



Meeting Record – OPEN SESSION – Approved

Meeting:	Cleveland Joint Audit Committee
Date:	Thursday 15 December 2022
Time	10:00 – 12:30
Venue:	PCC Office, CPHQ and MS Teams

Meeting Attendance:

Committee Members	
Stuart Green – Chair (SG)	
Joanne Gleeson (JG)	
Gill Rollings (GR)	
Andrew Prest (AP)	
Liz Hall (LH)	

Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner	
Lisa Oldroyd (LO)	Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer
Emma Keay (EK)	Executive Assistant

Cleveland Police	
Ian Wright (IW)	Director of Finance and Assets – Executive
Gillian Currie (GC)	HMIC Liaison Officer
Michelle Phillips (MPhi)	Deputy Head of Legal Services - Evolve Legal Services
Neal Gilson (NG)	Operational Ethics Lead Sergeant – Executive
Sara Lightfoot (S)L	Organisational Development Manager – People and Development
Satnam Singh (SS)	Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Manager – People and Development
Karen Lindberg (KL)	Head of HR – People and Development
Michelle Turner (MT)	Complaints & Discipline Constable - Directorate of Standards and Ethics
Louise Drummond (LD)	Head of Performance, Quality and Review – Corporate Services

Internal Auditors – RSM UK Risk Assurance Services	
Hollie Adams (HA)	Assistant Manager
Daniel Harris (DH)	Partner, Head of Emergency Services & Local Government

External Auditors – Mazars:	
Gavin Barker (GB)	Director / Public and Social Sector
Campbell Dearden	

Apologies:

Michael Porter	Chief Finance Officer – OPCC
Phillip Church	RSM UK Risk Assurance Services
Dave Sutherland	DCS Local Policing – Cleveland Police
Xanthe Tait Michelle Phillips attended as Deputy	Director - Evolve Legal Services

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
1.	Apologies for Absence: SG noted apologies.	
2.	Declarations of Interests: 1. AP flagged his seat on Cleveland Police's Internal Ethics Committee. 2. SG advised members he is a member of the External Ethics Committee (the Independent Ethics Committee) 3. JG flagged her association with Elevate Multi Academy Trust, JG advised no conflict of interest as serves North Yorkshire.	
3.	Open Minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 September 2022: SG, presented the minutes, providing opportunity for any issues or errors to be highlighted. SG thanked JG for her review of the minutes prior to the meeting. The minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2022, (open session) were deemed a reasonable record of the last meeting.	
4.	Internal Audit Reports and Plan Progress Update: Daniel Harris (DH) RSM UK Hollie Adams (HA) RSM UK SG instructed RSM to take the reports shared in advance of the meeting, as read. SG requested a high-level summary of the work completed and the key findings arising from that work. After which, SG will open the floor to members. DH proposed a deviation from the agenda order, and requested he present the Progress Report first.	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>DH requested whilst presenting the Progress Report, he includes comments around some of the other final reports, also taking them as read.</p> <p>DH indicated, these additional reports are all positive opinions, without substantively significant points within them.</p> <p><u>Internal Audit Progress Report - 15 December 2022 – DH</u></p> <p>DH confirmed satisfactory progress is being made in line with the agreed timetable. They have received good support from the Force and the Commissioner's Office in terms of allowing RSM to get through the program. RSM are pleased with the progress made.</p> <p>DH flagged Section 2, highlighting the five reports finalised since the last meeting. Only the Integrated Offender Management report, relates to the previous financial year.</p> <p>DH confirmed the remaining four reports all relate to the current financial year.</p> <p>Of these four, it is pleasing to note of the 35 actions, 31 were fully implemented, one had been superseded and the other three were ongoing.</p> <p>RSM's substantive follow-up work concluded, officers are taking the necessary action to address the issues identified through the review.</p> <p>This bodes well for the additional reports on the agenda, if this progress level is maintained throughout the financial year, DH hopeful a lot of issues will also be addressed.</p> <p>SG suggested members will agree this is hugely positive, nevertheless, to some extent it is only what is expected. SG agreed progress from officers and staff is very positive indeed.</p> <p><u>Key Financial Controls – DH</u></p> <p>RSM's yearly review of key financials has identified a substantial assurance opinion. Only one low priority management action agreed.</p> <p><u>General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) - DH</u></p> <p>Five actions agreed, including one high.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>DH advised members, the main point RSM took away was the self-assessment the force had undertaken, similar to a ICO self-assessment.</p> <p>DH confirmed all the issues had been picked up and were being worked on, or indeed the Force were waiting for new starters to pick up some of the actions.</p> <p>A pleasing point DH noted, a number of these issues had already been captured, had been flagged in an action plan and were already being reviewed. RSM will of course return, and review this in the future follow up.</p> <p>DH is keen to give credit where it is due and is hopeful officers have been assisted to prioritise focus in alignment with the actions.</p> <p>DH advised he had met with both IW and MP to discuss the programme originally agreed at the beginning of the year. It was felt on reflection it is slightly heavy, subsequently it was agreed to delay the Bail Management report until 2023/24, to ensure we can get back in line with the agreed budget for internal audit fees this year.</p> <p>The only additional substantive item DH wanted to mention, clearly any negative opinions have the potential to impact year end opinions, and there are two of those to date. One in Vetting, and the other Health and Safety.</p> <p>DH wanted to flag, albeit yes, they will both have an impact, they won't at this stage result in a qualification of those opinions, noting several audits remain undelivered. As RSM issue those report, if there's anything else significant, DH will update MP and IW as it occurs, and if communication outside of the meeting timetable is required, DH happy to accommodate this.</p> <p><u>Health and Safety – HA</u></p> <p>HA, Assistant Manager at RSM, delivered the Health and Safety Report, so will provide the high-level overview and is happy to take questions at the end.</p> <p>The issues found on the Health and Safety report have resulted in a minimal assurance opinion based on fifty-five high, three medium and one low priority management actions.</p> <p>Two high priority actions related to training.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>The first, E-learning training, at the time of the audit, there was no health and safety mandatory training. Anything completed by staff, was particularly low in numbers and on a voluntary basis only.</p> <p>The second, Line Manager training. At the time of the audit there did not seem to be any additional Line Manager training delivered in respect of health and safety. HA highlighted, Line Managers have a significant role in the accident reporting procedures, therefore this is a high priority risk.</p> <p>The third high priority management action was in relation to risk assessment. At the time of the audit, RSM were concerned at the oversight and recording of the risk assessments. Five out of the ten sampled were out of date and it appeared no clear list or tracker indicated risk assessment management.</p> <p>The fourth high priority management action raised, related to the RADAR reporting arrangements. RSM looked at ten accidents on the incidents and accidents register, one of which did not relate to a RADAR reportable incident, however this failed to be clearly marked on the registers, and therefore wasn't clear at the time of RSM's testing. Two had been delayed in terms of the 10-working day deadline, with no clear indication on the tracker to where the delay in process occurred.</p> <p>The fifth and final high priority management action relates to health and safety reporting. It is acknowledged the Committee receive an Annual Health and Safety report, however RSM understand no other committee has Health and Safety within their remit and no ad hoc reporting or regular reporting exists throughout the year on Health and Safety.</p> <p>The three medium actions were in relation to, actions from premises reviews, near misses and lessons learned, which RSM also identified as weaknesses and controls there.</p> <p>SG opened up to questions and comments from members.</p> <p>LH was really concerned about the position the RSM audit report is presenting, particularly only minimal assurance has been given. This is a key area with significant consequences if things go wrong, and legislation places significant responsibility on Chief Officers and Directors. Albeit LH is hesitant, the report has presented a worrying picture.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>LH is pleased to see actions agreed with the timescale to September 2023. However, given the significant responsibilities placed legally on Chief Officers, LH asked if the Committee could have an update report presented by Chief Officer, preferably from an operational policing background, at the next meeting. Putting on record Directors and Chief Officers are fulfilling their statutory responsibilities, which LH is confident they are.</p> <p>GR, very much endorsed the need for an urgent report on this, because it is worrying. GR especially concerned reference the lack of presence from senior offices, this goes right to the top and is ultimately the Chief Constable's responsibly. GR concerned by this report because the Committee has received lots of reports on health and safety suggesting all is progressing well.</p> <p>JG, agrees the reports shows some worrying trends, JG thinks perhaps as a result of staff changes within the Health and Safety Department and also the leadership team. Not only compliance that is a worry, JG concerned also does not seem to be system controls in place, meaning the Force isn't being kept safe.</p> <p>JG, worried this is a resource issue, we know specialists at this moment in time are really difficult to recruit. JG asked if we could look at doing some collaboration with fire colleagues who usually have extremely strict health and safety regulations.</p> <p>SG, asked if the comments and concerns raised by members resonated with HA on her overall take on this particular system. Is there any sense of resourcing issues or systematic problems within the Force.</p> <p>HA, agreed in terms of control issues. The Operational Planning and Safety Manager is responsible for health and safety, and his role is across three different remits. They are supported by a Health and Safety Officer, who HA understood to be new to the team at the time of the audit, who will be full time and an additional two part-time. Health and Safety is a large remit, unsure if this is sufficient to maintain administration, risk assessments etc.</p> <p>SG at this stage gave opportunity for management to respond to the points raised.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>SW introduced himself to the Committee, SW is currently the Forces Operational Planning and Health and Safety Manager and has been in post for approximately 9 years.</p> <p>SW recognised undoubtedly the Force has capacity issues, these were discussed in detail with HA at the time of the recent audit.</p> <p>To update members, the Health and Safety manager has now been identified as standalone role and separated from additional responsibilities across the Force. Interviews were conducted for a full-time Health and Safety manager, and the post has been offered.</p> <p>SW advised capacity will continue to be an issue moving forward, the changes at Executive level and the restructuring of the Force has had an impact on delivery of health and safety, certainly over COVID but also since COVID.</p> <p>The first action of the ten raised, although a low priority, SW identified as fundamental to everything else that's delivered. It is the content of the Health and Safety policy itself, which at the time of the meeting, is with Corporate Services. SW confirmed this will be linked directly to the Chief's return to district based BCU approach to command, which undoubtedly should be directly linked to how health and safety is delivered.</p> <p>SW agreed training is a huge area, and confirmed the Force is not complaint with the National Police Chiefs Council, particularly senior ranks training. Training is completed for initial recruitment but fails to extend up through the ranks after that.</p> <p>A Training Needs Analysis is being conducted and next year's finances identified for accredited courses for higher ranks within the force. The College of Policing does provide E-Learning packages, and these have been identified as mandated training for 2023. This is another step forward to raise the awareness of health and safety for serving officers and staff. SW is confident there will be an uplift and an improvement on training across the different tiers of the Force management structure next year.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>Looking at the administrative areas, SW confirmed this has been reviewed with some adjustments to the overall process now for RIDDOR. The Force now records the date an injury on duty is received. Reports were submitted late, hence the Force missed dates to notify the HSE. The Force now has a separate section which requires a reason for a late submission, enabling more accurate tracking.</p> <p>The Force were also asked to look at the Seven Point plan, when an officer has been assaulted on duty, and ensure management implement this plan. SW reaffirmed this has been implemented on every injury on duty report we receive when an officer has been assaulted. SW confident, on track to roll this out certainly in the first half of 2023, a lot of the easier actions have been completed already.</p> <p>As referenced by HA, accountability is a big area. Health and Safety is now a standing item at the Audit Inspection and Risk Board chaired by ACC Theaker. SW confirmed the Force now has Executive overview at a strategic level.</p> <p>SW flagged given the audit was conducted in October 2022, the Force is moving quite positively, and is hopeful a full-time Health and Safety Manager will be in post in the New Year.</p> <p>SG, clearly this this is very much a moving issue. SG noted the developments have been made, and some of them completed, which are very welcomed of course. As Chair, the scope for some of this to cross into other risk areas, is a concern, as SG is sure members will agree.</p> <p>SG, we welcome the clear progress, and asked if an invite be extended to SW for the next meeting.</p> <p>SW advised members, he will no longer be the Operational Planning and Health and Safety manager for Cleveland Police, at present SW is one of four Counter-Terrorism Security Co-ordinators, from the 01 January 2023 SW will be employed purely in this area.</p> <p>IW, from the Chief Officer team level, would like to say two things; firstly, thank you to SW for the update and the assurances given so far.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>Secondly, the Chief Officer team will ensure this improvement is appropriately resourced.</p> <p>And lastly, IW is happy to take away the action and ensure an update is available for the next committee meeting from a Chief Officer level colleague.</p> <p>SG agreed this would be excellent, no need for chapter and verse, a brief written report and someone to present at the next time we get together, would be splendid.</p> <p>ACTION: A brief written report, on the package of issues discussed today, focussing on the recommendations made by RSM and the issues touched upon by SW. A member of the Chief Officer team to present at the next Joint Audit Committee.</p> <p>AP – Understand an audit is a much bigger deep dive, but to reinforce the systemic concerns behind this, in the past 12 months the Committee has seen two massive pieces of work conclude.</p> <p>One on HR, reviewing all policies and procedures, many which were out of date for a long time, the second on Learning and Development. AP concerned neither of those processes, which have been lengthy, seem to have picked up these issues.</p> <p>AP suggested this underpins big disconnects in management capacity. AP concerned it has taken a deep dive to for these things to become known, when previous huge resource consuming internal processes’, should have already picked them up.</p> <p>GR, agreed with AP.</p> <p>SG asked by way of the update at the next meeting, details are given of the systemic broader package of issues here, focussing on the recommendations made by RSM and the issues touched upon by SW. It may well move towards assurance in respect to the points raised by AP.</p> <p>DH, albeit not saying Health and Safety is a strategic risk, following this report, he would flag it is not on the strategic risk register. DH asked if it would be added to an operational</p>	<p>Ian Wright</p>

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>register until satisfied all controls and a joined-up approach is in place.</p> <p>ACTION: Lisa Oldroyd requested the item be added as an agenda item to the Joint Strategic Board</p> <p>DH suggested he pick up with IW and MP, anticipating appropriate for a full re-audit of this area towards the end of 2023/24 to give assurance the improvements have been made.</p> <p>ACTION: A full re-audit to be completed in 2023, to give reassurances</p> <p>SG, agreed subject to usual discussions with management, and planning cycles SG and Members would welcome that.</p> <p>With Members agreement, noted the Committees thanks to officers and staff particularly in the finance function for their efforts and substantial and reasonable assurance.</p>	<p>Emma Keay</p> <p>RSM</p>
5.	<p>Internal Audit Recommendations Tracker:</p> <p>Gill Currie (GC) HMIC Liaison Officer</p> <p>GC reminded members the action plan is a living document and the follow up inspection is scheduled for January 2023, subsequently it is out for review and updates. The current number of actions put forward for closure is thirty-six, with the potential to increase by another few before we submit it in early January 2023.</p> <p>GC confirmed progress is ongoing and is most definitely updated and reviewed regularly.</p> <p>GC happy to discuss if anyone has any questions relating to particular actions.</p> <p>LH, commented the report is not always easy to follow, as it is not always clear, especially the closure of actions. LH asked GC if any among the eleven or so identified for closure, GC feels are important and may want to tell the Committee about.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>GC is sure everybody will be pleased to know that the oldest actions are the ones that are up for closure. Number 401 is from the previous auditors, and relates to the People Strategy, this is due to timings of consultations and the Boards needed for approval. Subsequently 401 will miss the January 2023 deadline and will be queued ready for the next in June/July 2023. GC highlighted three or four are already lined up for closure, ready for the next inspection.</p> <p>There is nothing GC would point out at this stage as a major issue. GC also reiterated the Health and Safety action plan is being discussed regularly, confirming a lot of work is being undertaken in the background for that one as well.</p> <p>SG asked, in reference to LH's earlier point, would it be beneficial for members at future meetings to have headline points in advance, drawing out any headline issues in an executive summary, perhaps on the front of the report.</p>	
6.	<p>HMIC Reports & AFI Trackers:</p> <p>Gill Currie (GC) HMIC Liaison Officer</p> <p>GC advised a lot of action with HMRC at present.</p> <p>The report refers to the different areas, in addition, GC wanted to give assurances, just because the Force is waiting for a lot of things to land from the HMRC, and the PEEL inspection being signed off. It does not mean the Force has stopped working with the current actions, GC reiterated it is a living system.</p>	
7.	<p>Civil Claims Overview:</p> <p>Michelle Phillips (MPhi) Deputy Head of Legal Services - Evolve Legal Services</p> <p>MPhi, taking the report as read, will provide headlines only.</p> <p>The report covers the six-month period, 01 March to the 31 of August 2022, and aims to advise members of the number and types of civil and employment claims that we get against the Force and the amount that we pay out.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>MPhi, provided a brief overview of the collaboration; Evolve Legal Services is a collaboration that delivers legal services on behalf of six clients, which is the three Commissioners and Chief Constables of North Yorkshire, Durham and Cleveland. The service is a virtual service. The report indicates Evolve have sixty-two permanent temporary staff, but currently have fifty-nine, carrying three vacancies. Evolve operate the service out of three hubs, Peterlee, Middlesbrough at North Yorkshire. Evolve have three main teams across, which are corporate and commercial team. We have an operational team and we have a litigation team. Those teams are led by professional heads, this is either a Force Solicitor or a Deputy Force Solicitor.</p> <p><u>Employment Tribunal Claims:</u></p> <p>During this period, the Force received fifteen claims, which includes ACAS, early conciliation matters. In comparison the Force received nine the previous year. No themes nor group litigations have been identified.</p> <p>Two were finalised this period and non the previous year. For the two finalised, just short of £34,000 was paid out.</p> <p>Any lessons learnt is shared via professional legal digest, which is usually produced for our HR departments. We put feedback on the knowledge hub and we give case outcomes for specific clients, and specific offices or departments.</p> <p>Evolve (across three Forces), are currently dealing with twelve Employment Tribunal claims in total. These are when they have progressed beyond early conciliation periods.</p> <p>Eight are within Cleveland Police, in comparison five were in Cleveland Police last year. MPhi, confirmed a short increase here.</p> <p><u>Civil Claims:</u></p> <p>For this period, the Force received sixty-one claims compared to the last period when forty-seven were received, not a significant increase for us to be concerned about. Page four provides a description of the types of claims that we are getting.</p> <p>The chart at the top of page 5, shows the majority of claims are made within two years of the incident date, especially for motor claims as it's usually pursued by insurance companies who are normally quick on the ball.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>We finalised eight cases, four of which we've successfully defended. Compared to the last period we had seventeen finalised and five were successfully defended.</p> <p>The COVID pandemic is still an area of concern and cases are not progressing as quickly, but hopeful that will ease in the next year.</p> <p>Three have been taken to trial, this is done when it is felt a settlement can be negotiated, we do that as soon as possible to reduce costs.</p> <p>Feedback is obviously provided on a case-by-case basis to ensure assistance is given in managing risk. We personally attend the gold groups such as the driver standards, the custody groups and give feedback on any cases we feel are relevant.</p> <p>MPhi also attends a subcommittee around civil litigation through the Association of Police Lawyers where we share lessons learned, any themes coming out nationally, MPhi, confirmed this is really helpful.</p> <p>MPhi also confirmed Evolve have recently started claims analysis, with similar Force groupings. Cleveland Police are grouped with Greater Manchester, Humberside, Merseyside, Northumbria and West Yorkshire, some bigger city Forces.</p> <p>Looking at the charts, for 2021, Cleveland's arrest rate per 1000 population was 20.8. The average across England and Wales is 11.5. Cleveland has a high crime rate, which obviously results in risks of claims.</p> <p>The sums paid out on the finalised case, as seen on page eight, for public liability, it's £10,300 and motor liability are around £62,000. We do pay out a lot of motor liability claims because it could be a personal injury claim together with water damage claim. They may have written a vehicle off, they might also be more than one person in the vehicle at the time, there may be two-three people in the vehicle, they will all claim for personal injury.</p> <p>AP the motor claims really stand out because exponentially they seem to be rising and there seems to be something of an underlying trend. AP asked what mechanism exists between Evolve and Executive to flag that higher level view?</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>Appreciate feedback is given on a one-to-one basis, AP asked if this feedback goes direct to the operational teams managing things, at the higher level. Ultimately AP asked how do members take confidence that this is getting flagged, and these trends are being followed and will therefore systemically result in action and acknowledge something is happening here.</p> <p>MPhi, first, any PVI that happens, it goes straight through to driver training. They're the department that assess the drivers and they have a criteria where they might suspend someone's driving permit for example. They review themes, drivers, whether any more training is needed.</p> <p>MPhi attends the fleet and driver standards meetings and reports any themes into them. The problem we have with motor claims is we don't deal with in-house. It is obviously dealt with by insurers and claims handlers, so we have no control particularly over what is paid.</p> <p>Currently we do not have communication with Executive, it is all completed at lower level through driver standards and driver training have that core responsibility.</p> <p>AP confirmed MPhi's feedback is really helpful and asked this is something the Committee can monitor from an assurance point of view, to ensure these things are followed through.</p> <p>AP concerned there does seem to be a trend that's becoming apparent. AP not saying it's not happening, asking how the action is evidenced.</p> <p>ACTION: MPhi will certainly liaise with driver training and identify how they capture the risks etc. and will feedback at the next meeting.</p> <p>SG, asked MPhi, reference regularly reporting to Finance accordingly on the magnitude of any liability, clear communication there?</p> <p>MPhi, yes, we quarterly report to our insurers on reserves and finance have access to that. For those cases that are not insured, such as Employment Tribunal claims and things like deliberate damage claims that are not insured, the Force has a non-insured reserve list. Every case is on a worksheet with a reserve for any damages that we think we may have to pay out and costs.</p>	<p>Michelle Phillips</p>

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>Every case that we deal with is on a reserve list somewhere and accounts have that every month.</p> <p>MPhi, confirmed this is a definite closed loop,</p>	
1.	<p>Annual Ethics Committee Report:</p> <p>Neal Gilson (NG) Operational Ethics Lead Sergeant</p> <p>NG introduced himself, NG is the Operational Ethics Lead.</p> <p>The overall strategy of the ethics and NG's particular role is to embed the Code of Ethics across the organisation and to raise ethical behaviours and understanding collectively of all aspects of the organisational ethics. It is quite an aspirational aim. Is it technically never ending? NG would say no. But this is what the work is aimed at.</p> <p>The infrastructure is one of the strengths of the ethics portfolio. We have some well-established mechanisms including;</p> <p>The Ethics and Standard Board, this is a bi-monthly meeting, and some attendees from this Committee attend. The Chair is a Chief Officer, demonstrating the level of commitment from the organisation, and I've detailed in the report the work and influence it has received supporting it.</p> <p>The Independent Ethics Committee also has some familiar faces and a similar sort of program, discussing similar matters. Overall NG would say their main role is to be a critical friend to Cleveland Police and are very valued and certainly add a lot.</p> <p>Working in parallel is the Youth Commission, albeit only in its infancy, it has a brand-new facilitator in place called the Junction. And very like the independent Ethics Committee, we've got some externalising views to help us and it's going to have a youth basis, this is improving.</p> <p>We also have the Ethics Advocates; these have progressed over the last sort of 12 months. The HMIC have been very complimentary of the Ethics Advocates.</p> <p>Very briefly, Ethic Advocates are people who, supplemental to their role and have an interest in ethics and it can be a point of contact for their colleagues. The aim is to have one in every department, every office or every team so that they can be a point of contact for their colleagues to discuss ethical matters.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>They are asked to use an ethical lens, and ask 'is this ethical', is everything that is going on in my office ethical? Not necessarily, breaches of standards of professional behaviour, but examine the infrastructure and what we do is ethical is it best focused?</p> <p>How do we compare to other forces, NG believes we compare well. Other Forces have similar things in infancy, other Forces do not have an ethics and standard board equivalent at all.</p> <p>NG advised; some Forces have been in touch with us to replicate Cleveland Police's work. Durham police have recently done this.</p> <p>Cross board work is undertaken, and the Independent Ethics Committee also work with Durham Police and on a separate and equivalent board, NG flagged Durham Police don't have an Ethics and Standard board.</p> <p>No other Force has Ethics Advocates, or anything similar, when this is presented at the Regional Ethics Committee, other Forces are very complimentary and looking to establish something themselves.</p> <p>How are we embedding ethics and the code of ethics across the organisation? Solid foundations, Ethics is a golden thread running through training, and all commands are well versed on ethics. The Force is ensuring practitioners are aware they deal with ethical situations every single day.</p> <p>The Force has lots of new initiatives to achieve that, including presentations from NG and others to every new starter who joins the organisation, whatever their role will be. And, to newly promoted Sergeants or Inspectors. First and Second Line Supervisors are spoken to by NG via a development programme about ethics. And if a particular department requires input this too is delivered.</p> <p>Outside of this reporting period, a CPD event was facilitated, external speakers were invited, and it was well valued, NG confirmed another is upcoming.</p> <p>The Force has growing online material, mostly managed by NG, it provides an ethics rich resource.</p> <p>NG confirmed Force wide sharing of an ethical dilemmas, the intention to spread awareness across the organisation of what</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>ethical dilemmas are, and prompt people to look more deeply, this is going well, and a repeat is being looked at.</p> <p>NG identified the report as quite heavy on ethical dilemmas and the write ups, NG advised these discussions, and the manner the Force is examining ethical dilemmas, is a sign of a healthy organisation.</p> <p>SG opened the floor for questions and observations from members.</p> <p>JG, this is a really good reflection on where the Force has been and where it is now, to see and hear such positive comments from other Forces, who now look to Cleveland Police as an example of good practice, is a real reflection on the hard work undertaken and JG wanted to commend the team for carrying on with it.</p> <p>SG, seconded JG's comments, and advised the stand out for SG is, Cleveland Police are very much ahead of the game on things, some at Cleveland, are not seen elsewhere. SG, agreed as NG affirmed earlier, this does not mean a resting of laurels of course.</p> <p>SG recognised this success is not least due to NG's efforts and DCC Arundale, who SG recognised had real commitment to this.</p> <p>SG thanked NG and highlighted the kind of work NG is involved in is really persuasive across more or less every risk area that we consider, SG requested NG be invited to join the meeting again at some point in the future to provide an update.</p> <p>ACTION: NG to be invited to the meeting in twelve months.</p>	<p>Emma Keay</p>
8.	<p>Equality & Diversity Monitoring Report:</p> <p>Sara Lightfoot (SL) Organisational Development Manager – People and Development</p> <p>Satnam Singh (SS) Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Manager – People and Development</p> <p>SG asked SL to provide members with a summary and SG will ask for questions and observations on completion.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>SL reminded members, the Force as a Public Sector Organisation with over 150 employees, must annually report and publish information that demonstrates our compliance with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, including outcomes.</p> <p>This relates to the progress on the equality objectives, of which the Force has two, information relating to the protected characteristics of our workforce and any other persons affected by our policies and practices.</p> <p>The deadline for reporting and submission for this 2021 / 22 financial report is the 31st of March 2023.</p> <p>SL, taking the report as read, opened to questions.</p> <p>AP never known any organisation of any size carry consistently so much unknown data, particularly on such a key important aspect. AP emphasised, if somebody actively wants to opt out of not giving it this is acceptable and is right.</p> <p>It is the unknown data that is a frustration. AP, guessing it is probably 50% across all of the EDI data is unknown.</p> <p>This flashes alarm bells, and members consistently see this in every report. AP would like to know what Senior Management is doing to address this missing, key critical data.</p> <p>SG asked SL if she had any thoughts on AP's questions.</p> <p>SL highlighted the Safe to Say campaign as detailed in the report. This has driven some increase along with the national campaigns, and the Force has taken this locally to drive trust and confidence in disclosure. To assure AP we have a lot of work underway.</p> <p>SS introduced himself, SS is one of the Equality, Diversity Inclusion managers for Cleveland, having worked in local authority for 20 years corporately and voluntary community sectors.</p> <p>Agree with AP, data, is a really unknown factor, not just with the police. People cannot be forced to disclose their information, whether from an LGBT plus Q background or a disability for whatever reason.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>As SL mentioned next year, the Force has a whole raft of work planned in reference to trust and confidence, visiting stations, getting out to our workforce and encouraging people, when they do disclose data, we can support them.</p> <p>There is no quick fix, the Force is on a journey with no right or wrong answers, but small steps.</p> <p>SL highlighted the Staff Networks, and the shift in maturity to support this ongoing work, to better understand trust and confidence.</p> <p>AP the right to disclose is perfectly fine, we cannot force anyone to disclose they have a disability, we can reasonably expect any paid employee of the organisation to engage in a survey and advise if they prefer not to disclose.</p> <p>Having massive numbers of unknowns means when interventions, programs, engagement with staff networks are in place, AP challenges without the data how is the Force targeting the right things. At present looking into a grey mist. Two sides, those to engage and what is an active choice not to disclose.</p> <p>SL Force are continuously delivering and sharing and asking for completion, this is not something the Force stop doing.</p> <p>SS, advised AP the Force is working with the DSN, the disability staff network and will be capturing some data and an understanding, some people may not be aware they have a disability. The Force has established a Gold group, generating a raft of actions, including working towards disability confidence. The Force have identified the issue collectively and we are on track.</p> <p>SG, the term trust and confidence has been mentioned by several colleagues, recognise SL has addressed the way in which some of what is asked, and the way in which it's worded, has been tweaked and modified. SG asked thinking instrumentally, is there scope to do something else there.</p> <p>SG shares AP's discomfort at any suggestion 'prefer not to say' would be withdrawn as an option. As Chair of this committee, this would be very, very difficult, and if there was any suggestion the Force might move towards that, it would be unfortunate.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
9.	<p>Gender Pay Gap Annual Report:</p> <p>Karen Lindberg (KL) Head of HR – People and Development</p> <p>KL, reminded members, the Force have a legal responsibility to publish the Gender Pay Gap on an annual basis. This data is taken from a snapshot of the 31st of March 2022 and has to be published by the 31st of March 2023.</p> <p>The report includes four calculations including the mean and median pay gaps, the proportion of male and females receiving bonuses, and the proportion of males and females in each quartile.</p> <p>The benefit of the report to the organisation is the creation of an action plan which we use to drive activities within the Force with the view of reducing our gap. Some of these actions are already underway, some will be underway in the New Year.</p> <p>The present action plans often review a year-old data, by the time it is published. KL suggested an annual action plan does not have an impact within that year.</p> <p>Subsequently KL, has for the first time, implemented a three-year action plan. This includes engaging with The Women's Network, the Federation, Unison and the Superintendents Organisation, with colleagues in L&D and HR and linking in heavily with the HeForShe programme to ensure we can deliver some of these activities.</p> <p>The activities as you will see in the report are drawn from a range of different areas. KL advised, importantly this year the Force has looked at, nationally, things that work and things that are proven to work rather than things that we think may work.</p> <p>KL, confirmed this work is already underway, and the Force will report on progress against the action plan into the EDI Board and into the People and Well-Being Board.</p> <p>AP commended and thanked KL on the format of the report, it is really simple, clear and succinct. SG seconded this.</p> <p>GR, thanked KL for adding a three year action plan, makes more sense than an annual report and GR looks forward to hearing the progress report.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>SG asked KL if she could provide members with a flavour of momentum, is there a sense this is building towards a tangible movement? SG can see from the data things are happening, what is KL's qualitative sense on this?</p> <p>KL believes nationally there is a movement now, on the back of Sarah Everard there is more awareness across Forces, which has reinvigorated the HeForShe campaign. In national terms, KL sits on the Gender Forum the Policing Forum nationally, and can pick up best practice.</p> <p>In KL's personal experience there is a newfound confidence in the organisation now, to not only raise issues, but can influence in a positive way. KL advised the Force has more females at senior level in the organisation, than in the 15 years KL has been with Cleveland Police.</p> <p>The work completed regarding peer support, the sharing of experiences by senior female leaders is absolutely encouraging other female police officers demonstrates it is possible and possible to have a family and manage your career, promotion and there is a lot of support in place.</p> <p>SG, thanked KL and agreed the softer elements certainly seem to be in place, albeit there is still progress to be made.</p>	
10.	<p>Auditor's Annual Report: Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland and the Chief Constable for Cleveland – Year Ended 31 March 2021:</p> <p>Gavin Barker (GB) Mazars</p> <p>SG asked GB of Mazars, to provide headlines after which SG will invite Members for comments and questions.</p> <p>GB this annual report related to the 2021 audit, and the 2021 financial year and is a new report replacing the annual audit letter. The main change is the approach to value for money arrangements work.</p> <p>Mazars drafted the report late admittedly, it was drafted at the end of July and we've responded to officer comments. Officers having made a number of comments on the first draft which were fair and reasonable and Mazars tried to respond fully to those.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>As a public facing document Mazars were very keen to set out the context to make the report as clear as possible.</p> <p>In terms of the 2021 audit, we issued the opinion on the financial statements just over a year ago, and it was an unqualified opinion on both the PC and Group and the Chief Constable financial statements.</p> <p>For 2021, Mazars have highlighted the query made by the National Audit Office in July, this remains unresolved, but Mazars will issue the whole of government accounts assurance statement, nonetheless. GB advised this may be before Christmas 2022 or just after.</p> <p>In terms of value for money and the new approach, this is the first reporting under the new approach. Previously, we used to issue qualified or unqualified conclusions on value for money. Arrangements under this new approach will required to identify and report on significant weaknesses.</p> <p>Mazars have reported a significant weakness and a recommendation in relation to that. The report seeks to set out clearly, the only significant weaknesses and recommendation made is in relation to the HMICFRS outstanding issues from their 2019 inspection, highlighting the Force as inadequate. Mazars are not identifying any other issues for either the PCC or the Chief Constable to consider.</p> <p>Mazars commentary in the report sets out Mazars views and arrangements in place across the key criteria of financial sustainability, governance and improving economy, efficiency, and effectiveness.</p> <p>Mazars drew attention to fess, these relate to 2021 audit, Mazars are keen to now seek approval from PSA in relation to those additional, very modest fees, and will be looking to get the fees billed in the near future.</p> <p>GR understands Mazars comments about value for money but is sure Mazars will share Members frustration that we're still in this position. GR asked GB when a slightly more positive view on value for money, may be given.</p> <p>GB, the significant weakness and recommendation is likely to be exactly the same for 2021/22 because it looks at the 2021/22 financial year. GB suggested Mazars could seek to take into account the latest information.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>GB pondering when Mazars should report on the 2021/22 VFM arrangements. If HMICFRS are planning to report by the end of March 2023, Mazars could potentially plan to report by the end of March 2023 also, potentially delaying slightly until Mazars have sight of HMICFRS opinion on progress.</p> <p>Mazars confirmed they are unable to change the significant weakness and recommendation, but we could reflect in our commentary the progress.</p> <p>IW, first of all on behalf of MP and our staff to thank Mazars for the work and the positive working relationship. In particular it has been a positive and receptive conversation around the draft of the value for money elements of this report.</p> <p>IW recognises the difficult position Mazars are in here, they must reflect on what IW would argue is historic evidence from a 2019 inspection, which cannot be updated until we get the next PEEL inspection. IW would be supportive of trying to wait until we have got that report before completing 2021/22.</p> <p>Furthermore, on fees, IW would like to say the Force do recognise the national pressures on cost for audits, and a PSA determination is needed. It is likely to be high and I don't think although it's higher than we would like, there isn't anything unreasonable in what Mazars are asking for.</p> <p>SG noted for the record if we may, the unqualified opinion on the financial statements and indeed GB's comment in respect of there being no significant difficulties experienced during the audit. This is hugely positive, not least in terms of our own Chief Financial Officers, but Mazars also.</p> <p>SG pleased there is a dialogue, and is sure members agree, what we are looking for is positive tension. The dialogue is good, but it is good a challenge and robust professional discipline is at play from Mazars and indeed our finance staff.</p>	
11.	<p>External Auditor's Update on the 2021/22 Audit:</p> <p>Gavin Barker (GB) Mazars</p> <p>Campbell Dearden (CD) Mazars</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>The statutory timetable this year was for the audit to be completed and an opinion given by the end of November 2022, Mazars have not been able to do that.</p> <p>That is entirely because Mazars are still waiting for pension fund auditor assurance, from the auditor of Teesside pension fund.</p> <p>In terms of value for money, Mazars have already discussed potentially delaying the annual report for 2021/22 to consider anything that comes out from the HMICFRS update. Mazars may look to complete this by the end of April 2023 if he HMICFRS report in March 2023.</p> <p>In relation to Whole Government Accounts, GB advised likely to be a substantial delay, because as members heard, Mazars are still dealing with 2021 Whole of Government Accounts and has become quite a frustrating process in itself.</p> <p>Mazars do not have a timetable for 2021/22 in terms of Whole of Government Accounts. Mazars cannot issue their certificate closing the audit until we sign off on All of Government Accounts.</p> <p>GB also flagged his worry going forward, the economy is obviously in a difficult position, funding and everything else. When Mazars issue the certificate, and look at this, the same time next year, it must be considered whether anything changed significantly since the opinion was issued. GB flagged, the going concern might be an increasing issue for public bodies given the financial constraints that they are operating under. It is a disappointing but an expected long delay before Mazars can issue the final certificate to close off 2021/22.</p> <p>Efforts are being made to try get the opinion issued as soon as possible and make a sensible decision on when Mazars reports on VFM.</p> <p>CD advised the finance team have produced a good quality set of financial statements for the group police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable. And as mentioned back in September 2022, also a good response from your finance team to our audit query, Mazars are very grateful.</p> <p>CD flagged, since Mazars presented the order completion report in September 2022, there has been a couple of additional errors.</p>	

Agenda Item:	Discussion / Action:	Action Owner:
	<p>One of them is a 1.6 million classification error in Note 6, which is the accounting basis and funding basis note. It is very much a technical accounting basis note, so it is nothing that affects your bottom line. It takes the statutory accounts and removes those elements that do not impact on your general funds such as depreciation, impairment, your pension costs. It very much is the technical accounting adjustment and because it is a classification, it does not, it doesn't impact on anything other than it goes into a different line. So, it is nothing of any concern.</p> <p>And, there's been a few amendments to pension assumption disclosures, but again they're just disclosures and they don't affect any of the Figures in the financial statement.</p> <p>GB mentioned some additional work will be completed when the pension fund letter is received. Then Mazars will have the closure procedures to finish off the audit.</p> <p>GB advised a follow up letter will be sent to formally share the final findings of the audit when it is complete and signed off.</p> <p>SG keen to avoid if at all possible, our finance people being taken off the day job at short notice, SG asked GB and CD if there is a dialogue.</p> <p>GB does not anticipate much more to do from an officer's point of view.</p> <p>Acknowledging officers are so busy, and considering the financial pressures and budgets, Mazars seeks to complete as smoothly and as efficiently as possible, and always aims to minimise the impact on officers. The sooner Mazars get out the way the better and they can sort of forget about us for a for a little while, although we will be back fairly soon of course.</p> <p>SG thanked CD and GB.</p> <p>SG formally closed the open session.</p>	

Date of Next Meeting: Monday 30 March 2023, 10:00

Venue: MS Teams