



To: Business Coordination Board

From: Acting Chief Executive

Date: 28 October 2020

INTEGRITY CONTROLS ASSURANCE

1. Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to provide the Business Co-ordination Board (the “Board”) with a report on the non-financial integrity arrangements that the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner (the “Acting Commissioner”) and Cambridgeshire Constabulary (the “Constabulary”) have in place and their effectiveness. This is the fifth report and covers the period April 2019 to March 2020.

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 update.

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 fifth Integrity Controls Assurance Framework Report on the non-financial integrity arrangements that the Cambridgeshire Acting Police and Crime Commissioner (the “Acting Commissioner”) and Cambridgeshire Constabulary (the “Constabulary”) have in place. This report covers the period from April 2019 to March 2020.

This Report provides assurance that both the Acting 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 Acting Commissioner and the Constabulary are committed to the need for governance, oversight and the delivery of professional behaviour within the Constabulary and the Acting 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 Acting Commissioner, his office, and the Constabulary, acting fairly, honestly, respectively and ethically.

The Home Secretary introduced new legislation from February 2020 designed to achieve a more customer-focused and simplified complaints system whilst putting an emphasis on individual and organisational learning. Whilst there is no room for complacency, the Acting 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 update

James Haylett

Acting 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 Acting Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner (the “Acting 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, 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 2019 to March 2020 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 Acting 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 Acting Commissioner;
 - Collaborative – those where the Constabulary and the Acting Commissioner are responsible for leading on behalf of the strategic collaborative alliance with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire (the “Strategic Alliance”);
 - 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 (but has been updated to reflect changes since then). For ease of reference these are given at Annex 1.

3. Evidence of the control processes being used and their effectiveness during the reporting period (April 2019 – March 2020)

Domestic – those that deal with the integrity within the Constabulary and on behalf of the Acting 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 Acting Commissioner’s **Business Co-ordination Board** has met 11 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 performance and integrity. Reports have also included the Commissioner’s key decisions, such as those in respect of collaboration with other police forces, financial spend, estates and complaints policy review.
- 3.3 A new group “Resources Group” was established in January 2020; this is a sub group of the Acting Commissioner’s Business Co-ordination Board. The purpose of this Group is to enable strategic discussions concerning the resourcing requirements for the delivery of the Acting Commissioner’s Police and Crime Plan (the “Plan”). To consider the implications of forecasting (environmental scanning, strategic assessments, demand, risks) and the development and integration of key organisational management strategies. Membership of the Resource Group consists of the senior leadership teams from the Acting Commissioner’s Office and the group meet every month.
- 3.4 The Constabulary launched their new Corporate Plan, which was originally planned for February 2020 but delayed, due to Covid-19, to June 2020. The Corporate Plan focuses on the Constabulary’s operational and organisation priorities. A new performance framework has been developed linking the Corporate Plan to the themes within the Acting Commissioner’s Plan with both qualitative and quantitative measures and reported to the Acting Commissioner’s monthly Business Co-ordination Board.
- 3.5 The Constabulary’s have a number of board and governance structures in place. The driver for these being to utilise Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue (HMICFRS)’s Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy Programme (PEEL) inspection methodology.

Collaborative

Professional Standards Department (PSD)

- 3.6 The Commissioner’s office undertook a series of random sampling of complaints to monitor the way in which the Constabulary responds to these and the lessons learnt. Further assurance regarding complaint handling was gained during the year through the Commissioner being represented on the PSD Governance Board.

This provided the opportunity to support and scrutinise policies, procedures, and performance related to complaint handling, anti-corruption, and vetting, in line with legislation, national guidance and the Code of Ethics for policing.

Independent – those that have independent members

- 3.7 The **Police and Crime Panel (the “Panel”)** have met approximately six occasions in the 12 months to March 2020, where they see reports at each meeting in respect of their remit to scrutinise and support the Acting Commissioner in the exercise of his statutory functions. Reports have included how the Acting Commissioner is monitoring the delivery of his Plan, the demonstration of the transparency and integrity regarding financial planning, such as the Medium Term Financial Strategy leading up to the final Budget and Precept reports, and how the Commissioner is holding the Constabulary to account. The Panel also reviewed the Commissioner’s key decisions for consideration and considered complaints made against the former Police and Crime Commissioner.
- 3.8 The independent **Out of Court Disposals Scrutiny Panel** continues to meet four times a year and a member of the Acting Commissioner’s office sits on this Panel in an observer capacity. The Scrutiny Panel has considered a range of randomly selected cases that have been resolved by use of an out of court disposal and actively challenges the Constabulary to ensure the action taken was appropriate in the circumstances.
- 3.9 The **Joint Audit Committee** meets on a quarterly basis and they consider the adequacy of the governance and risk management framework (Strategic and Operational Risk Registers and Internal and External Audit Plans and audits), the internal control environment and financial reporting. They provide independent advice and assurance to the Commissioner and Chief Constable.

4. External integrity drivers

- 4.1 HMICFRS 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, including Stalking and Harassment, Counter terrorism, Crimes against older people. Details of these and more can be found on the HMICFRS web site². The most recent HMICFRS PEEL inspection report covering the period 2018/19, which was published in February 2020, found that the Constabulary were judged as “Good” in all areas of the assessment. This was the first time that the Constabulary had been given this suite of ‘Good’ gradings since the assessments started in 2014. The Acting Commissioner has a statutory duty to respond to the Home Secretary regarding HMICFRS inspections, the responses are published on the Commissioners website³
- 4.2 The Constabulary track progress on HMICFRS recommendations through their Governance and Inspection Team with regular progress updates provided to the constabulary Change Board, and, in addition for the ones relating to Professional Standards Department (PSD), through the PSD Governance Board. Inspection reports are also taken to the Constabulary’s Force Executive Board and the Acting Commissioner’s Business Co-ordination Board. This contributes to the Acting

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

² [HMICFRS publication](#)

³ [Commissioners Web Site](#).

Commissioner fulfilling his statutory duty in preparing and publishing comments on the reports as required by, section 55 of the Police Act 1996.

5. Complaints update

- 5.1 There are a number of roles and responsibilities within the complaints system. The Acting Commissioner has a statutory duty to handle complaints made against the Chief Constable, undertake reviews of complaints, and monitor the complaints system. The Chief Constable is responsible, as the Appropriate Authority, for complaints and conduct matters relating to his officers and staff, although he has delegated this function. The Panel has a statutory duty to handle complaints against the Acting Commissioner and a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner, with delegated authority given in certain circumstances being given to the Monitoring Officer, OPCC.
- 5.2 By its legislative nature, a complaints process is primarily predicated on statutory requirements, such as recording timescales 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.
- 5.3 The Policing and Crime Act 2017 and supporting regulations made significant changes to the police complaints and disciplinary systems. They brought in a number of changes designed to achieve a more customer-focused and simplified complaints system, so complaints can be dealt with quickly, effectively and proportionately, with the emphasis on individual and organisational learning. This in part has impacted on the way complaints against the Constabulary are handled, and the Acting Commissioner's involvement in the complaints process. From the 1st February 2020, the Acting Commissioner became the relevant review body for low level complaints and the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) being the responsible body for serious complaints such as Chief officer complaints or gross misconduct. During this reporting period there was one request submitted to the Acting Commissioner for review, this was concluded in April 2020 and upheld in favor of the outcome reached by the Constabulary. Further information is available on the Commissioner's website⁴.
- 5.4 During this reporting period the Acting Commissioner received three concerns regarding the Chief Constable, which were considered and dealt with by the OPCC. One of these was formally recorded as a complaint in line with statutory guidance.
- 5.5 The Panel received four complaints against the former Police and Crime Commissioner. Of these, one was forwarded directly to the IOPC, which the IOPC subsequently investigated. No complaints were received against the Acting Commissioner in his current capacity or in his previous capacity as Deputy Commissioner.

6. Forward Look

- 6.1 2020 thus far has been a challenging year due to the Covid-19 pandemic and demand on the Constabulary following the introduction of new powers in response to the pandemic and a national graduated approach of "Engage, Explain, Encourage and Enforce" to the use of legislation. The use of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN) issued by police forces under the Coronavirus regulations has gained interest locally and

nationally in respect of their use. Monitoring of the FPN is via the Out of Court Scrutiny Panel, where a sample are reviewed at their quarterly meetings.

- 6.2 The Acting Commissioner has discussed with the Chief Constable the need for an independent scrutiny group – one that has a remit to look at the Constabulary’s use of stop and search and use of force, amongst other things. The Acting Commissioner is clear that to have in place a group that is independent and representative of the communities the Constabulary serves will be hugely beneficial. It will bring a community perspective to gain an understanding of the extent of any local concerns regarding integrity issues and an insight on policing policies and practices and their impact within these communities. It is hoped that this group will be in placed by the end of 2020.

⁴<https://www.cambridgeshire-pcc.gov.uk/accessing-information/complaints/complaints-review/>

Annex 1

Control processes

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

Business Co-ordination Board

The Business Coordination Board (BCB) meets on a four to six weekly basis and is Chaired by the Acting Commissioner, and whose members are from the Constabulary's Chief Officer Team, and the Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC). The BCB takes a proportionate and risk-based approach to governance and reporting requirements, being mindful of both the Acting Commissioner's and the Chief Constable's statutory duties. Minutes of the meeting and key papers are published on the Acting Commissioner's website, unless officially sensitive or commercial in confidence.

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.

Data Integrity Delivery Group

The Group meets regularly 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 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, and OPCC representatives from their respective OPCC offices. The Board is responsible for the governance and oversight of all PSD business. Updates from this Board are provided to both the Joint Chief Officer Board and Strategic Alliance Summit, chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable from Cambridgeshire Constabulary.

Independent – those that have independent members.

Police and Crime Panel

The Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel provides support and challenge to the Acting Commissioner. The Police and Crime Panel also has a statutory role of overseeing all complaints against the Acting Commissioner. Any complaints are handled in accordance with the legislation, IOPC 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 Acting 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 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 four times a year and has an independent Chair and membership, made up from representatives of the judiciary, Crown Prosecution Service, Youth Offending Teams and includes a representative from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner in an observer capacity. The Constabulary takes the Panel's recommendations and actively translate these into learning and development at both individual feedback level and across the Constabulary.