



College of  
Policing

**Title:** Board meeting  
**Date:** 03 July 2019  
**Time:** 10:00 – 15:00  
**Venue:** Canterbury Room – Amba Hotel Charing Cross  
 Strand, London WC2N 5HX

<b>Board</b>	
Millie Banerjee (MB)	Board Chair
Christine Elliott (CE)	Chair Nominations and Remuneration Committee and College Regulatory Consultation Group (CRCG) & Senior Independent Director
Robin Wilkinson (RW)	Chair Members' Committee & Police Staff Association
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
Jackie Smith (JS)	Independent Director
Ian Wylie (IW)	Independent Director

<b>Executive in attendance</b>	
Rachel Tuffin (RT)	Director of Knowledge and Innovation
Kate Husselbee (KH)	Director of Corporate Services and Business Development
Jo Noakes (JN)	Temporary Director of Workforce Development
Janette McCormick (JMC)	Temporary Director of Policing Standards

<b>Staff members in attendance</b>	
Matt Peck (MP) (Item 6)	Interim Head of Corporate Communications
Lisa Greenhill (LG) (Items 6&9)	Communications Manager
Helen Elderfield (HE)	Head of Governance
Camille Giffard (CG)	Governance Manager

<b>Invited observer</b>	
Paul Griffiths (PG)	Police Superintendents' Association
Mary Calam (MC)	Mary Calam Consulting Ltd

# OFFICIAL

## PART ONE – PRELIMINARY ITEMS

### 1. Welcome and administration (Chair)

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular Mary Calam who had been invited to observe the meeting following the Board development sessions on 17 and 18 June. 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, Stephen Mold, Bernie O'Reilly, Oliver Cattermole and Anne Owen (Anne Owen Leadership Consulting Ltd).
- 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.
- 1.5. The Chair complimented the quality of the papers submitted for the lengthy agenda.

### 2. Minutes of the meeting on 8 May 2019 (Chair)

- 2.1. The draft minutes were considered and accepted as a true and accurate record of the discussions that took place on 8 May 2019.

#### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Approve** the minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2019 without amendment.

### 3. Matters arising from the meeting on 8 May 2019 (Chair)

- 3.1. Board members recognised that a number of actions had been superseded and were no longer appropriate. It was agreed that the governance team would review the actions list and a revised version would be presented at the next meeting.
- 3.2. Clare Minchington noted that action 42 referred to a further development session in early autumn and asked that dates be canvassed without undue delay.
- 3.3. Robin Wilkinson queried whether the rewording of the budget narrative referred to in the update to action 58 was strong enough. Kate Husselbee advised that the content of the 2019-20 Business Plan was achievable but there may be more limitations in future years. Mike commented that a more efficient prioritisation process would be required but there would first need to be complete clarity on implementation of Plan on a Page.
- 3.4. 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

Rolling actions marked as suggested complete to be closed. **Camille Giffard**

The rolling actions list to be reviewed and superseded actions replaced where needed.  
**Camille Giffard**

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** progress made with the actions agreed at the previous meetings
- (j) **Agree** to close all actions recorded on the rolling actions list as suggested complete.

**PART TWO – ITEMS FOR DECISION / DISCUSSION**

**CORE DELIVERY ITEMS**

**4. Introduction to the Knowledge and Innovation Directorate (RT)**

- 4.1. Board members agreed that this was a good paper which clearly set out the work of the directorate. They were content that it did not require additional discussion and that any minor observations could be made outside the meeting.

Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the introduction to the Knowledge and Innovation Directorate
- (ii) **Note** the production of the draft Knowledge plan
- (iii) **Agree** a shift in focus towards high speed sharing of local practice and innovation.

**5. Policing Systems Improvement (MC)**

- 5.1. Mike Cunningham explained that this was a fast moving ministerial initiative to develop a more comprehensive approach to improving the policing system. There had been a local focus in recent years, with the creation of Police and Crime Commissioners and the establishment of local police and crime plans. This had benefited local priorities but there was now a need for more national cohesion and a national framework to look at national policing issues requiring a national response. This had been most recently discussed the preceding day at a Police Systems Leaders meeting at the Home Office.
- 5.2. Much of the work discussed at that meeting would fall to the College. A key component of the smarter system would be the ability to look at the future through horizon scanning and futures research. Mike had proposed that the futures work should be viewed through the prism of community safety. A central governance meeting would need to be developed, chaired by the Policing Minister but sitting with the College.
- 5.3. Aspects of the proposal included the transfer of knowledge, the approach to the Police Knowledge Fund, the concept of research forces and the expansion of the peer support offer. Funding allocation had not been discussed.
- 5.4. Board members welcomed this development but noted it also raised questions and challenges.
- 5.5. A wider model for system-wide working was discussed. Mike indicated that such a system would still be far off and it was not yet possible to explore how it would function. Similarly, a regulatory role whereby forces would be required to 'comply or explain' was not currently a realistic prospect due to the key role of operational independence in the British policing model.
- 5.6. Several Board members raised the apparent conflict between this new role for the College and the draft design principles based on Plan on a Page that had been

## OFFICIAL

circulated to Board members in advance of the Board meeting. The discussion raised issues of how the College would adapt to the significant new responsibility, including ensuring it had the right capability to deliver it, how long the Home Office would allow for capability to be built and how the Board could support the Executive to build it. This would need to be further explored and discussed as whatever design the College adopted for the future would need to follow the direction of travel and be led by a longer-term vision.

- 5.7. It was acknowledged that the College did not yet have the capability or capacity to deliver such an ambitious agenda but that the College should consider whether lower priority matters should be put aside to focus on this. There would be risks attached to the College adopting a central role, with ministers looking to it for solutions.
- 5.8. It was asked if there was any prospect of mergers between forces in a similar way to the health sector sharing chairs and chief executives. It was clarified that the closest initiative to a merger had recently dissolved so it did not seem a likely prospect.
- 5.9. The Spending Review bid set out three possible levels for College involvement, the top level being greater than the College could take on. Rachel Tuffin clarified that this option had not been selected but had been included in the bid as a marker for future exploration.
- 5.10. A concern was expressed that the police service and existing staff of the College may view this new departure as a change in direction. Assurance was given that the intention was to expand what already existed rather than pursuing a completely new direction.

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Agree** that work in this area will largely be subject to receipt of additional funding.

### **6. Update on Widening Access (MC)**

Lisa Greenhill and Matt Peck joined the meeting.

- 6.1. Mike Cunningham reminded Board members that they had agreed to the College opening up its services to everyone in policing but advised caution in how this was managed. Agreement was now being sought for a comprehensive communications plan and proposed timescales for widening access through a move away from the formal membership scheme.
- 6.2. Board members were very complimentary of the paper setting out the plans. All those who expressed a view were supportive of both the timescales and the communications plan, which was felt to be considerate of internal and external stakeholders.
- 6.3. Paul Griffiths advised working more closely with staff associations as they had been in favour of such a development for some time. Robin Wilkinson suggested that the opportunity be used to convey messaging to Chief Constables around what the College could do for them.
- 6.4. Early indications were that the widening of the offer was being well received by College ambassadors in forces.
- 6.5. It was asked whether there was confidence that the website would be ready in December and assurance that finance was in place. It was clarified that some

## OFFICIAL

sign off was still awaited from the Home Office but there were no concerns of note and the project was on track.

- 6.6. External messaging was scheduled to commence in December. It was explained that materials would be produced earlier than this and that the College would have the capability to respond before December if questions were received earlier. Conference season could also be built in if appropriate.
- 6.7. It was suggested that this could be an opportunity to launch the new College branding and Matt Peck advised that the wider connection aspects were being viewed as a whole as they were all interconnected.

Lisa Greenhill and Matt Peck left the meeting.

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the plans
- (ii) **Agree** the College will close the formal membership scheme by December 2019

### **7. Workforce Development Directorate update (JN)**

- 7.1. Jo Noakes updated the Board on developments in her directorate since the introduction she provided in March. A structure was now in place corresponding to the directorate areas of work, the Tier 2 roles had been filled and a new senior leadership team was in place. They were focusing on setting priorities and establishing ways of working. Stakeholder engagement workshops had been held.
- 7.2. The main areas of work were attraction and recruitment, supporting and enabling functions and inclusion, diversity and engagement. Jo indicated that they wanted to take more of a leading role in the area of diversity. The Chair asked if there was a strategy and objectives in relation to diversity. Jo advised that she intended to present strategy proposals to the Board at the November meeting. She explained that the general aim of gaining a greater connection with policing applied but that in this area there was a need to be provocative.
- 7.3. PEQF, apprenticeships and degree holder entry were areas of focus. Progress had been made but forces continued to have concerns regarding abstractions. Work was ongoing with Bedfordshire to develop a new tool to calculate abstractions using new information. It would vary according to the force and education provider. Resources were being moved to support the implementation team, which was set up as a fairly small junior team as it had not been intended to play a large role. It was apparent that there was a wider need for implementation than just for PEQF. The Chair commented that it was right at this time that the College support implementation but that this may not be the College's role in future.
- 7.4. Dave Bamber welcomed the comments on implementation and the quality assessment process, as one of the criticisms of the College was poor delivery and he regularly received concerns regarding implementation. Was there any guidance on this? Jo advised that the new tool would be ready the following day. The team had previously worked on membership engagement and already possessed the skills to speak to forces. They would be in a position to perform a scoping role following some familiarisation with PEQF.
- 7.5. Paul Griffiths remarked that the Spending Review may result in potential increases in force recruitment. Would the College have the capacity to cope with

## OFFICIAL

increased numbers? Jo advised that this would be a scale issue and, although a challenge, it would be possible to share information for larger forces.

- 7.6. Board members agreed that for PEQF the narrative of 'why' was still not completely accepted across policing, as was evident from recent social media posts. The Chair observed that it was possible to have different sub-narratives for different audiences, as different initiatives would meet with approval or disapproval depending on the audience or role. Jo advised that Matt Peck, having been appointed as the interim Head of Corporate Communications, would work with the directorate on promoting the 'why'.
- 7.7. Robin Wilkinson also raised the point that there was a danger of trying to do too much, and suggested that the College should be brilliant at a small number of things. It should also be willing to be bold and provocative.
- 7.8. Clare Minchington asked if anything was being done to join up the 29 universities involved in the apprenticeship and degree schemes and identify best practice, as they would not all be experienced. It was clarified that Higher Education Institutions attended a quality panel hosted by the College for assurance purposes.

### Action

Strategy proposals for diversity to be brought to the November Board meeting. **Jo Noakes**

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the update on the Workforce Development Directorate
- (ii) **Discuss** the update and progress
- (iii) **Agree** the current priorities.

## **8. Fast Track & Direct Entry – November 2019 evaluation reports to Parliament (JN)**

- 8.1. Fast Track & Direct Entry was launched in 2014 and a report to Parliament with an evaluation in autumn 2019 was part of the original planning. The purpose was to provide an overview of how successful the programmes had been and make some recommendations on the future of the programmes. Mike Cunningham indicated that he would be interested to see the evaluation report in respect of the Direct Entry Superintendent programme, which was having limited take-up after a promising start. A fast track inspector to superintendent programme was being considered.
- 8.2. It was clarified that the reports would be approved by Professional Committee under their delegated powers from the Board and brought before the Board for noting. Robin Wilkinson advised that the Board would require assurance on the risks and implications for the reputation of the College. The Chair asked that consideration be given to bringing an early draft to the September Board meeting.

### Action

Consideration to be given the bringing an early draft of the Fast Track & Direct Entry to the September Board meeting. **Jo Noakes**

## OFFICIAL

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the review and governance process for the sign-off, publication and submission of the FTDE evaluation reports.
- (ii) **Note** the proposed content and authorship of the supporting implications paper
- (iii) **Note** the method by which force views about perceived benefits of the FTDE scheme will be captured and included in the implications paper
- (iv) **Note** the parameters for the financial analysis of FTDE programmes, to be included in the implications paper

### **ENABLING ITEMS**

#### **9. Transforming our College update (MC)**

Lisa Greenhill rejoined the meeting.

- 9.1. Mike Cunningham referred to the draft organisation design principles that had been circulated to Board members.

Christine Elliott joined the meeting at 12:29.

- 9.2. Board members agreed they were seeking a rich conversation about the design principles that would allow the Board to input their thoughts to some of the bigger questions, such as whether the College sees itself as being an agitator or implementer and whether its ambitions were passive or aspirational. It was suggested that the draft that had been circulated appeared to be based on the current position rather than an ambition for the future which did not seem congruent with the policing systems work discussed at agenda item 5 and required a fundamental rethink. Additionally it was stated that the design principles should be seen as an opportunity to reposition the College in the policing landscape and differentiate it from its current position. It was agreed that a discussion between the Board members and the KPMG team who were leading on this work would be arranged to take place as soon as possible, to enable Board members' views to be incorporated in the design work.
- 9.3. It was noted that KPMG had been retained for a 12 week period only and consequently this work would be concluded in a short timeframe.

Lisa Greenhill left the meeting.

### Action

A meeting to be arranged as soon as possible to discuss the draft design principles and for Board members to give their input. **Change Co-ordination Team**

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the progress detailed in this paper

#### **10. College Business Income (KH)**

- 10.1. Kate Husselbee explained that she had assumed responsibility for College business development in March 2019 and had since been developing an

## OFFICIAL

understanding of the College's approach to business income and to subsidising fees.

- 10.2. She advised that business income was primarily earned from international work, accommodation, and selection and assessment. Approval for subsidising fees was awaited from the Treasury after which the cost model and charging approach would be confirmed and brought to a future Board meeting.
- 10.3. The recommendations proposed an approach for the coming 18 – 24 months. The College's priority in this area would remain as providing services for England and Wales forces. There would be a focus on public sector income growth. Regarding international work, there were often costs associated in adapting the materials and it was necessary to better understand why the College was doing the work.
- 10.4. The Head of Business Development was leaving and being replaced on an interim basis pending the outcome of the organisational design work. The key consideration would be the extent to which a commercial arm should be built into the organisation, as it did not currently have the capabilities.
- 10.5. Board members generally supported the approach which was felt to be pragmatic, particularly the focus on growing public sector income. It was suggested the College should speak with other bodies currently engaged in similar activities.
- 10.6. Dave Bamber expressed a reservation that the proposed timescales may be too short. Robin Wilkinson was not in favour of pursuing income unless it was for the purpose of reinvesting in policing.
- 10.7. Paul Griffiths asked whether demand had been ascertained. He suggested that in his experience there would be an appetite from bodies such as the Ministry of Defence. Kate indicated she would discuss this further with Paul outside the meeting.
- 10.8. Relevant discussions with the Home Office focused mainly on the College's independence rather than specifically pushing for an increase in income, as well as the reduction in the College's ability to invest to save if cuts to funding continued. There was a question around the sort of relationship the College wished to have with the Home Office and Foreign and Commonwealth Office in relation to its international work. It was noted that the College had received criticism for its international work and it was essential there remain confidence in the ethical basis and purpose of the work.
- 10.9. The Chair raised concerns about College materials being used internationally by retired consultants. Rachel Tuffin advised that the leadership curriculum was being standardised to modularise it which would have the effect of it being more strictly controlled.

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Agree** the approach to subsidising College services as follows:
  - (a) *Home Office police forces*: continue to develop the cost model for each College product, and undertake an assessment to consider if any College

## OFFICIAL

products justify a level of subsidy and what level of subsidy should be applied.

- (b) *Other UK policing bodies and other public bodies:* as the cost model is developed, consider whether there is any justification to provide a subsidy in specific cases.
  - (c) *Private sector and third sector organisations:* charge commercial rates as appropriate to the sectors.
- (ii) **Agree** the approach to business income growth as follows:
- (a) *UK policing:* continue to prioritise the needs of UK policing in product design and delivery.
  - (b) *Other public bodies:* focus efforts to develop and increase business income through the sales of existing products to other public bodies.
  - (c) *Private and third sectors:* focus our efforts on demand that we identify on a reactive basis, rather than proactively developing this sector; and revisit the potential for further growth into the private sector once the College has an established approach to business development and delivery within policing and other public bodies. An approximate timescale for revisiting would be in 12-18 months' time.
- (iii) **Agree** the approach to international income as follows:
- (a) Maintain current levels of international delivery that are direct sales, rather than generated through our UK Government partners; and take a reactive rather than a proactive approach in terms of generating additional opportunities beyond our existing client base.
  - (b) Revisit the potential for further income generation internationally once the College has an established approach to business development and delivery within policing and other public bodies. An approximate timescale for revisiting would be in 12-18 months' time.
  - (c) Continue to play a role in cross-Government policy objectives and working with FCO, Home Office and NCA subject to the above, as far as our resources allow, and as long as it does not diminish our ability to deliver our core objective to support everyone working in policing to reduce crime and keep people safe.
  - (d) Agree a College approach to working with countries whose approach to human rights differs to that of the UK.

### 11. Spending Review 2020 (MC)

- 11.1. Mike Cunningham thanked Dominic Finigan and his team for preparing the Spending Review submission within short timescales which had precluded earlier Board consideration. It was not yet formally launched and uncertainty continued as to its duration.
- 11.2. The Permanent Secretary for the Home Office, Philip Rutnam, clearly wanted to put together a coherent submission to the Treasury on behalf of the Home Office and it was widely known that the Home Secretary was aiming to secure more funding for policing. The College formed part of the overall policing submission but also submitted its own proposals with regard to building a smarter system, a national attraction and recruitment programme, and transition of directly funded activity into business as usual. It was also supporting two further proposals in the

## OFFICIAL

areas of digital learning and knowledge base, and crime prevention. Further capital investment was also proposed.

- 11.3. Robin Wilkinson considered that this again raised the question of whether the College should do many things adequately or fewer things with more expertise. He questioned whether national recruitment would be an appropriate area to pursue as it represented a broadening into a difficult area. There was a risk attached to expanding without already having the confidence of the service. Mike indicated that this would be a useful conversation to have at a future Board meeting, as the bigger strategic questions would need to be discussed separately from the design principles. Christine Elliott suggested that the question that should be asked in each case was what the College's role in the system should be. It did not need to do everything itself but should have influence and be able to facilitate other parts of the system.
- 11.4. When asked if the College's proposals were likely to be successful, Mike and Kate were optimistic that at least the core part of the bid could succeed.
- 11.5. The Chair observed that it would be relevant to the design principles to understand what was likely to succeed and what would represent a risk for the College. Mike indicated that there was a need to be collectively clear on the purpose of the design principles, whether they were a statement of ambition or for a more limited purpose of assisting the designers to make assumptions about the organisation. Bernie O'Reilly and Oliver Cattermole should be present for any discussion as they had been leading the dialogue with the design consultants.
- 11.6. Ian Wylie remarked that he could see some nervousness around the table but that he would be significantly more concerned if the bid had not showcased the College as having ambition. He felt the work done was excellent.

### Action

Board members to have a further discussion on whether the College's role should be wide-ranging or more focused but expert. **Governance**

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the current uncertainty relating to the specifics of the Spending Review
- (ii) **Note** the College's initial Spending Review submission.

## 12. Management Updates

### (a) Key performance questions reporting (KH)

- 12.1. Kate Husselbee explained that the key performance questions (KPQ) approach was new to the College and the aim was to move to a fully integrated business reporting model which could be used to influence next year's business planning process. It would be done progressively, bringing a summary report to the Board, accompanied by a more in depth look at a few areas at each meeting, but continuing with parallel Finance, Performance and Risk reporting in the first instance.
- 12.2. Mike Cunningham commented that it was the first time there would be a performance reporting framework in the College. He had previously experienced its operation in practice and felt it would be an opportunity for the Board to have a line of sight across all directorates. There was a risk of drawing attention to areas in need of improvement but he would also encourage the Board to look at areas

## OFFICIAL

where the College was doing well. It would sharpen the accountability relationship. He had found in previous organisations that a numbers culture could lead to perverse incentives and felt that questions supported by figures would promote a better culture. This was echoed by Dave Bamber, who remarked that questions made people think and numbers made people count, so the KPQ approach would better facilitate improvement.

- 12.3. Board members were interested and generally in favour of trying the approach but had many questions about how it would work in practice, in particular how the answers to the questions would be measured and what good would look like. It was clarified that it was not intended to abolish quantitative data. Effective answers for some questions would still require figures and there could be a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data and targets set where appropriate.
- 12.4. Clare Minchington felt that the tool itself could be beneficial but that the strategy required to convert the plan on a page vision into practice was missing, which left a gap when applying the tool.
- 12.5. Ian Wylie had experienced the approach at the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and advised that it had taken 12 to 18 months to establish. Christine Elliott agreed, indicating that there was a body of work from improvement science around this but that it would take time. Kate advised that Durham Constabulary had adopted the approach several years previously and that it was now driving the organisation. Their key learning point had been to ensure that each stage was landed before moving on to the next. It had taken a long time and required significant cultural change.
- 12.6. Robin Wilkinson remarked that the answers to the questions would lead to further enquiry, but it would require a culture of honesty and openness to criticism. Mike agreed that honest answers were key as they would promote a better conversation around what was needed to improve.
- 12.7. The Chair was of the view that the questions themselves could not be agreed and that further discussion would be required. Mike suggested that the questions could be adapted as appropriate if not working in practice but that they could be used as a starting point. It was decided that the Board would approve the approach and note the questions in the report as being the starting point for further exploration.

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the progress on development and implementation of the KPQs
- (ii) **Approve** the proposed approach to reporting on Key Performance Questions to the Board
- (iii) **Note** the Key Performance Questions to be used as a starting point for exploration of the approach.

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

- 12.8. Kate Husselbee advised that the 5% budget cut had been confirmed, along with a cut in capital budget. The budget was currently on track, though it was early in the year. In relation to internal audit progress, the homeworking audit at the end of the 2018-19 programme had encouragingly been rated 'Substantial'. The first internal audit for 2019-20 was in progress, in the area of approach to business development. A counter-fraud compliance consultancy review was also in progress.

## OFFICIAL

- 12.9. The risk registers had been revised to align with Plan on a Page. The new registers were considered by the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) on 5 June and it was not proposed to bring these to the Board. The approach to risk appetite was also considered by the Executive and ARC. The College risk appetite was deemed to be cautious but with the flexibility to vary this depending on the particular context and circumstances at the time.
- 12.10. A new programme of assurance activities had been agreed by ARC. This addressed the recommendations and actions identified by the GIAA's audit on Second Line Assurance Checks and supported the arrangements set out in the College's Board Assurance Framework. Clare Minchington added that GIAA had been very complimentary in the ARC meeting about the work on the assurance framework.
- 12.11. The Chair asked why all the internal audit actions were amber. Kate explained that a number of the actions were dependent on other timelines: the ERP system replacement depended on the Home Office timetable; benefits management was dependent on the change programme. The Key Financial Controls actions were behind due to a shortage of resources.

### Decision

The Board resolved to **note** the:

- (i) Updates on finance, internal audit, strategic risks, and current priority initiatives
- (ii) Government Internal Audit Agency (GIAA) annual overall audit opinion rating for the College 2018/19
- (iii) The reporting for the first time on our Business Plan deliverables
- (iv) The progress made to improve the College's Assurance processes

## 13. Committee Updates

### **(a) Audit & Risk Committee (CM)**

- 13.1. The most recent Audit & Risk Committee had taken place on 5 June 2019. Clare Minchington indicated that the quality of the work brought to the meeting had been excellent. She advised that the Government Internal Audit Agency Annual Report and Opinion had been considered. The Opinion was moderate but it had been emphasised that interaction with the College was strong, its recommendation tracking was excellent and it was on a positive trajectory.

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the matters discussed and decisions taken at the Audit & Risk Committee meeting on 5 June 2019.

### **(b) Nominations & Remuneration Committee (CE)**

- 13.2. The most recent Nominations & Remuneration Committee had taken place on 13 June 2019. Christine Elliott had taken up her new role as Chair of NRC and Ian Wylie had newly joined the committee.
- 13.3. The CEO's annual appraisal had taken place and he was commended for his performance over the previous year, having met and exceeded expectations.
- 13.4. It was clarified that the committee did not review objectives for the rest of the Executive as the objective-setting structure had not previously been sufficiently

## OFFICIAL

embedded. This could however be reviewed and there was support from Board members for this to be done.

### Action

Objective setting for the wider Executive to be considered when reviewing the NRC Terms of Reference. **Governance**

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the matters discussed and decisions taken at the Nominations and Remuneration Committee meeting on 13 June 2019.

#### **(c) Professional Committee (JMCC)**

- 13.5. Janette McCormick advised that the Professional Committee had considered one item in relation to the Code of Practice on Armed Policing. There was one piece of feedback to incorporate, around data capture in relation to young people.
- 13.6. It was clarified that the Code had been approved by Professional Committee under its delegated powers from the Board and the next step would be for it to go to the Home Secretary.
- 13.7. There had been some confusion about it having bypassed the College Regulatory Consultative Group (CRCG). Dave Bamber was invited to comment on this aspect and advised that it concerned an update rather than a significant change, so the issue had been resolved and the correct process was now being followed.

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the matter discussed and decision taken at the Professional Committee meeting held on 13 June 2019.

## **PART THREE – ITEMS FOR NOTING**

### **14. Chair's Update (MB)**

- 14.1. The Chair advised that she had met with Nick Hurd, the Policing Minister. They had discussed system working and the Chair's experience in the NHS. She had asked if he had given thought to working outside the policing system when considering system improvements. He indicated he had not but would be open to suggestion on the subject.

### **15. Chief Executive's Report (MC)**

- 15.1. Mike Cunningham advised that Jo Noakes would be attending the Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC) to give evidence with HMICFRS and IOPC as part of the Inquiry on the MacPherson Report: Twenty Years On. It was anticipated that she would face questions on disproportionality in police recruitment. The Chair asked for the HASC briefing to be shared with Board members.
- 15.2. The roll out of PEQF had commenced, with the programme underway in a number of forces. Lincolnshire and Bedfordshire PCCs had spoken against it as they felt it was inappropriate. There were also separate implementation challenges, in particular regarding cost and abstraction. Jo and her team were

## OFFICIAL

working closely with forces to support implementation and ensure abstraction modelling was based on the right information. Mike had just been made party to a letter from the Home Secretary to the Lincolnshire PCC advising that it was a matter for the College and he was satisfied that it was being done correctly. Board members viewed this as a positive development.

- 15.3. Dave Bamber advised that concerns related primarily to abstractions but also included concerns about the implications of working with universities on implementation. Basic questions were still being asked, including by Human Resources departments. Much of the concern was being caused by misinformation and it was advised to reissue the FAQs on PEQF.
- 15.4. The findings and recommendations of the front line review were being launched on 10 July 2019, with Bernie O'Reilly and Jo Noakes representing the College. Mike had chaired the front line review steering group. The review had involved wide-scale consultation. Key recommendations included that the front line should have an opportunity to influence change; that working patterns should balance operational demands and personal needs; and that there was a disproportionate level of bureaucracy. Wellbeing should be evaluated at a national level and HMICFRS should inspect on the extent to which wellbeing was embedded in forces.

### Action

FAQs on PEQF to be reissued. **Jo Noakes**

Briefing for the Home Affairs Select Committee Inquiry on the MacPherson Report: Twenty Years On to be shared with Board members. **Jo Noakes**

### **16. Brexit Impact Group Update**

- 16.1. Janette McCormick advised that Brexit was included on the Strategic Risk Register and the Brexit Impact Group was monitoring developments. There were two national groups, on both of which the College had representation. A review of College products had already taken place in readiness for Brexit.

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

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

### **17. Stakeholder Information Briefing**

- 17.1. Dave Bamber praised the quality of this briefing and the weekly communication to Board Members.

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION OF BUSINESS**

### **18. Any Other Business**

- 18.1. No additional matters were raised for discussion.

### **19. Review of the meeting**

- 19.1. Mary Calam was invited to comment on her observation of the meeting. She commented that she had observed a good range of skills, interesting contributions and constructive challenge. Board members had praised the quality

## OFFICIAL

of the papers and given clear direction on next steps. Some fundamental issues had emerged as requiring discussion, in particular regarding the remit of the College and the design principles.

### **20. Close of the meeting**

20.1. There being no further business the meeting was closed at 14:55.

**Date of next meeting:** 18<sup>th</sup> September 2019

**Name of Chair:** Millie Banerjee