Title:	Board meeting
Date:	18 September 2019
Time:	11:30 – 15:30
Venue:	Broadway House, Tothill St, London, SW1H 9NQ – Whittle Room

Board	
Millie Banerjee (MB)	Board Chair
Christine Elliott (CE)	Chair Nominations and Remuneration Committee and College Regulatory Consultation Group (CRCG) & Senior Independent Director
Mike Cunningham (MC)	CEO & Chair Professional Committee
David Bamber (DB)	Police Federation of England and Wales
Clare Minchington (CM)	Chair Audit & Risk Committee & Independent Director
Stephen Mold (SM)	Association of Police & Crime Commissioners (APCC)
Jackie Smith (JS)	Independent Director
Ian Wylie (IW)	Independent Director

Executive in attendance	
Rachel Tuffin (RT)	Director of Knowledge and Innovation
Bernie O'Reilly	Director of Organisational Change
Kate Husselbee (KH)	Director of Corporate Services and Business Development
Jo Noakes (JN)	Director of Workforce Development, Professional Development & Integrity Faculty
Janette McCormick (JMC)	Senior Police Advisor

Staff members in attendance	
Oliver Cattermole (OC)	Chief of Staff
Helen Elderfield (HE)	Head of Governance
Camille Giffard (CG)	Governance Manager

Invited observers	
Paul Griffiths (PG)	Police Superintendents' Association
Scott McPherson (SMP)	Director General – Crime, Policing & Fire Group (Home Office)
Andy Lea (AL) (Item 7)	Director, Justice & Security, KPMG

PART ONE – PRELIMINARY ITEMS

1. Welcome and administration (Chair)

1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised that Scott McPherson would be attending for items 4 to 8. The Chair noted that the meeting had been duly convened and a quorum was present.

1.2. Apologies for absence were received from Ian Hopkins and Robin Wilkinson.

1.3. There were no declarations of interest made pertaining to items on the agenda.

1.4. No items were raised for discussion under Any Other Business.

2. Minutes of the meeting on 3 July 2019 (Chair)

2.1. A typographical error was noted at item 11, the title of which should have read 'Spending Review 2020'.

2.2. The draft minutes were considered and accepted as a true and accurate record of the discussions that took place on 3 July 2019, subject to the typographical error being corrected.

Action:

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2019 to be amended at item 11, the title of which should be amended to read 'Spending Review 2020'. **Camille Giffard**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Approve** the minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2019 subject to the change identified.

3. Matters arising from the meeting on 3 July 2019 (Chair)

3.1. It was suggested that action 1 was not complete but that it would be better to close this action and add a new one that better reflected the current direction of travel.

3.2. Action 52 was not yet complete as the document referred to would be circulated before the end of September. It could be closed once circulated.

3.3. There were no further matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting for discussion. The Board agreed that the actions listed as suggested complete could be closed.

Action

Existing action 1 to be closed and subsumed into a new action to better reflect the current direction of travel. **Camille Giffard**

Actions marked as suggested complete to be closed. **Camille Giffard**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Note** progress made with the actions agreed at the previous meetings

(ii) **Agree** to close all actions recorded on the rolling actions list as suggested complete.

PART TWO – ITEMS FOR DECISION / DISCUSSION

CORE DELIVERY ITEMS

Scott McPherson joined the meeting. He thanked the Chair for the invitation and indicated that he was looking forward to the discussions.

4. **College's role in supporting 20k recruitment (BR)**

   4.1. Bernie O'Reilly advised that the scale of challenge in this recruitment drive was unprecedented. Regular cross directorate meetings on this were being held within the College. A funding application had been submitted for approximately £3.3 million until the end of the year, and £10 million next year. An overall funding amount of £45 million had been agreed for this year which would be allocated in the coming weeks. At the national level, Janette McCormick had been seconded full time to lead the national programme, and a National Policing Board had been established, chaired by the Home Secretary.

   4.2. Janette advised that 53,000 officers would be recruited over the next three years and that this was a huge opportunity to get the right people with the right skills, targeting recruitment and attraction, and learning and development. It was also linked to Rachel Tuffin's work on supervision. Costings had been built in for sergeants and inspectors. Efforts could be made to address attrition at different levels regarding protected characteristics. A parallel piece of work was being undertaken for the Special Constabulary.

   4.3. Board members indicated that they would want to know how the funding was being spent and how the College would be held accountable.

   4.4. Bernie advised that some decisions needed to be taken prior to confirmation of the funding allocation, to ensure the College was seen as an enabling influence working at pace. Exact demands would depend on the outcome of the profiling work being done by the national programme team, due to be considered by the programme board at the end of September. The College selection and assessment unit would recruit additional resources. Funding had been committed for the new AIMS technology along with additional resource in digital services. The intention was for the assessment centres to move to the Day One model, subject to a £560k investment which would require tacit endorsement from the central programme team. Investment would also be required in the College estate, which would depend on the demand profiling by the national programme team. The Chair suggested that Board members could be consulted as and when required regarding funding decisions, input and support.

   4.5. In response to a query whether there was any sense of cross-party support for the ambition for 20k additional officers, It was reported that conversations with politicians from opposition parties suggested that it would be difficult to retreat from the commitment and an indication was given that this was the correct interpretation.

   4.6. The importance of retention was raised and it was confirmed that this was recognised as a key requirement which would represent a significant cultural change.

<u>Decision</u>

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Note** the activity and governance arrangements required to support the uplift and align to the national program

(ii) **Note** the funding request of circa. £17m revenue and £15m capital to 2022/23

(iii) **Note** the risks identified and being managed within the College Risk and Issues framework.

Andy Lea joined the meeting.

5. Fast Track and Direct Entry (FTDE) - The November 2019 evaluation reports to Parliament (JN)

5.1. Jo Noakes advised that the evaluation reports were early drafts. They had not been made available in advance due to being under embargo but each Board member was provided with a hard copy, subject to this restriction. Any feedback could be taken into account.

5.2. Jo indicated that the essential elements of the evaluation reports had been agreed with the Home Office when the programmes first started. The overview papers with costings were being prepared to address additional questions that had emerged during the course of the programmes. The overview papers would be brought to the Board meeting prior to submission to Parliament, by which time Board members would have had an opportunity to consider the draft evaluations. The key point from the evaluations was that it was possible to successfully bring people into policing from other backgrounds. There was a question over whether the programme should run with small groups and one point of discussion for the Board would be about future direction of the programmes.

5.3. The suggestion that Fast Track and Direct Entry should be separated as they raised different issues, especially regarding diversity was noted.

5.4. The approval process was discussed, in particular the role of the Professional Committee. Jo advised that it had been agreed at the most recent Professional Committee meeting that the embargoed reports would be circulated to the NPCC lead and other key persons. Once the reports had returned to the Board in November, the process of sharing with these bodies would begin. It was noted that this would need to be carefully managed.

5.5. Board members asked for a specific timeline to be provided and were informed that the overview would be brought to the Board on 6 November, following which it would be taken to Professional Committee and Chiefs' Council. Jo advised that communications would shortly be issued around the Direct Entry programmes for the coming year. The Fast Track and Direct Entry Inspector programmes would run but there may not be enough uptake for a Direct Entry Superintendent cohort to be viable on this occasion.

5.6. It was suggested that the reports also be sent to Police and Crime Commissioners.

Action

Details of the timeline to be published. **Jo Noakes**

Police and Crime Commissioners to be included in circulation of the reports. **Jo Noakes**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

   (i) **Note** the draft evaluation reports submitted to the Board under embargo

   (ii) **Note** the revised review and governance process for the sign-off, publication and submission of the FTDE evaluation reports and options paper

   (iii) **Note** the intention to consult and engage with stakeholders and the service to develop recommendations for the future of FTDE pathways

6. **Introduction to Standards - Crime and Criminal Justice and Uniform Policing Faculties (RT)**

   6.1. Rachel Tuffin explained that it was the turn of the Standards Directorate to introduce itself, with the paper setting out its role and responsibilities, people structure and financial information. She noted that a key consideration was how to make good connections between the Knowledge and Standards directorates, so that the College is not just writing standards but working with others to achieve implementation.

   6.2. It was suggested that this consideration would be relevant to the Key Performance Question as it would be helpful to split up how to look at success: setting the standards, adoption of the standards and implementation of the standards.

   6.3. Clarification was requested on whether consultation would be conducted with the public or the service. Rachel advised that Authorised Professional Practice (APP) was subject to full public consultation on the College website, although there could be more active outreach, for example through citizen panels.

   6.4. Clarification was also sought on how the College could know that it was developing standards in the most appropriate areas. Rachel advised that this was achieved through a combination of horizon scanning, perennial problems analysis to find recurring issues, and Policing Standards Managers being well connected with service partners. Standards development was often proactive and already underway before the College was approached by the service. The perennial problems and scanning process was developing, being more connected with business planning. There could be further improvement in involving a wider group of stakeholders.

   6.5. Mike commented that developing processes for prioritisation would be key to effective College transformation.

   6.6. Board members asked if the College went beyond its own knowledge in the development of standards and impact analysis, in particular beyond policing. Rachel advised that that the main issue was with specialist areas, where there was a narrow field of expertise. The College looked at models for borrowing people for a fixed period of time, which was not always straightforward, but it was creative in looking at other options. Members shared their experiences from other sectors of how resources could be drawn in for particular projects. . Rachel indicated that certain areas would be specific to policing, for example licensing, but that the committees involved in developing guidelines are mixed, including

academics, third sector and government agencies, as well as police professionals.

6.7. Board members also enquired how ethical considerations were taken into account. Rachel advised that this was done on a topic-by-topic basis, giving as an example that the undercover APP had its own separate ethical group to advise because of the nature of the subject. There was no standardised approach to ethics as yet, but this would be brought to a future Board meeting.

Decision

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Note** the introduction to the Directorate

(ii) **Note** the work to develop an approach to standards that is more focused on supporting improvements to policing services that benefit the public

ENABLING ITEMS

7. **Transforming our College update (BR)**

7.1. Bernie O'Reilly explained that no advance paper had been circulated for this item in order to ensure the Board received the most up to date information. Board members had all had the opportunity to provide feedback on the organisational design principles.

7.2. Oliver Cattermole advised that testing of potential models had been taking place and there was now a preferred model following an Executive meeting earlier in the week. The next step would be planning how College work would fit into the operating model.

7.3. Oliver presented a series of slides setting out: the drivers for change; the as is/to be; the aspiration; the organisational design principles; and the proposed capability-led model, along with its accountabilities, benefits and risks.

7.4. Oliver explained that the capability-led model would challenge the College to think differently, with external facing services being provided in a lifecycle format with continuous testing. It would be dependent on a critical prioritisation process, with ownership and responsibility focused on delivery and outcomes. The model would be built around front-line capabilities and enabling capabilities. Front-line capabilities would include a central 'horizon-scanning brain', along with business engagement, learning and knowledge design, development and delivery, external platforms digital design and delivery, and project resources. Enabling capabilities would divide into capabilities according to front-line delivery needs and fixed capabilities with the ability to flex for College requirements. The Leadership Hub was offered as an example of how the capability-led model would work.

7.5. Andy Lea explained that having signed off the principles, the next step was to drill down to understand what they meant in practice. It represented a fundamental shift not just in structure but also in understanding and culture.

7.6. Board members had questions about how the model would work in practice and the next steps, including how it would be communicated externally.

7.7. It was asked whether there was experience of this model working in other organisations and whether it had been process mapped. Andy explained that this was how KPMG organised themselves. Board members agreed that the challenge would be cultural more than process.

7.8. Board members questioned how performance management would overlay the model, whether an individual would belong to a project or have a permanent home. Oliver advised that that they would belong both to a project and within their capability. Some would see this as an opportunity, others as a threat.

7.9. The aspiration having been presented, Board members were interested in knowing how the College would achieve it and establish ways of working. What provision had been made to continue the work after KPMG's departure? Oliver advised that this would form part of the implementation planning process, with four areas of focus: data analysis; operating model design; business change communications; and human resources capacity and capability.

7.10. Board members were also of the view that there would need to be a simpler way of presenting this externally to ensure it was well received. Andy advised that a table-top exercise with 21 people considering alternative model scenarios had been instructive in this respect. It was recognised that more work was required on clearer and simpler articulation. The focus for the coming weeks would be on fleshing out the model and understanding the gap between the current position and what was required.

7.11. One Board member asked if it was right to focus on digital learning and professional development products in the context of the 20,000 uplift, given the preference for face to face delivery. Rachel Tuffin advised that a learning strategy was being developed which specifically considered this and what the College could do differently.

7.12. Oliver invited the Board to give their support for the direction of travel, presenting the proposed model as an executive recommendation.

7.13. Board members agreed that they had not heard enough to agree anything immediately. They wanted more information to understand the alternative options rejected, the performance management structure and the gap between the present situation and the new model.

7.14. Mike Cunningham indicated that, as there was clearly and properly an appetite for more information, this would need to return for further Board consideration. It was clarified that the decision would be an executive one, but it was important to ensure all Board feedback had been taken into account and for Board members to be reassured that issues had been addressed. Board members would be contacted for their availability.

Andy Lea left the meeting.

Action

Board members' availability to be sought and a further discussion scheduled within the next two weeks. **Change Co-ordination team**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Agree** that they required further information on the proposed model

(ii) **Note** the progress on the organisational design work.

8. **Annual Report and Accounts 2018/19 (KH)**

8.1. Kate Husselbee thanked the Board members for their comments in developing the Annual Report and Accounts 2018/19, all of which had now been

incorporated. They had been reviewed by Clare Minchington in her role as Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee and she was content with the changes. Kate noted that the narrative related to a moment in time and there had been further developments since which could not be included in the main narrative. She also thanked the finance and governance teams for their efforts in finalising the document.

8.2.   Clare added that she had held a private session with the auditors at which they had raised a few points but nothing requiring escalation to the Board. She reported that the Audit and Risk Committee had considered the draft annual report and accounts and were content to recommend its approval to the Board.

8.3.   Helen Elderfield advised that the communications team would work on presenting the ARA in a similar style to the Business Plan.

Decision

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Approve** the Annual Report and Accounts subject to the amendments outlined in Annex A being made

9. Management Updates

(a) Key performance questions: September Update (KH/RT)

9.1.   Kate Husselbee remarked that the process so far had been found to encourage a collaborative approach across the College and prompt more consideration of the impact of College work. Colleagues were pushing further instead of preferring the easy option. The intention was to bring the remainder of the KPQs to the Board later in the year. A yearly update would be provided to the Board for each KPQ unless more frequent updates were requested. Developing and progressing KPIs for each would ensure the approach could be future-focused.

9.2.   Board members were generally very supportive of the approach and presentation, commenting that it was bold and innovative, a challenging and sophisticated approach that was progressing well. It was an iterative process that helped to identify gaps and would align well with a capability based organisation structure.

9.3.   Concerns remained around how targets would be set against which the executive could be held to account, and how performance would be measured, in particular to what extent the measure would be quantitative or qualitative.

9.4.   Kate explained that the view of where the College is now in a KPQ would be based on qualitative and quantitative data. Measurement would be through KPIs but all of the information would be brought together to answer the overall question. The gaps would be identified and next steps carried out.

9.5.   Board members further expressed concern around whether data would be gathered from internal or external sources, as there was a risk of it becoming a self-assessment. Kate advised that this would depend on the KPQ, that it would be a mixture of qualitative, quantitative, external, internal, hard and soft data. Mike commented that questioning from the Board would determine how satisfied they were with the quality of the data for any particular KPQ and that if the Board was not content more information would be sought from wider data sources.

9.6.   Kate advised that those in the KPQ network had so far offered each other robust challenge. Rachel commented that they had collectively agreed that more external assessment should be sought, which would be a next step. Rachel then

offered to provide an overview of the knowledge KPQ as an example to bring the process to life. Mike added that this would give the Board an opportunity to be presented with information to respond to so they could indicate if they were satisfied with the process and what could be done differently, with a view to developing this as the principal accountability mechanism.

9.7.   Rachel introduced the KPQ 'How good are we at sharing knowledge and good practice?' for which the principal data source was the College survey. This had received approximately 16,000 responses which were significant numbers but it should be borne in mind that this was not a representative sample as responses would be sent by those already engaging with the College. When people knew about College products they thought they were good, but awareness levels more widely were very low. The College had good connections with specialists, some leadership roles and neighbourhood officers, but there was a big gap in relation to frontline response. The survey provided data annually so it was possible to examine direction of travel for access figures, for example. Connections with ambassadors and engagement teams also provided data but the largest gap was at point of use. There was a need to seek assessment through one or two questions at the time of using the product. There was ambition to measure the things that would make the most difference. Rachel concluded that if she was rating the College on frontline response only it would be a red rating, but that overall it was amber because there were good connections with certain groups.

9.8.   Kate briefly introduced some of the resource-related KPQs as further examples.

9.9.   Board members agreed that there was no need for more data but that the missing aspect seemed to be an element of moderation or validation in the approach to avoid the risk of becoming self-serving.

9.10.   Board members made two suggestions in mitigation:

9.10.1. The first was for the development of a matrix to explain the weighting given to different types of evidence. Rachel commented that this could be included with the KPQ pack.

9.10.2. The second was around fixing the questions for a period of time so that linear comparisons could be made. As part of the iterative process was the ability to develop sub-questions, it was agreed that the headline questions could be fixed but the sub-questions could be modified.

9.11.   Rachel commented that as a point of learning, the team discussion of the question 'How good are we at setting standards?' had encouraged the team to think about impact and not just satisfaction. Kate remarked that this was an example of the benefits of the approach. It was clarified that the question followed the language of Plan on a Page and incorporated the notion of use, as a good standard would be implemented.

9.12.   Kate advised that the next step would be to bring more KPQs to the Board following a similar style. Mike remarked that when a KPQ returned to the Board it would be possible to compare ratings, so the approach was future-focused. The Plan on a Page and KPQs could both be refreshed if appropriate in due course.

<u>Decision</u>

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Note** ongoing progress of establishing the KPQ process
(ii) **Consider** the findings of the first five KPQs as presented in Annex A, and accompanying KPIs in Annex B
(iii) **Consider** the proposal for future reporting to the Board.

(b) Finance, Performance and Risk Report (KH)

9.13. Kate Husselbee addressed three key highlights of the Finance, Performance and Risk Report:

9.13.1. Firstly, the financial forecast was currently projecting a £0.3 million overspend, due primarily to a drop in international income, but it was early enough in the year for this not to be a cause for concern.

9.13.2. Secondly, two further pieces of audit work had been completed: a business development audit, which had yielded a moderate opinion; and a counter-fraud compliance consultancy review which had concluded that the College was unable to demonstrate a satisfactory level of compliance due to having been previously unaware of the functional standard (GovS 013). Similar findings had been made in relation to other Home Office Arms' Length Bodies.

9.13.3. Finally, work was underway to establish the risks arising from Operation Uplift and the pending Judicial Review on PEQF.

9.14. Clare Minchington reassured Board members that although the counter fraud compliance finding may appear concerning, there was no suggestion of a risk of fraud, it was merely highlighting that compliance with the new standard was now required.

9.15. The Chair concluded by commenting that this report was now very good.

Decision

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Note** the Updates to finance, current priority initiatives, internal audit and risk management
(ii) **Note** the latest GIAA audit and consultancy review findings on the College's approach to business development and counter fraud compliance
(iii) **Note** the progress being made on the KPMG recommendations in relation to technology threats
(iv) **Note** the assurance programme progress

10. Draft Terms of Reference for the Board (KH)

10.1. The Chair invited Board members to reflect on the draft terms of reference and return their comments by email to Helen Elderfield. She advised that the NRC was also updating its terms of reference. She observed that there had been a lot of items to note at this meeting and that it was an opportune moment to reconsider the role of the Board.

10.2. Helen Elderfield advised that the document was an initial draft and that a further iteration would be presented to the Board once comments had been received. The draft presented was based on the updated Protocol with the Home Office, updates to the Corporate Governance Code and to regularise standard points that had been omitted from the original. The next iteration would include an appendix with a schedule of matters reserved to the Board and a further schedule to give clarity around the role of the Board in approving items, noting executive decisions that the Board was being made aware of for accountability purposes, or making recommendations to the Home Office.

<u>Action</u>

Return comments on the draft terms of reference for the Board by email to Helen Elderfield by 11 October. **Board members**

<u>Decision</u>

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Note and discuss** the suggested amendments to the terms of reference.

PART THREE – VERBAL UPDATES

11. Chair's Update (MB)

11.1. The Chair advised that she had attended a useful formal meeting with Scott McPherson and his team, at which they had mainly discussed the 20,000 uplift.

11.2. She attended her regular meeting with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and a meeting with some Learning and Development representatives who indicated they wanted to professionalise the force Learning and Development groups.

11.3. A meeting had also been held with Baroness Hughes of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority. Key messages were that they felt the College should communicate more about their activities and they were also keen to make use of the College's knowledge and databases.

12. Chief Executive's Report (MC)

12.1. Mike Cunningham updated the Board on two meetings held on 17 September 2019.

12.2. Mike and Jo Noakes had an extremely positive meeting with the Home Secretary who appeared very committed to professional development and was keen to understand the practicalities.

12.3. This was followed by a positive meeting at No.10 with the Prime Minister's special adviser on policing, Blair Gibbs. He was interested in how the National Policing Board (NPB) would function and in the perennial problems work. He advised that the Policing Minister would attend Chiefs' Council.

12.4. Board members asked if there would be any follow up and if there was any sense of being able to explore the wider system beyond policing. Mike indicated that this would depend on how the NPB developed. The next meeting was due week commencing 23 September and would discuss its reach and whether it needed to be strengthened by statutory status. A line of communication had been established with the Prime Minister's office and the perennial problems documents had already been forwarded. Blair Gibbs was aware of the need to locate policing within the wider system. The Chair remarked that work had already begun in the Home Office on how police and health could interact regarding mental health issues. It would be good to develop a proposition on a wider collaborative framework.

12.5. It was mentioned that the notion of regional training centres had been raised with the Policing Minister and the College was asked whether it would consider this. The Chair advised that the Board had previously discussed whether it should take

on training and had decided it was not the right time, but it would be possible to reconsider if circumstances changed.

13. Brexit Impact Group Update

13.1. Rachel Tuffin advised that little had changed since July. The intensity of liaison would increase over the coming weeks but preparations were as advanced as they could be, given the uncertainty.

Decision

The Board resolved to:

(i) **Note** the update from the Brexit Impact Group

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION OF BUSINESS

14. Any Other Business

14.1. No additional matters were raised for discussion.

15. Review of the meeting

15.1. The Chair invited Board Members' views on the meeting and in particular the introduction of the strategy discussion session before the formal Board meeting.

15.2. The strategy discussion session was generally considered to have been a useful opportunity to be more discursive and delve deeper into a subject area. It enabled the Board to offer direction far enough in advance to influence the work. The Chair summarised the comments as a good process that should be considered for future meetings.

15.3. Board members agreed that although they understood the desire to present the most up to date information, it would have been beneficial to have papers in advance of the meeting and time for reflection and then be provided with a verbal update on the day of any developing issues.

15.4. Several comments were made about the length of the paper bundle, although it was noted that in this instance the inclusion of the Annual Report and Accounts had artificially increased the size of the bundle.

15.5. It was also noted that it was unfortunate the Director General was in attendance at a meeting where many of the papers were for noting or decisions could not be made because papers had not been circulated in advance.

15.6. The Chair remarked that she found it useful for there to be a robust rhythm for papers coming to a Board, with set phases regarding early thoughts, direction of travel and final agreement.

16. Close of the meeting

16.1. There being no further business the meeting was closed at 14:59.

Date of next meeting: 6th November 2019

Name of Chair: Millie Banerjee