



College of Policing

Title: Board meeting
Date: 29 January 2020
Time: 11:10 – 15:30
Venue: Broadway House, Tothill St, London, SW1H 9NQ – Abbey 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
Robin Wilkinson (RW)	Chair Members' Committee & Police Staff Association
Stephen Mold (SM) (Dial in)	Association of Police & Crime Commissioners (APCC)
Paul Griffiths (PG)	Police Superintendents' Association
Jackie Smith (JS)	Independent Director
Ian Wylie (IW)	Independent Director

Executive in attendance	
Rachel Tuffin (RT)	Director of Knowledge, Innovation and Standards
Bernie O'Reilly	Director of Organisational Change
Jo Noakes (JN)	Director of Workforce Development
Janette McCormick	20k Uplift Programme Director

Staff members in attendance	
Oliver Cattermole (OC)	Chief of Staff & Change Programme Director
Ferzana Shan (FS)	Training Design Team Leader (Observing)
Kate Fromant (KF)	Interim Head of Governance
Camille Giffard (CG)	Governance Manager

PART ONE – PRELIMINARY ITEMS

1. Welcome and administration (Chair)

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. She noted that the meeting had been duly convened and a quorum was present.
- 1.2. Apologies for absence were received from Ian Hopkins and Stephen Mold. The Chair welcomed Paul Griffiths as the newest Board member, with formal confirmation of his appointment having been received the previous week. She also welcomed Kate Fromant as the new Interim Head of Governance and invited Kate to introduce herself, which she did by setting out extensive governance experience in the non-profit and public sectors.
- 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 6 November 2019 (Chair)

- 2.1. The draft minutes were considered and accepted as a true and accurate record of the discussions that took place on 6 November 2019.
- 2.2. It was asked if any action had been taken in relation to paragraph 5.8 and the use of diversity statistics for comparison purposes. Rachel Tuffin confirmed that the comments had been passed on to the authors.

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Approve** the minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2019.

3. Matters arising from the meeting on 6 November 2019 (Chair)

- 3.1. It was noted that actions 61 and 72 were ongoing, actions 82 and 85 were to be reported on at the March meeting and the Board agreed that the actions listed as suggested complete could be closed.
- 3.2. Mike Cunningham advised that finance would be discussed as a later agenda item but he wished to make some preliminary comments to set the context for discussions. The settlement figures had been received. There had been an uplift in both revenue and capital budgets but the Police Transformation Fund (PTF) was now closed. Consequently, initiatives which had previously been funded by the PTF, like the National Wellbeing Service and PEQF, would need to be funded from the settlement and flexibility would continue to be limited.
- 3.3. It was discussed that the closure of the PTF could be positive for the College as it had previously been able to block College products and initiatives to retain ownership of them. Mike remarked that it was unclear as yet what it would mean for other activities. He clarified that it was not on the agenda for the National Policing Board but there would be a new Strategic Investment Board chaired by the Policing Minister. This would have implications for the College's prioritisation exercise. Reporting requirements may become more stringent, with an increased focus on outcomes.

Action

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

OFFICIAL

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

4. *Item moved to private session*

5. 20k Uplift Programme Update (BR)

- 5.1. Bernie O'Reilly reported on two specific areas of College support for the national programme, assessor recruitment and estates, with Jo Noakes and Janette McCormick contributing on their areas of responsibility.
- 5.2. Assessor recruitment: Insufficient numbers of assessors would hinder the wider uplift initiative and represent a significant issue for the College. Jo explained that the College had a bank of assessors, with College involvement in 30% of initial recruitment. An additional 310 associate assessors and 79 assessment coordinators were being recruited to support the increased requirement for assessment centres. The College was on target to deliver these numbers by June 2020. The diversity statistics so far indicated that 64% of applicants were female with a good geographic spread. There would be a target for under 45s as there was tending to be a bias towards the over 45s. More statistics would be made available as the programme went on. Recruitment was also taking place on behalf of forces. Human Resources processes had learned lessons from previous experiences with assessor recruitment and no issues had arisen as yet.
- 5.3. When asked how confident she was that the pipeline would deliver the desired numbers, Jo indicated that the conversion rates were promising and there were no concerns. She advised that targeting was just within the UK at this stage. Janette added that the campaign had a fresh look and feel with a modern and diverse approach. They were looking at the evidence base and evaluating as they went, so hoped to source their assessors from a wider pool. She was confident they would achieve the desired results
- 5.4. Estates: Funding had been confirmed and covered committed costs. The current College estate would not accommodate the enhanced requirement for assessment centres delivered by the College so options had been investigated. Four of these proposed the development of the Ryton estate, either the conversion of existing underused buildings or the construction of new buildings, and a further option proposed the use of an offsite location at Wyboston Lakes. The preferred option was the development of existing buildings at Ryton, supported by rental of Wyboston for an initial period of 18 months to allow the Ryton work to be completed.
- 5.5. Board members suggested this might be an opportunity to look more widely at the estates strategy, as any increases in estates for Operation Uplift would be permanent. The Nominations and Remuneration Committee (NRC) had approved the appointment of a Head of Business Services who would be responsible for estates. It was suggested it might also be an opportunity to improve the College's carbon footprint as a responsible public body. Consideration could be given to

OFFICIAL

alternatives to additional car parking, for example. This should be a whole estates strategy, not limited to Ryton.

- 5.6. Benefits should be viewed medium to long term, for the next five to eight years rather than for the three year commitment of Operation Uplift.
- 5.7. It was clarified that some capital funding may need to be topped up from the general capital allocation.
- 5.8. Board members sought clarification of the governance arrangements in relation to estates. Mike advised that to date sign off had been at Senior Management Team level, comprising the executive team and the Tier 2s. It was asked what financial risk the Board would carry in this arrangement and how it would be sensitised to the risks around this part of the project. Mike advised that the financial situation had not yet been confirmed in respect of the core grant and that options were still being worked up. He would want the Board to share the risk once the information was available.
- 5.9. The Chair remarked that it was a very good paper. She requested a clearer view of governance for the financial aspects be provided to Board members.
- 5.10. Mike advised that the Home Secretary was due to make an announcement on core funding in the coming days.

Action

Consideration should be given to the College's carbon footprint as part of the whole estates strategy. **Bernie O'Reilly/Head of Business Services**

A clearer view of governance for the financial aspects to be provided to the Board at the next meeting. **Bernie O'Reilly**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** that good progress is being made and, as requested, further monthly board reports will provide evidence of a robust College programme framework that demonstrates a joined up approach to meet and deliver against the national requirement.
- (ii) **Note** that the financial position and associated risks are being managed and mitigated

6. The future of Fast Track and Direct Entry – proposal to consult (JN)

- 6.1. Jo Noakes advised that the evaluation reports had been sent to the policing minister the previous week. They had not yet been laid in Parliament as they were awaiting sign off by the HASC chair. Once this had been obtained, the consultation process would commence.
- 6.2. The consultation would be in two parts. The first, areas for consideration, would examine three key questions: whether there was demand from forces, whether the programmes supported improvements in diversity and whether they were viable. The second would look at the proposed Fast Track Inspector to Superintendent (FTIS) programme. Forces had previously indicated there was a gap in this area. It could also support Operation Uplift. It was proposed to consult on full scoping of aims, delivery and content. Consultation would take place with the usual stakeholder groups, Professional Committee and other relevant bodies. The aim was to gauge interest in a Fast Track Inspector to Superintendent

OFFICIAL

programme and turn the areas for consideration into recommendations for the future of direct entry.

- 6.3. Mike Cunningham observed that focus had moved away from direct entry, coinciding with Operation Uplift, and decisiveness would be required in light of the pause in funding for DE Superintendents and the apparent lack of appetite.
- 6.4. Board members noted that the cost per head for DE Superintendents was significant and that a fast track programme may deliver better, but cautioned that the welfare of those having already entered the service through the programme should be carefully managed. The lack of appetite was disappointing from a diversity point of view as it would take longer to achieve a representative senior leadership.
- 6.5. Consultation would be welcomed by the PSA. It was further remarked that the term consultation could also be viewed provocatively by staff associations if the direction of travel was already determined. Consideration should be given to using alternative terminology such as recommendation or direction.
- 6.6. Mike observed that it would be important to retain the College's role as agitator, for example in relation to PEQF and some elements of diversity. If the DE Superintendents programme was supported by a good business case it would be easier, but its costs and the evidence in relation to diversity were not supportive. There were strong levers in relation to regulation change and PEQF but not in this area.
- 6.7. The view was expressed that this programme was an innovative and interesting initiative that should continue to be viewed as such even if not continued. It was important to continue creating dynamic new solutions. Mike emphasised that the evaluation had shown it could work. The cohorts who had entered the service were good, which would help with communications, but there was a lack of appetite from chiefs.
- 6.8. It was asked if the FTIS programme could be redesigned to lower the cost. The consultation should look at implementation as well as content.
- 6.9. It was also suggested that the College could have an innovation unit to look at problem solving by thinking differently and increasing internal and external connection.
- 6.10. It was noted that getting the communications right would be vital, as this was a common criticism of the College. There should be clear messaging to say it was being stopped, with the decision being market led. In response, it was observed that letting the market decide was different to doing the right thing and the consultation might explore which proposition should be followed.

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Discuss and agree** the proposed consultation process on the future of the FTDE programmes and the potential development of a new FTIS programme.

ENABLING ITEMS

7. Transforming our College update (BR/OC)

- 7.1. Bernie O'Reilly provided an update on the broader context and progress since the November Board meeting.

OFFICIAL

- 7.2. He advised that there would not be a single changeover date and that change was already in progress. Two new senior leadership posts had been approved by NRC. Teams had been amalgamated. A new Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) lead had been appointed. The Establishment Board had been created as a control measure for the revenue budget. There had been changes in governance and senior leadership. There had been £5m in digital investment over the past year, including the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) replacement discovery phase, which would require a further £2 – 2.5m to continue, and £1m on the website which also needed further investment. Funds had never been allocated to achieve the connection aim. There was still a lack of prioritisation and it would not be possible to reduce the headcount and continue doing the same things. A small redundancy budget would be needed.
- 7.3. The gap to where the College wanted to be was significant. The change team was doing good work but still lacked some capability on the technical aspects of the change programme. The team was asked to put together a more detailed business case setting out the delivery options. A teleconference between the change team and Board members took place on 8 January 2020, with some additional calls to seek feedback from Board members who had offered apologies. Advice was given to stay away from the big consultancy firms, while noting that a piecemeal approach would require significant management.
- 7.4. Oliver Cattermole introduced the Outline Business Case summary. He explained that it was based on the treasury model and had been independently reviewed to secure external assurance. Connection and relevance to the service were vital and would require clearly defined priorities, better resource management, development of key capabilities and the development of people for new ways of working.
- 7.5. The economic case explored options for the delivery model. Option 1, incremental change, would not deliver and Option 4, delivery led by an external supplier, would hand over the work to an external supplier so neither was favoured. Option 2, a mixed model of College-led delivery with support from multiple suppliers represented plan B – it was viable but less secure due to the increased risk caused by multiple procurements requiring Home Office approval for each. Option 3 was preferred option, a mixed model with a single supplier which could be run as a single procurement exercise.
- 7.6. Benefits and indicators had been identified as improved stakeholder perception, improved relevance of College products and services and increased staff satisfaction.
- 7.7. An invitation to tender for the delivery partner would be issued with a range of £800k – £1m, with negotiation to secure value for money.
- 7.8. Additional strategic oversight and support were needed due to capability or resource gaps. Estimated costs had been set out, including opportunity costs.
- 7.9. The outline management case set out a delivery plan with 4 work streams, each of which was to be led by a member of the senior management team supported by a business change manager. Each would report into the programme board chaired by Bernie. The identified work streams, delivered through eight key projects, were:
 - Defining our priorities
 - Managing our resources
 - Defining our capabilities
 - Developing our people.

OFFICIAL

Proposed timescales were of 19 months' duration, based on option 3.

- 7.10. Good progress had been made on scoping, with a scoped example provided of work stream 1 (setting priorities), project 1 (understanding and prioritising our current demand). Risks were discussed at each meeting of the Programme Board. An experienced programme manager from HMRC had just started.
- 7.11. The Chair remarked that this was a good paper of appropriate depth.
- 7.12. Board members questioned the financial situation, in particular seeking an understanding of the financial burden and benefit to the organisation and how it would be sustainable if not cost-neutral. There was information on the estimated cost of the programme but little understanding of the ongoing cost implications.
- 7.13. Views were split among Board members. Some wanted an indication of costs for the future state of the College and others were of the opinion that the policing environment would change, especially in light of the spending review, and that the future state and cost could not be reliably predicted at this stage. Emerging from the discussions was the notion of developing a more flexible and agile model that did not assume growth but was resilient, responsive to change and able to scale up or scale down, withstand financial pressures but continue to deliver the core mission – a scalable model rather than a costed structure. It was pointed out that this was not set out in the paper and it would need to be articulated.
- 7.14. It was observed that the way in which the change papers had developed meant a capability was being built as the programme went on. There was much greater understanding and capability than there had been six or nine months previously. Extra capability might still be needed but it was nonetheless greatly improved.
- 7.15. The Chair agreed there had been much improvement and summarised the discussion, indicating that there should be an expectation of skills transfer with any consultancy and that performance should be measured against this expectation. A guiding principle should be added that the expectation was not of growth but rather of a more flexible organisation. She asked Board members if there was agreement to Option 3.
- 7.16. There was still uncertainty about the affordability of Option 3. Mike advised that it was not yet possible to answer this definitively as not all figures were available. He asked if approval in principle could be obtained for Option 3 or if Board members wished to have a separate discussion. It was noted that the cost difference was not very significant if taken in context and Board members agreed Option 3 could proceed.
- 7.17. Board members advised that the tender process would be a key step. It should specify the requirement for skills transfer, include a call off situation and allow for a change in needs. Care should be taken with the Service Level Agreement to ensure it secured what was needed from the contract. The possibility of shared risk with the supplier should be explored.

Action

The financial impacts and benefits should be articulated, based on a scalable model rather than a costed structure. **Bernie O'Reilly/Oliver Cattermole**

Milestones to be included in the delivery plan. **Bernie O'Reilly/Oliver Cattermole**

OFFICIAL

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note and agree** decisions and discussion points raised on 8 January 2020
- (ii) **Note** progress on the implementation phase of the change programme
- (iii) **Approve** the developing approach to selection and costing of delivery partner capability for the next phase of change
- (iv) **Approve** delivery Option 3, College-led delivery with support from a single supplier.

8. College People Survey 2019 (BR)

- 8.1. Bernie O'Reilly reported that the survey had been carried out in May 2019, with an encouraging response rate of 74%. Staff were working hard, engaged and in good health. The report picked out the top 10 positive features and a number of areas for development. Anecdotal evidence had suggested there could be some issues for homeworkers but this was not borne out by the survey. An action plan would need to be developed for further improvement.
- 8.2. Board members queried why the results had taken so long and how the College planned to explain the delay. Bernie explained that Durham University owned the data received from the survey. It had taken time for them to return the data and further time interpreting the data. The results would now be delivered, with an apology for the delay.
- 8.3. It was asked whether the College's own research unit would have the capability and capacity to deliver the survey in-house and what had been gained from using Durham University. Mike Cunningham clarified that Durham University delivered the survey for the majority of forces in the country and it was selected to allow for better comparison. However, the report indicated that it was not possible to compare results so this had not been achieved.
- 8.4. Board members commented that the results were generally positive and that it was important not to focus solely on the negatives. Two areas for development, vision clarity and communications, were at the core of the change programme. Hindrance stressors were noted as making a real difference and it would be important to explore those areas further.
- 8.5. It was suggested that consideration be given to external benchmarking such as Investors in People and the British Standard of Wellbeing. Board members with experience of these processes had found it very positive, with the process being as valuable as the accreditation.

Action

Consideration to be given to external benchmarking such as Investors in People and the British Standard of Wellbeing. **Bernie O'Reilly/Judith Whitaker**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note and discuss** the results of the People Survey 2019 and proposed next steps to bring about positive change in the College

9. Counter Fraud Policy (BR)

- 9.1. Bernie O'Reilly advised that the existing Anti-Fraud and Theft Policy has been reviewed and updated in line with the new government functional standards (GovS 013) resulting in a new Counter Fraud Policy. The College had not previously been aware of the new standards and the development of the new policy was part of an agreed action plan with the Government Internal Audit Agency. Clare Minchington, Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC), added that other ALBs had also been unaware of the new standards. The new counter-fraud policy had been reviewed by ARC, which had recommended its approval by the Board subject to a number of minor changes. These had not yet been made in this version of the policy so approval should be subject to these being made.
- 9.2. It was explained that the emphasis was on prevention rather than detection, with the aim being for the organisational culture to make it more difficult to commit fraud. It was asked how this would intersect with whistleblowing and was clarified that there was specific reference to this in the policy.
- 9.3. The Board approved the policy subject to the changes requested by ARC being made.

Action

Update the Counter-Fraud policy with the changes requested by ARC. **John Baird**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Approve** the Counter Fraud Policy subject to the changes requested by ARC being made.

10. Management Updates

(a) Finance, Performance and Risk Report (BR)

- 10.1. Bernie O'Reilly reported that the strategic risks had been revised and reduced from ten to seven, with an additional risk in relation to the change programme, resulting in a total of eight strategic risks. The Chair remarked that SR4 Communications and SR5 Stakeholder Relationships had been closed and incorporated into SR1 Connection with the Service, but that the communications discussion was more far-reaching than just the service. These connection issues had not been resolved. Mike Cunningham agreed that if SR4 and SR5 were merged with SR1, the wording of SR1 would need to be amended.
- 10.2. There were 16 open internal audit actions, an increase of 3 since the previous meeting, with one having been completed. The Travel and Expenditure audit final report had been issued with a moderate rating. The Communications audit would be the next report received.
- 10.3. The ERP replacement discovery phase had cost £300k but would require a further £2m to follow through. It was asked if this was really required. Bernie explained that it was necessary to replace SAP which had come to the end of its life and no longer fulfilled the College's requirements. The ERP solution that had been found was to on board with the Home Office system to keep the costs down.
- 10.4. Regarding financial performance, a £0.9m overspend had been projected at the previous meeting. This had since been revised to a £0.4m underspend which was likely to increase. An update would be provided at the next Board meeting. Any

OFFICIAL

underspend would need to be repaid as it could not be accrued to the following financial year. Bernie was following the situation closely with Dominic Finigan.

- 10.5. It was asked when there would be greater clarity on finances and whether an interim update could be provided for Board members on the finance position. Mike agreed this could be provided.

Action

Review the wording of SR1 to fully incorporate closed actions SR4 and SR5. **Claire Swallow**

An interim update to be provided to the Board on the financial position. **Dominic Finigan**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the performance, internal audit and assurance updates
- (ii) **Note** the revised strategic risk register.

(b) Key performance questions: Update (JN)

- 10.6. Jo Noakes presented three KPQs from her area. She reported that they were proving a useful tool which encouraged different thinking. Much of the work was to develop, quality assure and maintain learning. There had been a change of emphasis to increase support for implementation and the KPQs had reinforced this, identifying a gap in the work the College was doing to increase understanding of impact. There was a need to determine whether the right questions were being asked, at the right level, and to ensure they corresponded to the College's priorities for the coming year.
- 10.7. How well are we setting national educational standards relevant for current policing roles? – The key product was educational standards for the National Policing Curriculum covering 97 learning programmes/areas, including PEQF entry routes. Some, like PEQF, had a detailed implementation process, while others were learning standards for the forces to implement. A comment was made that there was a need to be very clear about the difference between the College's own core standards and learning standards for forces, as there continued to be confusion about what the College does in a complicated landscape – for example in forensics where there is a separate regulator and the College owns part but not all of the standards.
- 10.8. A general discussion took place about the KPQ process. It was asked how the process had been cascaded and how it had been received by staff. This would be reviewed at the end of 2020 as it had not yet landed quite as expected. More time would be needed before cascading into PDRs. It was also asked how KPQs would be used in the business planning process for 2021 and how the Board would be involved.
- 10.9. Mike observed that it was important to remember there had been no performance framework previously and this was a new approach. The proposed KPIs were trying to work up appropriate indicators so there could be quantitative information as well. There had been productive discussions at Senior Management Team meetings about what sat behind the KPQs. The questions themselves were a work in progress and would develop. A Board member commented that the KPQ process should also be continued for the benefit of the police service.
- 10.10. Mike clarified that if targets were imposed, the KPQs could be flexed to suit. It was likely that any targets for policing would involve operational crime and

OFFICIAL

violence reduction targets. If these were priorities for the police service the College would need to reflect them.

- 10.11. Board members requested an update on the work being undertaken by Sharon Harrison on the College strategy. Mike advised that this would be brought to a future meeting.
- 10.12. How well are we helping forces identify, develop and select current and future leaders at all levels? – A lot of work was being done in these areas but the questions might need adjusting as they currently required four pages of information. The KPQ revealed an inconsistency in the approach to selecting current and future leaders. There was a lot of work to do to bring a coherent message to service and it was not landing as well as it could, with insufficient follow up.
- 10.13. A lot of focus was being placed on senior leaders' CPD, for example last summer work had taken place to identify requirements and a framework in this area. The KPQ indicated a gap in wider CPD across the service. The workforce directorate senior managers wanted to change the KPQ and develop a separate question as this one was specifically for senior leaders.
- 10.14. To what extent are we promoting and supporting wellbeing and diversity of police officers and staff? – The National Police Wellbeing Service had been established but there was a need to improve awareness of it. The funding model had also changed. Evaluation of impact would be needed to decide what would continue. It was currently being run as a joint enterprise with NPCC, being jointly chaired with the NPCC lead.
- 10.15. It was asked what was available for frontline officers and whether there was any provision for financial wellbeing. Mike advised that it was still fairly new but that it included resilience training and health screening. Police Mutual offered assistance on the finance side and Wellbeing Vans would attend critical incidents to provide on-the-spot support. It had taken off well across policing and the Home Secretary had been explicit in confirming it would continue.
- 10.16. An update on diversity was due to be brought to the Board in March 2020.

Action

College strategy to be brought to a future meeting. **Sharon Harrison**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the progress and update on the KPQs 1.3.1a, 1.3.1b, 1.3.3a and 1.3.3b

11. Board Awayday and Board-Exec Development Day (KF)

- 11.1. Kate Fromant referred to the facilitators' notes of the previous Board Awayday and agreed next steps. Board members were content with these and did not wish to comment further.
- 11.2. Kate introduced the upcoming Board-Exec development day and indicated it would be an opportunity to obtain greater clarity on the role of the Board and Board engagement. It would be important to establish that the Board would provide advice and support to the executive directors. A draft straw man based on the Protocol had been prepared and contained nothing unusual or surprising.
- 11.3. Mike observed that he would be keen to focus on the relationship between the executive and Board and not only on the statutory or constitutional role of the

OFFICIAL

Board. In light of the ongoing change programme, a new member joining the executive team in the next few months and the change in Board personnel it would be essential to develop the relationship further.

- 11.4. It was asked whether the new executive director could attend the joint development day. Kate indicated she would make enquiries.
- 11.5. A note of caution was raised that it would be important not to focus exclusively on internal relationships but to remain current by discussing the role of the Board, the role of Professional Committee, the College's understanding of policing and its direction of travel.
- 11.6. It was further observed that there were two culture sets around the table, those with policing experience and those without but with other valuable experience, and it was imperative to learn how to get the best value, performance and learning from each other.
- 11.7. The Chair indicated that if there was an appetite within the Board to understand more about its role, a discussion should take place with the Home Office.
- 11.8. Board members agreed that authority to finalise the agenda for 17 March 2020 could be delegated to the Chair and CEO in conjunction with the facilitators.

Action

Enquiries to be made into whether the new executive director can attend the joint development day on 17 March 2020. **Kate Fromant**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Ratify** the outputs from the Board Awayday
- (ii) **Discuss and agree** the draft agenda/format of the Board/Executive Development Day
- (iii) **Agree to delegate** authority to the Chair and Chief Executive Officer to finalise the agenda with the facilitators.

12. Home Office ALB conference 2019 reflections (KF)

- 12.1. The Chair advised that the ALB conference in November was much improved compared to previous years and she had felt it would be useful for other Board members to see what was presented. She had attended the session on diversity presented by Suzy Levy, a member of the Home Office Board specialising in inclusion and diversity development, and found her methodologies to encourage boards and middle managers to challenge themselves very interesting. She urged Board members who had not yet done so to attend future ALB conferences if the opportunity arose.

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the feedback received from Board members who attended the Home Office ALB conference on 26 November 2019

PART THREE – VERBAL UPDATES

13. Chair's Update (MB)

- 13.1. The Chair advised that her resignation had been accepted by the Home Secretary, with a departure date yet to be agreed.

14. Chief Executive's Report (MC)

- 14.1. Mike Cunningham advised that the current focus across policing was on Operation Uplift. The first National Policing Board since the election was taking place on 30 January 2020.
- 14.2. He reported that although the Lincolnshire judicial review had been refused, the relationship continued to be difficult. It remained unclear if there was a genuine interest in negotiating timescales for the implementation of PEQF in Lincolnshire.
- 14.3. The judicial review of the College's hate crime guidance was awaited. It concerned the retweeting of a transgender-related tweet by a former police officer in Humberside, which had been recorded as a hate incident, citing the College's guidance. It was being challenged on the basis that it breached the right to freedom of expression and required a careful response.
- 14.4. Christine Elliott indicated that she could share some relevant information that may be of assistance.
- 14.5. Mike remarked that much discussion had taken place about change in the College but the NPCC were also undergoing change and had proposed a new operating model. Tracy Holyer was working with both organisations to ensure their respective change programmes would be complementary. Discussion would be required to achieve improved clarity, particularly around the development of standards. The current relationship was a positive and constructive one. It was suggested that this may be an opportunity to review the role of Professional Committee.

Action

To share information with Mike Cunningham in relation to the Humberside judicial review.
Christine Elliott

15. Brexit Impact Group Update

- 15.1. Rachel Tuffin reported that the UK would enter a transition period after 31 January. During that time, access would be retained to intelligence and security information. No protests were expected before the end of 2020. The port arrangements previously developed would be reset towards the end of the transition period.

Decision

The Board resolved to:

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

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION OF BUSINESS

16. Any Other Business

- 16.1. Robin Wilkinson, Chair of the Members' Committee, indicated that a complete rethink of that committee would be required. Engaging people from the policing sector may require alternative means of meeting, for example an electronic solution to widen attendance. Only 6 attendees were expected at the coming meeting on 4 February. A changed approach would also link to the wider communications strategy.
- 16.2. No additional matters were raised for discussion.

17. Review of the meeting

- 17.1. The Chair invited Mike Cunningham to review the meeting. He observed that the meeting had worked through a lot of business. He felt that a further increase in understanding between the Executive and Board was still required. There had been good challenge regarding the change paper and the People Survey but he wondered if, in exercising challenge, there was insufficient qualitative discussion. From an executive perspective, with some papers it seemed more about preparing to answer questions rather than a good discussion. Challenge was necessary but should go hand in hand with advice and support. For example, there was a lot of discussion on the People Survey being late but nothing about how it could take the College forward. It would be important to increase the qualitative discussions.
- 17.2. Board members commented that the Strategy Discussion Session had been very engaging and useful for gaining collective ideas. They discussed whether this was because of the informal nature of the session and whether it could be achieved in the main Board meeting. It was perhaps about timing of items coming to the Board. The Chair referred to a session she had attended in which challenge and support were explained as being two separate pillars which were not mutually exclusive but with a different tonality.

18. Close of the meeting

- 18.1. There being no further business the meeting was closed at 14:46

Date of next meeting: 18 March 2020

Name of Chair: Millie Banerjee