

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND INTEGRITY SUB (POLICE) COMMITTEE
Wednesday, 1 March 2017

Minutes of the meeting of the Professional Standards and Integrity Sub (Police)
Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on
Wednesday, 1 March 2017 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Alderman Alison Gowman (Chairman)
Nicholas Bensted-Smith
James Tumbridge

Officers:

Fern Aldous	-	Town Clerk's Department
Oliver Bolton	-	Town Clerk's Department
Alistair Sutherland	-	Assistant Commissioner, City of London Police
Dermont Robinson	-	Director of Professional Standards, City of London Police
Stuart Phoenix	-	Head of Strategic Development, City of London Police

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Henry Pollard, Helen Marshall and James Thomson.

2. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF PERSONAL OR PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on the 2 December 2016 be approved as an accurate record.

4. PRESENTATION: SPECIAL CONSTABLES IN THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS DEPARTMENT

The Sub-Committee heard a verbal update from the Director of Professional Standards regarding the Special Constables employed by the Professional Standards Department. A full presentation on the Special Constables would be presented to the next meeting of the Grand Committee. The following points were noted:

- There were three special constables employed in the PSD department; two in the investigative team and one in the counter corruption team.
- There had been national acknowledgment of the initiative to use Special Constables in non-patrol roles.
- The Specials brought unique skills to the role and could bring a new perspective to investigations; for example, an inconsistency in the

deployment plan and omissions in the management and training of staff were identified.

- A review of the use of Special Constable across departments was being undertaken to ensure that their skills were identified and deployed to the greatest advantage. It was recognised that the City of London Police were national leaders in this area.

In response to a query from a Member regarding the recruitment of Special Constables, Officers undertook to investigate the motivation behind how and why they joined the professional standards department. It was confirmed they currently undertook approximately 12 hours of work per week.

RECEIVED.

5. INTEGRITY REPORT AND DASHBOARD

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Commissioner of Police outlining recent changes in the integrity dashboard. It was noted that, due to the timing of the meetings, the analysis from the Integrity Standards Board was not included in the report. Members discussed the following indicators from the dashboard:

Indicator 6: Corporate Credit Card Transactions.

Members queried whether zero instances of irregular use was indicative of a poor monitoring system, or whether unauthorised use diminished when monitoring was occurring. Officers reported that training had been delivered to authorisers to ensure correct usage, and there had been a reduction in the number of new cards issued.

Indicator 8: Expenses Claims

Members queried how the intelligence led research was conducted. It was confirmed that attempted claims that were non-compliant were scrutinised.

Indicator 12: Information Security

Members queried the pool from which the dip sample of 1% was taken. Officers undertook to provide this information.

Indicator 14: Re-Vetting

It was reported that additional staff had been contracted for a six week period to help with the additional workload and backlog of the re-vetting process. It was recognised there were surges in demand.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

6. DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY PLAN

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Commissioner of Police presenting the development and delivery plan which would help to embed the code of Ethics into working practice. It was reported that the Ethics Board had held its first meeting and had discussed the best way to assess ethical issues that arose. It was decided that each would be judged against the principles laid out in the code of ethics, as well as weighting being given to whether the

incident had an adverse impact on a victim or if it affected service delivery. The board were happy to receive anonymous issues and observers were welcomed to the meetings. A professionalism newsletter had recently been introduced to further embed the code of ethics into decision making.

The Sub-Committee discussed the Strategic Risk Assessment Sessions (STRAs) that were conducted to identify threats and vulnerabilities in departments. They were reported to be an effective and useful meeting and had recognised the need for extra resources across the PSD Department. A summary report from the session would be produced.

It was reported that the actions identified as “amber” were not a cause for concern and that work was ongoing to progress these.

A Member raised the issue of acronyms within the report and the inconsistency of the glossary. Officers undertook to remedy the issue.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

7. **HMIC PEEL INSPECTION**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police presenting the findings of the HMIC PEEL inspection which had taken place in June 2016, alongside the action plan compiled to track the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report.

The inspection report had been finalised in December, and Members discussed the sharing of the draft version of the report, which had been available in November, so the Committee could conduct more effective scrutiny. Officers reported that the final version of the report could change significantly to the draft, and that the draft was marked as “sensitive” so were reluctant for it to be widely shared. Officers undertook to approach HMIC regarding the issue.

It was noted that there were a number of outstanding actions from the action tracker still denoted as “amber”. It was felt that the timescales attributed to the actions from HMIC were arbitrary, and that the actions were close to being completed. It was felt that the Force was in a good position compared to the national results. Forces that had achieved “outstanding” results were consulted on for best practice; a culture of learning was being adopted.

It was confirmed that the action plan would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

8. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED - That Under Section 100 (A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1, Paragraphs 1, 2 and 7 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

9. **BODY WORN VIDEO CAMERAS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Commissioner of Police concerning the use of body worn video cameras.

10. **MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

Members discussed a report detailing progress on issues outstanding from previous meetings.

11. **PUBLIC CONFIDENCE SURVEY 2016**

The Sub-Committee received a letter in relation to the Public Confidence Survey which had been conducted in 2016.

12. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

The Sub-Committee considered the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2016.

13. **CASES OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Sub-Committee considered cases outstanding from the previous meeting.

14. **PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS STATISTICS - QUARTER 3 OCTOBER TO DECEMBER 2016**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police regarding the Professional Standards Statistics for Quarter 3.

14.1 **Summary of Cases**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

14.2 **Misconduct Hearings**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

14.3 **Misconduct Meetings**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

14.4 **Case to Answer**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

14.5 **No Case to Answer**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

14.6 **Local Resolution**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

14.7 **Discontinuance and Disapplication**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

15. **IPCC POLICE COMPLAINTS INFORMATION BULLETIN APRIL-DECEMBER 2016**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Commissioner of Police.

The meeting ended at 3:45pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Fern Aldous
tel. no.: 020 7332 3113
fern.aldous@cityoflondon.gov.uk**