marketing and Comms Lead	Millie Banerjee – Board Member
Jo Smith (JS) Secretary of Ethics, Integrity & Public Interest	Sam Peach - Curriculum Design & Accreditation Lead, also leading on PEQF
Karen Guerin (KG) Org & Dev Consultant (Dialled in)	
Attending Panel Members	
David Carrigan (DC) - ICAP Chair	Keith Kerr (KK) Vice Chair
Laura Costello (LC)	Abigail Lammas (AL)
Gurvinder Sandher (GS)	
Apologies	
John Azah (JA)	Rachel Tuffin (RT) Director of KR & E
Mohammed Basharat (MB)	Shindo Barquer (SB)
Suzanne McCarthy (SM)	Laurence Gouldbourne (LG)
Florence Agyei (FA) Head Of Human Resources	

OPEN SESSION			
No	Title	Action	Action Owner
1.	Welcome and Introductions		
1.1	The minutes of the 13 April 2016 were an accurate record to the meeting. DC stressed the need for the College to chase ICAP members up to support the delivery of actions in between meetings. ICAP members had a number of commitments and though should be given to facilitate their engagement in actions.		Secretariat
2.	Follow up to Board Recommendations		
2.1	VW introduced a paper on the College response to DC's presentation to the Board in February. The paper set out the recommendations from DC and resulting	Updates on the actions will be taken as a standing item at future	JS

<p>actions the College proposes, including timescales. The recommendations relate to formal commitments the College made when it was established.</p> <p>2.2 AL asked what success would look like, she felt the “purpose” was missing from the table. VW invited the ICAP help the College assess whether and how the actions are having an impact.</p> <p>2.3 VW confirmed the actions will not be seen as a tick list and will be seen as the basis for future work requiring commitment from the College.</p> <p>2.4 GS suggested the timings may need revision for point 3 (September deadline for Public Sector Equality Duty), DC is keen the College work with ICAP to define the data. RC noted College will to deliver effectively on this, FA would pick this up on return from leave.</p> <p>2.5 GS would welcome rotation for Board members, AT confirmed there were options for the October meeting</p>		<p>meetings</p> <p>ICAP to advise how College measures success against measures</p> <p>FA to follow up and advise</p> <p>AT to confirm Board attendee for October</p>	<p>DC</p> <p>FA</p>
<p>3.</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p>	<p>Recruitment for College Chair</p> <p>The College are recruiting a new chair to replace Dame Shirley Pearce, this will be an appointment by the Home Secretary in line with legislation.</p> <p>MB discussed the process. Applications closed on 12 July, with 23 applicants. A panel to review applications, consisting of MB and representatives from the Home Office and Ministry of Justice was now in place. A meeting was planned for 14 July to gather views on weighting for each interview criteria. Sifts were planned for 25 July with process concluded by 22 September. Dame Shirley will leave in October and options are being discussed on bridging any gap.</p> <p>DC commented the ICAP would have liked more influence over the recruitment, criteria required, in particular, leading a diversity agenda. DC said the Police service looked to the College, to be exemplars in practice and behaviours. The ICAP would continue to challenge the College. If the College is committed to recruiting a diverse chair, then it</p>	<p>AT to advise Secretariat on timetable for the process to conclusion.</p> <p>Recruitment Panel members to consider what questions are needed to test criteria and experience of leading on the</p>	<p>AT</p> <p>MB</p>

3.4	<p>must actively incorporate actions to achieve this as part of the recruitment process. There are significant examples of how this can be done as it's often an overt part of any recruitment drive. The selection process and questions should evaluate the ability of the Chair to lead an organisation to achieve effective EDHR outcomes.</p> <p>KK felt the Chair's role in addressing diversity issues, creating an inclusive organisation was vital. MB wants the College to be reflective of society and not merely representative.</p>	diversity agenda.	
4.	<p>Policing Education Qualifications Framework (PEQF)</p> <p>4.1 SP and AS provided an overview of the standardised national framework that will set minimum educational qualification levels either by rank or practice for the police service. The framework is to provide consistency across the service and is a priority for the College.</p> <p>4.2 The College led a consultation between February and April, conclusions of which are due to be published shortly. Some emerging themes included; concern over accessibility to service from people with certain socio economic backgrounds, education, protected groups, mature applicants, concerns for work life balance for people studying, lack of qualification seen as a barrier to promotion. These factors may reduce diversity.</p> <p>4.3 A PEQF Board has been created to provide challenge, AS invited the ICAP to nominate a member to join. The PEQF team will report to the College Board in September. The Home Affairs Committee have also asked the College to report on the PEQF plans.</p> <p>4.4 SP explained the context for professional policing agenda and set out the four criteria for professions. AL questioned the terminology, preferring the use of professional framework rather than "qualification".</p> <p>4.5 LC asked whether this worked with the National Occupational Standards (NOS). AL queried whether the learning would be assessed against professional standards. SP commented that the NOS don't reflect what is expected of police, it's a changing role to reflect future</p>	AL to join PEQF Board. JS to provide contact details to AS	

<p>need.</p> <p>4.6 KK felt level 6 in the programme was aspirational, qualifications do not always make successful officers. SP noted professional statuses are associated with a level 6, however the College is taking on people in the service without this level of qualification as we have every intention to help support and help gain that qualification at some point.</p> <p>4.7 DC asked about the equality impact analysis (EIA) for the PEQF. What process was there to quality assure the EIA, what support and training were people given for drafting and implementation. EIA analysis is fundamental to policy and process. RC noted faculty lead Giselle Lockett had taken responsibility for EIA within the College. This will be tabled for the next meeting.</p>		<p>College to consider capacity, skills needed for effective drafting of EIA. Secretariat to liaise with Giselle Lockett and schedule for October meeting</p>	
<p>5. Staff Survey update</p> <p>5.1 KG provided an update. The survey will be conducted by external partners (Roberston Cooper) and this required a procurement round, the College is currently in the middle of getting the single tender action approved.</p> <p>5.2 Earlier feedback from EIPI and ICAP has been included in the discussions with the consultant. The consultants will provide a briefing session with the directors. This will look at the results and impact. The project has been delayed due to IT governance issues.</p> <p>5.3 DC noted the ICAP intention to assist and help draft questions and their expectation to engage on the analysis. How can this be supported by an external supplier? He was also concerned on timescales. The survey is fundamental to driving the culture of the College, to look at whether it's meeting its own commitments. DC asked for clarity on how the ICAP can feed into questions and assessment.</p> <p>5.4 KK felt the survey needs to test the values of the organisation and staff attitudes. The Executive need to be able to monitor change over time. DC suggested delaying the survey.</p> <p>5.5</p>		<p>DC requested that the tender document and proposal to Executive is circulated to the ICAP members.</p>	<p>KG</p> <p>DB</p>

		the ICAP concerns with the Executive at their next meeting. DC to speak to FA	
6.	Valuing Inclusion and Difference Strategy		
6.1	JH explained the progress of the strategy since the ICAP first discussed it in January. The current version has been divided into 3 parts; -Research and evidence -Research methodology -Setting out the role of the College		
6.2	The College is collating stakeholder feedback until end August, JH was hoping the ICAP could provide feedback to help inform the culture content. He also asked the ICAP for a steer on other stakeholders he should consult.		
6.3	KK asked what coordination there had been between HR and JH on the staff survey and the strategy, to reflect internal and external positions. The strategy is only in the development process and is not yet confirmed, to date focus has been external.	JH to consider ways of working with HR.	JH
6.4	GS suggests that the bullet points in the report on page 16 could be removed.	JH to consider	
6.5	LC found that the report was comprehensive but too long. It should be concise and crafted for its audience. JH would welcome suggestions for edits.	LC to be asked to provide specific feedback	
6.6	DC felt culture needed greater prominence, what would leaders do in response? The strategy needed to tie in to the Board recommendations (item 2), consistency on published data and clarity of message.		
6.7	JH explained the strategy would work alongside the leadership Review, help develop leadership qualities, using HMIC guiding principles.		
6.8	DC asked about Board engagement. A development session was held in February and revisions were made. The strategy will go to the Professional Committee and the Board once the consultation phase is over. VW noted the strategy was included in the Business Plan, and was one of 20 initiatives		

6.9	<p>regularly monitored by the Board.</p> <p>LC questioned the use of the “BME” inbox for replies and the message this sent.</p>	JH to consider	
<p>7.</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>7.4</p> <p>7.5</p>	<p>Communication Plan</p> <p>DB gave an update on developments since the April meeting, when the issue was last discussed and introduced a paper from Jon Hopkins. The College is in the process of building an Internal Communications and Marketing plan. There is a need to move towards serving the needs of individual members of policing. We need to develop an evidence based strategy, but need clarity on who our members are. Marcomms cannot give ICAP the full work strand until the wider strategy is in place.</p> <p>The Internal Communications plan set out what we were doing internally to raise the profile of the ICAP, acting as an action plan.</p> <p>GS suggested making short films, talking heads to raise awareness.</p> <p>DC felt staff engagement was vital, were there opportunities for podcasts, could staff be asked what agenda issues ICAP should discuss, what were the outcomes, ideas for future items.</p> <p>VW suggested the ICAP meeting could welcome observers to attend.</p>	<p>The College to engage other members of ICAP in communications to staff.</p> <p>The College to consider what alternative methods of communication will support better understanding and ownership of EDHR within its own staff.</p> <p>DC agreed that there was no objection to members of staff attending ICAP meetings in the future. VW to see if staff have an appetite to attend ICAP meetings.</p>	
<p>8.</p> <p>8.1</p> <p>8.2</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p><i>(Taken at item 2)</i> KK raised a concern that a number of Board members were unaware that ICAP existed. He also argued for ICAP members to be paid. AT noted the NRC view on payment had been to the Board twice, this would indicate Board awareness.</p> <p><i>Follow up story on ICAP Meeting</i></p> <p>JS asked if the ICAP could agree messages for a follow-up story in the intranet. DC confirmed</p>	<p>AT to share NRC minutes</p>	

	<p>messages should be taken from the Minutes and Actions from the meeting.</p> <p><u>Feedback from the Code of Ethics Conference</u></p> <p>8.3 AL gave feedback, she liked the fact that the workshops were short and prompt. The workshops were well set up and linked in to the agenda. AL mentioned it was an excellent Conference, you could sense a purpose of why it was happening.</p> <p>8.4 DC encouraged other members to take some time out of their busy diaries to attend College events if possible. AL had a positive insight and engaged with staff to promote ICAP in positive way. MB had also attended.</p> <p>8.5 RC would like to update the Panel on options for work to deliver a further conference on ethics at a later date.</p> <p>8.6 <u>ICAP Papers</u> ICAP would like papers earlier. DC asked for papers to set out what the ICAP should focus on and why. It would also be helpful to have options and risks set out.</p> <p>8.7 <u>Home Affairs Committee Report</u> The ICAP were given copies of the report. The College would issues its response in September and a draft would be shared with ICAP</p> <p>8.8 NEXT MEETING Scheduled for 13 October in Ryton. Please note this is a development day and meeting. More details will follow. Proposed dates for 2017 meetings 25 January 19 April</p>	<p>AL agreed to write a blog about her impressions of the conference</p> <p>DC to send an template example</p> <p>AT to share</p>	
--	--	---	--