



## Independent College Advisory Panel

<b>Date:</b>	<b>13 April 2016</b>
<b>Meeting time:</b>	<b>16:00 -19:00</b>
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Tate and St Paul's, Riverside House, London</b>

<b>Attending College Representatives</b>	
Rachel Tuffin (RT) Director of KR & E	Alex Marshall (AM) Chief Executive Officer
Vaughan Willmore (VW) Strategic Planning Lead	Anne Taylor (AT) Company Secretary
Jane Crockett (JC) Organisational Development	Matt Peck (MP) CEOs Office
Jo Smith (JS) Ethics, Integrity & Public Interest	Karen Guerin (KG) Org & Dev Consultant
Rachel Cloughton (RC) Ethics & Integrity Manager	Ruby Chahil (RCh) -Actions / Minute Taker
Jonathan Hopkins (JH) Marketing and Comms Lead	
<b>Attending Panel Members</b>	
David Carrigan (DC) - ICAP Chair	Keith Kerr (KK)
Laura Costello (LC)	Shindo Barquer (SB)
Suzanne McCarthy (SM)	Abigail Lammas (AL)
Laurence Gouldbourne (LG)	Mohammed Basharat (MB)
<b>Apologies</b>	
John Azah (JA)	Gurvinder Sandher (GS)

<b>OPEN SESSION</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>		
<b>1.1</b>	The following amendment was made to the minutes from 13 Jan 2016; Valuing Inclusion Strategy <b>2.4</b> – LC noted minutes did not capture discussion. DC asked the Panel for some alternative wording.  The minutes of the 13 Jan 2016 were an accurate record to the meeting.	1. Replace sentence and publish minutes	Panel/JS
<b>1.2</b>	AT gave an overview on the governance and development of the College. The College Chair is leaving in August and AT is liaising with the Home Office on the recruitment process. A meeting was scheduled for 14/04/2016 to set out the timeline and process. DC requested to be kept updated.	2. AT will keep ICAP board informed on the recruitment. AT to update DC on 14/4/16.	AT
<b>1.3</b>	KK suggested as the position is not service related, it was an opportunity to engage a more	3. DC	DC

1.4	<p>diverse group. He suggested the ICAP write to the Home Secretary with their views on the role and recruitment for the Chair. DC noted a letter to the Home Secretary would be a consideration if the Panel couldn't secure involvement through cooperation. DC suggested an ICAP member work with the College on the process.</p> <p>The ICAP had a close relationship with the College's COO. DC asked if the post was being replaced. AM confirmed the size of the Executive was being reduced and the COO post would not be replaced. RT will now attend the ICAP in her capacity as Director for Knowledge, Research and Education</p>	4. Panel to D	DC
<p>2.</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>2.3</p>	<p><b>Welcome from Chief Executive Officer - Alex Marshall</b></p> <p>AM updated the Panel on the College's vision as a professional body, raising professional standards for people working in Policing. "Hot topics" included; importance of local communities, public interaction with police officers, mental health, stop and search, child abuse, child sexual exploitation and domestic abuse.</p> <p>Qualification and Direct Entry for officers, SM asked about continuing professional development (CPD) and the challenge of ensuring police have the attributes needed. KK asked about how the College enforced standards, particularly where they weren't met. AM referred to the Leadership Review, and the work introducing CPD for Chief officers. He confirmed HMIC will inspect forces against College standards to ensure delivery is met.</p> <p>The Business Plan will be presented to the Board on the 27/4/16 for approval. VW encouraged the Panel to consider where they could add value, develop a forward plan. The Panel had no immediate responses.</p>	5. College to consider how the ICAP can engage/have a role in evaluating consultation responses on qualification and direct entry.	(Nerys Thomas)
<p>3.</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p>	<p><b>Communications Plan for ICAP</b></p> <p>JH is looking at communications across the College, its links to delivery of the Business Plan, what difference it would make and what it needs to deliver in behaviour.</p> <p>Activities need to link to what has the most impact. SM suggested that the internal</p>		

<p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p>	<p>communications plan should include a column for purpose and understanding.</p> <p>DC asked what the College needed from the Panel. JH felt it was too early and would need to consider.</p> <p>DC noted the panel supports transparency and would work with the College to define what information College is publishing to meet its public sector duty. KK felt workforce data was critical, communications can help the leadership engage people. MP noted the College had been through a change process but was now settled. VW noted the Business Plan commits the College to conducting a member survey in the first six months of the financial year, the Panel may want to engage on this.</p> <p>DC asked how advanced the Communications Plan would be in July. JH stated that the plan would be evidence based, aligned to the Business Plan. DC suggested the ICAP nominate members to work with JH once a Communications Plan has been agreed.</p>	<p>6. ICAP to work with College on survey?</p> <p>7. Panel to identify a member to work with JH so Panel comms are aligned to the wider College Strategy</p>	<p>Nerys Thomas</p> <p>DC</p>
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>	<p><b>Diversity Survey</b></p> <p>The Diversity survey ran from the 18/1/16-12/2/16 with a completion rate of 75%. MP introduced the draft report's findings. There were some gaps emerging, people didn't complete all the questions, differences were emerging between sites and grades. The final report will be put forward to the College Executive towards the end of April 2016, MP was seeking Panel input.</p> <p>SM asked about benchmarking against other organisations, MP felt it may not be possible. MB thought the College wasn't unique.</p> <p>JC divided the panel into groups giving them two questions to discuss The questions asked were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the key themes arising from the survey that we should investigate further in the upcoming staff survey?</li> <li>2. What are your initial reactions to the key findings</li> <li>3. What else should be included or amended in this year's report?</li> <li>4. What are the main considerations for</li> </ol>	<p>8.MP and JC to looking at other professional bodies and "what works" centres</p>	

<p>the Executive following this report</p> <p>5. What additional information should be included in these types of report in the future?</p> <p>6. What steps would you recommend the College in 2016/17 following this survey</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.7</p>	<p>Panel asked what the survey aim was, it needed to include what it “feels” like for individuals in the College.</p> <p>Summary of Panel reactions; benchmarking needed, could the respondents be broken into police, police staff, was data on complaints available, quotes from staff should be added, could the data be put in a visual format, was any legacy data available. Other comments included; why did secondees not complete survey and should this survey now become part of the induction process for new entrants.</p> <p>VW asked whether it was possible to establish how the staff profile had changed in the College, was there a bias in recruitment, average length of service. RT advised that MP would have to look at units as some functions had been transferred to other organisations, direct comparison was not possible.</p> <p>MB suggested the College needed to understand who and why didn’t complete the survey.</p> <p>MP and JC will use the feedback for the Executive paper and use to help inform HR policy and procedure.</p>	<p>9.JC and MP to set out the Panel’s feedback and circulate to Panel</p>	<p>MP and JC</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p>	<p><b>Staff Survey</b></p> <p>Observations from the previous survey suggested a reduced focus for 2016, better links to staff metric data collection and inclusion of wellbeing as a step towards Investors in People (IiP) accreditation. At the time of the meeting KG was preparing tenders for external providers as the Executive were still to make a decision on whether the survey would be produced internally or externally. The survey would be electronic.</p> <p>DC noted the previous survey didn’t contain profile information, there needed to be a link to the diversity survey. It was suggested that KG could work with the CIPD, which the HR</p>	<p>10. KG to approach CIPD public body to work with in support (AL can help advise if</p>	<p>KG</p>

<p>5.3</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>5.7</p> <p>5.8</p>	<p>professional body to support with this area.</p> <p>MB asked if KG was using the civil service platform and survey. KG planned to liaise on this, but College was an anomaly in terms of Civil Service. DC supported looking at the civil service questions, could Panel help coordinate the HR and diversity questions. KG agreed.</p> <p>KK urged College to be consistent in questions asked, to test changes in behaviours and expectations. KG confirmed questions would be consistent but include steps towards liP over the next three years. The survey would also include diversity information.</p> <p>SM suggested the inclusion of a section to test whether staff understand the College objectives and a free text box for any other comments.</p> <p>KG invited the Panel to suggest survey questions and confirmed the evaluation would be done externally. DC suggested the College staff be consulted about what should be included. He suggested KG ask about ethics, integrity in the survey.</p> <p>RC noted the College is planning an Ethical Health Audit, this would complement the staff survey.</p> <p>KG confirmed the Executive were still to approve an external supplier option, and budget. This was expected at the 26/04/2016 meeting. She would return to the ICAP in July with an update and list of possible questions.</p>	<p>needed)</p> <p>11. KG to consider including question about future prospects, "I feel the College encourages me to...." And include a section for "any other comments"</p> <p>12. Survey to include questions about ethics and integrity, trust through transparency</p> <p>13. Panel members to develop question set outside of meeting and send to LG early in June.</p>	<p>KG</p> <p>KG</p> <p>Panel/LG</p>
<p>6.</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p>	<p><b>Embedding the Code of Ethics across Policing</b></p> <p>RC gave a presentation about the development of the Code of Ethics. It was not a rule book, but a Code for "a profession".</p> <p>KK asked for an evidence based interpretation.</p> <p>LG commented on the Standards in Public Life and relationship to ethics. RC agreed that selflessness was a hard concept, it needed</p>	<p><b>14. RC to share documents on police integrity</b></p>	

6.3	<p>balance. KK noted the need to articulate behaviours and ethics, the expectations where people fail in the delivery of their duties. DC asked about the framework for the professionalism of policing. RC said cultures were emerging.</p>		
<p><b>7.</b></p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>7.4</p>	<p><b>Any other business and close up</b></p> <p>KK passed on a message that John Azah had offered his apologies for today.</p> <p>LC asked Panel to note the Stop and Search consultation on the website</p> <p>RC thanks JS for the organisation of the papers in the meeting and RC for supporting.</p> <p>DC welcomed the contribution from the Panel and its new members and brought the meeting to a close.</p> <p>The next meeting is scheduled for 13<sup>th</sup> July 2016</p>		

DRAFT