



To: Business Coordination Board

From: Chief Executive

Date: 22 June 2017

INTEGRITY CONTROLS ASSURANCE

1. Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to provide the Business Coordination Board ("the Board") with a report on the non-financial integrity arrangements that the Police and Crime Commissioner (the "Commissioner") and Cambridgeshire Constabulary ("the Constabulary") have in place and their effectiveness. This is the third report and covers the period April 2016 to March 2017.

1.2 The report specifically provides a summary of:

- the controls process, how the various control processes have operated during the reporting period and evidence of their effectiveness; and
- complaints and any learning that should be applied.

1.3 The report can be found at Appendix A.

2. Recommendation

2.1 The Board is recommended to note the report.



OVERVIEW OF INTEGRITY CONTROLS ASSURANCE

This is the third Integrity Controls Assurance Framework Report on the non-financial integrity arrangements that the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner (the “Commissioner”) and Cambridgeshire Constabulary (the “Constabulary”) have in place. This report covers the period from April 2016 to March 2017.

This Report provides assurance that both the Commissioner and the Constabulary fully recognise and support the principle that all those in policing should uphold and embed the highest standards of ethical behaviour, personal conduct, and at the same time be transparent and accountable for their actions.

Integrity – ‘doing the right thing in the right way’ - cuts across all areas of policing in respect of the decisions that are made and how people are treated. Both the Commissioner and the Constabulary are committed to the need for governance, oversight and the delivery of professional behaviour within the Constabulary and the Commissioner’s own office, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. The Chief Constable has reiterated the Constabulary’s commitment to integrity as a core value of his vision for a safer Cambridgeshire.

The responsibility for integrity is both at an institutional level and a personal level to meet the expectations of the public. The public’s confidence in police integrity can be met, and equally undermined, in the light of their own experiences, those within their communities, and those relating to national issues whether current or historical. Therefore, we must have mechanisms to respond to, and rebuild confidence, which resonate with national requirements but recognise our local identity.

The College of Policing’s Code of Ethics is not just a piece of paper. Its principles are that integrity ‘is at the heart of every policy, procedure, decision and action in policing’ to ensure that there are the highest personal standards for everyone in policing. No one element or approach to driving integrity can stand-alone. Pro-activity around integrity such as the Code, behaviours, conduct, decision making, governance processes and controls assurances, are taken together to ensure the public can be assured that the Commissioner, his office, and the Constabulary, acting fairly, honestly, respectively and ethically.

Future reforms in policing spearheaded by the Home Secretary, including legislative proposals on the way complaints are managed, will continue to drive up standards. There is no room for complacency. The Commissioner and the Chief Constable recognise the need to build upon and enhance integrity.

This Report specifically provides a summary of:

- the controls process, how the various control processes have operated during the reporting period and evidence of their effectiveness; and
- complaints and any learning that should be applied.

Dr Dorothy Gregson
Chief Executive, Office of Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Integrity is about 'doing the right thing in the right way'. The Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner (the "Commissioner") and the Chief Constable are clear that integrity is the responsibility of all those in policing. The demonstration of integrity is not one that can easily be measured by statistics alone. Equally, integrity should not be driven by a target culture which can create perverse incentives and consequently drive down public confidence. Whilst outputs and statistics can be useful, for example in measuring compliance with statutory guidance for complaint handling timescales, outcomes are the key measure.
- 1.2 Outcomes can be realised in many ways across the integrity agenda and can be influenced by a number of factors. What is important is that there is a culture of integrity and that there are appropriate levels of scrutiny, challenge and support to ensure that policing principles and standards of professional behaviour are embedded in everyday policing; ones which the public can have confidence in.
- 1.3 Robust control processes have continued to be in place during the reporting period of April 2016 to March 2017 to ensure the non-financial integrity of policing in Cambridgeshire. These processes have pro-actively driven a culture of integrity through establishing standards, setting methods for measuring actual performance, comparing results, taking into account risks, issues and mitigation, reinforcing strengths and taking necessary corrective action.
- 1.4 These processes have taken place at a range of levels to provide appropriate control and assurance in terms of both hierarchy and independence. This means that some of these processes are the sole or joint responsibility of the Commissioner and/or the Chief Constable. Some relate to Cambridgeshire's oversight responsibility on behalf of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire, as collaboration partners, for some business areas such as the Professional Standards Department (PSD).

2. Control processes

- 2.1 The three controls governance groupings to reflect the business or their autonomy are:
 - 'domestic' – those that deal with integrity within the Constabulary and on behalf of the Commissioner;
 - Collaborative – those where the Constabulary and the Commissioner are responsible for leading on behalf of the strategic collaborative alliance with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire;
 - Independent – those that have independent members.
- 2.2 Each of these controls processes were described in the first Annual Integrity Controls Assurance Framework Report presented to the Joint Audit Committee in March 2015. For ease of reference these are given at Annex 1.

3. Evidence of the control processes being used and their effectiveness

Domestic – *those that deal with the integrity within the Constabulary and on behalf of the Commissioner*

- 3.1 The various control processes and the respective governance groups as given at Annex 1, continue to function in their respective roles, provide support, challenge and scrutiny in line with their purpose and met regularly.
- 3.2 The Commissioner's **Business Co-ordination Board** has met 10 times. The Board has pro-actively set the agenda by calling for reports to ensure the Constabulary are held to account regarding matters relating to integrity, including the Commissioner's key decisions, such as those in respect of collaboration with other police forces, financial spend, and estates disposal.
- 3.3 A **Performance Working Group** was created in May 2017 as a new controls assurance group. This has enabled the Commissioner to hold the Chief Constable to account for the Constabulary's performance. The Group has pro-actively identified matters of concerns at both local level generated through public interaction and correspondence, such as call handling, and those of national significance such as hate crime (domestic abuse and response times).
- 3.4 In spring 2017, a new **Performance Framework** was developed to align with the Commissioner's new Police and Crime Plan. The Framework is qualitative and embraces an assessment of vulnerability and impact on long term demand.
- 3.5 The **Constabulary's new board and governance structures** are now embedded since their inception in March 2014. The driver for the new structure was to utilise HMIC's Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy Programme (PEEL) inspection methodology.
- 3.6 The Constabulary has also formed two new controls assurance bodies to ensure greater public accountability and scrutiny around Stop Search. The **All Stops Steering and Scrutiny Group** and the **Stop Search Public Scrutiny Group**. In September 2016 HMIC informed the Constabulary that they were now compliant with the new Stop and Search requirements.

Collaborative – *those where the Constabulary and the Commissioner are responsible for leading on behalf of the strategic collaborative alliance with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire*

- 3.7 **Organisational Support Governance Board**, as part of the governance for the Strategic Alliance, ensuring transparency in terms of risks and allowing partners to hold the Commissioner to account with respect to his responsibility for PSD.

Independent – *those that have independent members*

- 3.8 The **Police and Crime Panel**. See reports at each meeting with regard to the Commissioner's key decisions for consideration and any complaints made against the Commissioner, a number of specific papers on the Commissioner's work and how he has held the Constabulary to account are presented, for example on call handling and crime recording.

- 3.9 The independent **Out of Court Disposals Scrutiny Panel** continues to meet three times a year and has considered a range of randomly selected cases that have been resolved by use of an out of court disposal. The Panel actively challenges the Constabulary to ensure the action taken was appropriate in the circumstances.
- 3.10 The **Stop Search Public Scrutiny Group** is an independent group chaired by a community member and made up of key community representatives, including those groups most subject to Stop Search. The Group meets on a quarterly basis and provides advice, guidance and scrutiny around all aspects of Stop Search, from a community perspective. This includes setting a community trigger following complaints, influencing policy change, witnessing stop search in action, via Body Worn Video footage, inspecting Stop Search records and aiding decision making.
- 4. External integrity drivers**
- 4.1 HMIC has undertaken a number of inspections of the Constabulary during this reporting period, the purpose of which being to monitor the Constabulary's performance. Some inspections have been solely on the Constabulary's effectiveness and efficiency, others have been thematic¹. Results can be found on the HMIC web site <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmic/peel-assessments/peel-2016/cambridgeshire/>
- 4.2 The Constabulary track progress on HMIC recommendations through their **Organisational Improvement Group** and, in addition for the ones relating to PSD, through the Alliance Sub-Group and Governance Board.
- 5. Complaints update – delivery of integrity**
- 5.1 By its legislative nature, a complaints process is primarily predicated on statutory requirements, such as recording timescales advocated by the IPCC. Nonetheless, a complaints process should be able to challenge the culture of an organisation and in doing so ensure that robust checks and balances are in place, and that learning is seen as a necessary outcome for individual officers, staff and the organisation.
- 5.2 The Chief Constable has underlined that integrity is at the root of all the Constabulary do, so consequently there are roles and responsibilities for all officers and staff in the complaints process. In addition, this also brings accountability to those who have a legal responsibilities placed upon them to ensure this integrity is upheld.
- 5.3 PSD undertakes reactive and proactive investigations and management of misconduct and complaints against the Constabulary. The Commissioner has a statutory duty to monitor complaints and to handle complaints against the Chief Constable. The Police and Crime Panel has a statutory duty to handle complaints against the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- 5.4 During the period of this report the Commissioner received 10 complaints against the Chief Constable. None of these were upheld by the Commissioner in line with statutory guidance, or the IPCC (to date) where the complainant exercised their right of appeal.

¹ These inspections examine a key issue across a representative number of forces, and comment solely on performance in relation to that key issue.

5.5 The Panel recorded two complaints against the Commissioner and none against the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner. The Panel's Complaints Sub-Committee considered the complaint and agreed that no further action was to be taken against the Commissioner but made some recommendations.

6. Forward Look

6.1 2017 onwards will be a challenging year. Changes in legislation are likely to radically change the way in which complaints are handled. The focus on governance will become even more key. Whilst there are robust structures and procedures in place which make for a strong foundation, it may be healthy and opportune to review the controls assurance landscape to ensure it continues to be fit for purpose.

Annex 1

Control processes - *as presented to Joint Audit Committee at March 2015.*

Domestic - *those that deal with integrity within the Constabulary and on behalf of the Commissioner*

Business Co-ordination Board

The Business Coordination Board (BCB) will continue to meet and these have been scheduled to be held on a six weekly basis between the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, senior officers from the Constabulary and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC), chaired by the Commissioner. The BCB takes a risk-based approach. Minutes of the meeting and key papers are published on the Commissioner's website.

Force Executive Board

The Force Executive Board (FEB) is the Constabulary's most senior management team, the Board meet on a monthly basis. FEB members include the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable and Assistant Chief Constable. The remaining members each represent a directorate or department and staff association representatives. All the members support and advise the Chief Constable in the overall strategic direction of the Constabulary.

Crime Data Integrity Working Group

The Constabulary's Crime Data Integrity Working Group was established in November 2013 to ensure recording is accurate and victim focussed. The Group meets monthly and considers and embeds recommendations from national and Constabulary specific reports into working practices.

Collaborative - *those where the Constabulary and the Commissioner are the responsible for leading on behalf of the strategic collaborative alliance with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire*

PSD Governance Board

This Board meets every three months and is chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable from the Constabulary with senior level membership from the Constabulary, Bedfordshire Police and Hertfordshire Constabulary, along with the Cambridgeshire OPCC representing the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire OPCCs. The Board is responsible for the governance and oversight of all PSD business.

Independent - *those that have independent members.*

Police and Crime Panel

The Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel provides support and challenge to the Commissioner. The Police and Crime Panel also has a statutory role of overseeing all complaints against the Commissioner and the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner. Any

complaints are handled in accordance with the legislation, IPCC guidance and their own Complaints Procedure. A report is presented to the Police and Crime Panel at each meeting updating them on any complaints received against the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner.

Joint Audit Committee

The Joint Audit Committee comprises five members who are independent of the Commissioner and the Constabulary. The Committee, which meets quarterly, provides an independent assurance on the adequacy of the corporate governance and risk management arrangements in place.

Out of Court Disposals Scrutiny Panel

The purpose of the Scrutiny Panel is to independently review a selection of anonymised cases that have been resolved by use of an out of court disposal by the Constabulary. Its aim is to determine whether the method of disposal, such as a cannabis warning or a simple caution, is considered appropriate based on a review of the information available to the decision maker at the time. The Panel meets three times a year and has an independent Chair and membership, made up from representatives of the judiciary, Crown Prosecution Service and Youth Offending Teams. The Constabulary takes the Panel's recommendations and actively translate these into learning and development at both individual feedback level and across the Constabulary.