



## Cleveland Police Ethics Committee

### Minutes

**Date:** Tuesday 8 December 2020

**Time:** 16:00

**Venue:** Via MS Teams

#### Attendees:

Name	Role
Dave Smith	Committee Chair
Richard Smith	Committee Vice Chair
Khan Hanif	Committee Member
Craig Marshall	Committee Member
Georgina Fletcher	Committee Member
Rachelle Kipling	Interim Assistant Chief Executive – Cleveland OPCC
Jenni Salkeld	EDI Manager – Cleveland OPCC
John Dodsworth	Operational Ethics Lead Sergeant – Cleveland Police
John Bonner	Complaints & Discipline Chief Inspector – Cleveland Police
Paul Waugh	Complaints & Discipline Superintendent – Cleveland Police
Nick Hunt	Corruption Prevention Officer – Cleveland Police
Charlotte Rumins	Community Hub Advisor – Cleveland OPCC (Minutes)

#### Apologies:

Name	Role
Isaac Holmes	EDI Officer – Cleveland OPCC
Ian Arundale	Temporary Deputy Chief Constable – Cleveland Police
Tresor Bukasa	Committee Member
Stuart Green	Committee Member

No.	Discussed	Outcome/Decision/ Attachment
1	<b>Introduction and Apologies</b>  Apologies for absence were noted from Lisa Oldroyd, Tresor Bukasa and Georgina Fletcher.	

<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Declarations of Conflicts of Interest (if any)</b></p> <p>DS declared his interest as being a member of the Internal Ethics and Standards Board.</p> <p>It was noted that all external lay members have signed a confidentiality agreement and the matters discussed within this meeting are protected by that agreement.</p>	
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes of the Previous Meeting and Matters Arising</b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.</p> <p>Following on from the previous meeting, DS noted that he has requested CR circulate a link to a recent news article on his behalf in relation to Hate Incidents which are not considered to be Hate Crimes and it was acknowledged that the matter remains pertinent.</p> <p>PW noted that an appeal has been received and rebutted in relation to the business interest raised within the previous meeting. The parties involved in the business interest have now been informed that it is inappropriate, and it has been recommended that they no longer participate in the business.</p> <p>DS queried whether an action log is currently in place for the outcomes of the Committee’s discussions. This would provide a history and allow future updates when themes the group have discussed are operationalised. JS noted that this will sit holistically as opposed to just with the Independent Ethics Committee, JD added that it would be worth expanding upon the template which had been produced for the Audit Committee. It was agreed that the document would be formulated outside of the meeting, brought to the next Triage meeting and subsequently to the main Committee itself.</p>	<p><b>Holistic action log to be produced for ethical advisory groups.</b></p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Updates from Previous Submissions</b></p> <p><b>Gifts and Gratuities Update</b></p> <p>JD noted that the policy was assigned to a PC within the Department of Standards &amp; Ethics. Engagement took place with other force areas to compare the approaches and identify best practice. The process has now been amended with additional consideration on the impact that declining may have on the person who is offering the gift.</p> <p>JD provided an overview of the processes for the different levels of approval. There is an onus on staff to record every acceptance or rejection of gifts or hospitality. Guidance has also been made available to set out key features of genuine, transparent gifting.</p> <p>CM queried the force position on cash, JD noted that any cash received ordinarily goes into charity boxes if receipt of it is unavoidable.</p>	

	<p>GF queried the reference to cultural gifting and asked how it is structured within the policy. JS noted that it came up as a point from the EDI reviews which had been conducted whilst the policy was being produced as the value of the item is not purely based on the financial value of it but also the cultural value of some items. The preliminary thinking would be that the receipt of the items would be referred to the EDI team for a view if the force were unsure of the cultural nature of the item. GF noted that she didn't feel that differing treatment based on cultural attachments to items would be ethical and she felt that the approach should be consistent regardless of the person giving the item or the item itself.</p> <p>DS queried how officers are made aware of what is expected of them from policies. PW noted that his view is that the policy should be sent to all members of staff within the organisation through the weekly internal news bulletin and there should be an emphasis on the importance of staff having an awareness of the policy's content as well as a request for senior leaders to ensure their members of staff understand what is expected of them.</p>	
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Nick Hunt – Corruption Prevention Officer</b></p> <p>NH attended the meeting to introduce himself and his role to the Committee. It was noted that NH is one of three dedicated Corruption Prevention Officers across the UK. The role covers a wide range of offences which fall under the banner of corruption but NH's initial focus is in relation to abuse of position.</p> <p>NH is running awareness raising sessions internally in relation to abuse of position and sexual harassment in the workplace. It was noted that NH is also engaging with partners and key stakeholders to stress to them the importance of reporting any concerns they may have in relation to members of staff as doing so can allow early intervention to take place.</p> <p>PW noted that it is important to note that not all concerns raised will fall under NH's remit as it may not be corruption per se, in some instances it may be more appropriate for some of the concerns raised to be considered as ethical dilemmas by the Internal Ethics and Standards Board or the Independent Ethics Committee.</p> <p>DS queried how NH and the force will try to address the culture in relation to whistleblowing to change the view to a positive as opposed to a negative one. NH noted that there is currently a whistleblowing policy in place within the force. He added that engagement with new members of staff is vital as they will enter the organisation without sharing some of the views that are considered to be part of the current organisational culture. NH is offering himself up as an initial sounding board to those he is engaging with if they are unsure of whether the concern merits reporting based on what they have seen so far. PW added that whistleblowing is something the force are focusing on to ensure staff are aware of the processes and</p>	

	<p>the protection afforded to whistle-blowers, with an acknowledgement that there is not an automatic right to anonymity in some circumstances.</p> <p>NH noted that the force aim to address the issue rather than move the individuals who have raised the concerns as they've not done anything wrong in coming forward and identifying the issue to be addressed. It was noted that there is a victim and witness strategy in place within DSE to ensure that welfare support is available during investigations for those who have raised concerns or those who have been impacted by what has been reported.</p>	
	<p><b>Submissions</b></p> <p><b>Social Media Policy</b></p> <p>JB attended the meeting to deliver a presentation in relation to the plans for an updated social media policy. The new policy will focus on five key areas: corporate social media accounts, personal/private social media usage, and personal use of communication/web-based services on police systems, communication for policing reasons and how to manage and report concerns. The detail on each of the sections of the policy was discussed.</p> <p>DS asked whether the stations could have sub-accounts, JB noted that it is likely there would be an individual overall Hartlepool Neighbourhood Team to ensure that messages which are put out are not being lost.</p> <p>RK asked whether there is an awareness of how many accounts are open in total at the moment and how many are legacy accounts. JB noted that there are around 5 or 6 accounts currently opened by individuals which do not have the proper links with corporate communications which will be addressed following the policy going live.</p> <p>CM queried what social media platforms are being discussed, JB noted that the main ones are Twitter, Instagram and Facebook but he acknowledged that it is a fluid environment and the popularity of platforms differs from time to time.</p> <p>RK queried the accountability structure in relation to the accounts if multiple people have access in terms of knowing who has accessed the accounts and when. JB noted that the reader should know who the post updates have come from as they will be required to log who has made the post in line with the strategy and the guidance.</p> <p>RK queried the process in relation to shared accounts such as CDSOU where the account is likely shared with Durham Constabulary, JB noted that he had not previously considered this and will now factor this into the planning.</p> <p>CM queried whether it will be structured so that members of the</p>	

	<p>public can contact the police through social media, PW noted that there is a stipulation that the individual accounts are not to be used for policing concerns to be raised and the appropriate methods of communication are set out.</p> <p>CM queried whether the force is permitted to contact officers or staff through their personal devices, JB noted that the use of personal devices for operational reasons shouldn't take place but in some instances it is required. For example, force devices do not allow the use of WhatsApp which is required for quick time encrypted messages in some circumstances.</p> <p><b>Role of Different Ethical Advisory Groups</b></p> <p>This item was deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
	<p><b>Development Action Plan</b></p> <p>It was noted that the work in relation to the development action plan is still ongoing.</p> <p>Recruitment is being progressed and in recent weeks there have been five new expressions of interest for people to join the Committee. Last week, three of the five individuals were interviewed and were impressive and have since been invited to join the Committee. It was noted that a further two interviews will be taking place following the meeting and an update will be provided in relation to those interviews in due course.</p> <p>It was noted that a form of induction will be developed for the new members who are appointed. There has also been a suggestion for mentors within the Committee to be allocated to new members of the panel to ensure they are sufficiently supported when joining the group.</p> <p>The development needs of the group are to be discussed in more detail within the next meeting of the Committee to ensure they are able to be appropriately assessed and met.</p>	
	<p><b>Terms of Reference</b></p> <p>The ToR was discussed, and it was asked whether members are happy for the Committee to be known as the Cleveland Independent Ethics Committee. It was confirmed and the ToR were agreed as the final version. Confirmation is still required in relation to whether expenses are available to members and if they are, at what level and for what.</p> <p>GF queried whether the word 'advice' within the ToR has been carefully considered and been used with due thought and whether it may be more appropriate to note that members give their thoughts or opinions. RS noted that he agreed it could be changed to 'providing views to Cleveland Police', CM suggested that 'considerations' be used, and it was agreed that the document would be amended.</p>	

	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>No items were raised for discussion under any other business.</p>	
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--