

OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER
FOR GREATER MANCHESTER

ETHICS COMMITTEE

27 January 2015

Meeting commenced: 5.30 pm

Meeting ended: 7.35 pm

PRESENT: Bishop David Walker – in the Chair
Catherine Boyd, Ruth Bromley, Cym Dsouza, Nasir Hafezi, Peter Joyce, Sally Lester (via Skype), Sean McHale, Ian Hopkins, Shaid Mushtaq and Ruth Purdie.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Jim Battle, Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner
Smyth Harper, Head of Communications and Advocacy
Rachael Storey, Business Support Officer
Emma Stonier, Business Support Officer

Paul Rumney, Chief Superintendent, Professional Standards Branch
Chief Superintendent John O'Hare, Greater Manchester Police
Chief Inspector Bob Pell, Greater Manchester Police

22. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of David Arnold and Paul Horracks

23. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 20TH NOVEMBER 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 20th November 2014, were approved as an accurate record.

24. ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING

Action 16: Body Worn Video – Jim Battle informed the Committee that a report from him, Bishop David Walker and Sir Peter Fahy is being finalised and he will feedback on this. BWV updates will be brought back to later meetings of the Ethics Committee.

Action 19: Update on minutes of Ethics Committee meetings being made available to the public. Once a profile for Ethics Committee has been created on the GMPCC website, the minutes of these meetings will be made available online once they have been approved by the Committee.

Action 19: Please amend in minutes to show that a member, on behalf of the chair, spoke to the detective inspector who had to observe the committee as part of a

Masters degree. The member reported back that the detective inspector was no longer pursuing her Masters degree, so no further action needed regarding the research request received. The detective inspector passed on thanks to the committee for their time.

25. TOPIC FOR CONSIDERATION – USE OF WEAPONS

John O'Hare and Robert Pell provided members with information on the police use of weapons and outlined the National Decision Model used in training officers in the use of weapons/force. National Decision Model can be used dynamically, to forward plan or to make decisions very quickly. Code of Ethics is at the centre of the model to ensure that actions taken are decided on by using an ethical judgement. The staff feedback received so far has been positive indicating that that model has helped when having to make decisions about use of force.

Members considered the information and discussion took place surrounding the following areas:

- Who gets trained in the different aspects of the model? For example who undertakes Personal Safety Training? Police Officers up to rank of Chief Inspector would undertake this, and Chief Inspector with public role would receive Personal Safety Training. Model does not necessarily make clear who receives what training.
- Mandatory training related to job related Fitness Test is with the Police Federation currently and Chief Officers in March. Once this has come back GMP can provide an update to the committee.
- How is model incorporated into recruitment process? New recruits are trained in the model as part of the process so should be embedded in decision making process from day one.
- What is the evidence for the National Decision Model? How can demonstrate that the model is a good thing?
 - Demonstrate that officers are aware of impact of actions, not just on individual/family but also the wider community
 - Would be statistics which committee could see what would demonstrate how effective the model is?
 - At Command Level – pass/fail and model is integral to this
 - Could model result in consistency of behaviour over time which could be measured?
- What is the likelihood that the model will remain consistent in face of change of government?
 - Model now owned by College of Policing
 - It is National model which is being used across various services
 - Joint training sessions of emergency services
 - Centre of the model – ethics/public safety will not change so should ensure consistency, even if some aspects change slightly.

- How does the model account for individual differences in way people react to situations?
 - Retraining would be offered, lessons learnt with Professional Standards Branch – with the aim to avoid situation happening again, to change behaviour and to help reputation of individual, the force and the scheme.
- How will the model be delivered to communities across Greater Manchester? How will they be aware of it?
 - Communicate to the public – partnership and community engagement at local level to show listening. Model should help with this so community become aware of it in a more informal way.
 - Neighbourhood policing
- How are officers trained when using the model in approaching communities which may already feel vulnerable or they are a threat/risk in themselves?
 - Focus on the individual and not the community
 - Community Impact Assessments – directed towards individual and also capture impact on the wider community
 - Code of Ethics at heart of model – incorporating respect and equality and diversity
- Is there a way to map the use of force in particular areas? Is the use of force used more in different areas/areas with a different demographic?

Following the above discussion the members considered the information presented and it was agreed:

1. Chief Superintendent John O'Hare to look up datasets which can be accessed for the National Decision Model and how these could be used to measure success/evaluate the model.
2. Committee to discuss how the success of the National Decision Model is measured/evaluated at a future meeting and to decide what the indicators for measuring its success should be for e.g. reduction in use of weapons/force or reduction in number of complaints relating to use of force.
3. Committee to look at what their role is in the 'use of force' outside of this meeting and to feedback their decision.

26. TOPIC FOR CONSIDERATION – POLICE EMPLOYMENT OF PEOPLE WITH CRIMINAL RECORDS

Ian Hopkins introduced the paper on Police Employment of People with Criminal Records. The Committee had read the paper and the following questions/areas were discussed:

- Confirmed that on the whole someone will be barred from joining the police force indefinitely if have been convicted of a serious offence, for e.g. assault/theft.
- Can someone with a caution be employed? Yes, can be decided to employ someone who has previously received a caution, particularly if relate to low level offences, Section 4 offences, Section 5 offences and Public Order offences. GMP also confirmed that there is flexibility with young people who have received cautions/fixed penalty notices in the past.
- Does GMP carry out psychological testing? It was confirmed that psychological testing does not take place in the recruitment process.
- GMP has a Notifiable Association Policy which can exclude people from being employed through associations with people commit criminal activity/journalists/business people. When apply to be a police officer must declare any association issues, if these are not declared then may not be employed. Serving police officers asked to declare any notifiable associations at their Annual Appraisal. Vetting – low level renewal takes place on annual basis and have declare notifiable associations when undergoing this process.
 - Are there ethical issues with regards to the Notifiable Association policy potentially limiting the community of police? When vetting takes place in scenario for e.g. where someone has a family member with convictions that on its own would not necessarily bar them from joining the police. Each case is taken on its own merit.
 - Are people allowed to know the reasons why they failed vetting? There is an appeal process where can appeal the decision, but will not be told the reasons why failed, for e.g. because of Data Protection issues.
 - Vetting process is a fine balance between holding people responsible for associations and taking people on their own merit. Vetting does take place on a case by case basis and each one is looked at and taken seriously.
 - Potential ethical issues around equality and diversity and the vetting procedure – some communities may be more likely to have member of family in prison for e.g. so vetting procedure may work against having a diverse police force. GMP informed committee about Operation Peel – talking to communities about situations that would stop you from joining the police force so communities are more aware of the procedures for joining.
 - Difficulties to attempt to get a balance between positive impacts of having officers from hard to reach communities vs. the vetting procedure.
- Who makes the vetting decisions? Force Vetting Unit makes decisions and a set criteria is applied to every application.
 - Who are the people who make the decisions? 3 senior members of the Force Vetting Unit make the final decision. The Right of Appeal goes through Professional Standards Branch and Force Vetting Officer.

- GMP would be happy to provide a dip sample of the vetting decision making process to the committee.
- There is an audit trail of decisions made, and why. A National Framework is in place which GMP follow which comes from the College of Policing. There are set checks to go through e.g. criminal checks, credit checks, counter terrorism etc.

It was decided that:

1. Ethics Committee needed more information in form of data, vetting forms, and dip samples of how decisions are made. Once this has been undertaken the Committee can decide on key issues which they want to take forward and where ethics come into play.
2. A small group to be established to look further into GMP vetting procedure and police employment of people with criminal records. Smyth Harper to liaise with working group to arrange a meeting with the Force Vetting Unit.

27. FRAMEWORK FOR ROBUSTNESS - DISCUSSION

A member introduced the briefing paper for discussion about the Framework for Robustness which she had circulated to members prior to the meeting. The main areas discussed and questions raised were as follows:

- Where the Ethics Committee gets their information from? Most information currently is received from the Police, should the committee be getting their information from wider sources? Does committee need to set out why/what information they want? IPCC hold many datasets, for e.g. on investigations undertaken, HMIC also holds datasets/information.
- Should the committee decide what information they want to see/would like to see and feedback this to the police?
- What are the public concerns? What issues and concerns do the wider public have with the police? In carrying out the Body Worn Video work committee met with various groups and obtained feedback different settings which resulted in different issues being discovered. Could this be something the committee could do for other topics?
- Possibility of 2/3 people in small groups scoping out a topic prior to the meeting to scope further what information is available and to bring this to the main meeting.
- How the success of the Ethics Committee should be measured?
- Committee there to attempt to deal with ethical issues and draw out ethical principles and standards to improve policing;
 - Committee may need better legal advice and support surrounding laws related to topics under consideration
 - Information from sources including the laws which police use and are governed by
 - For committee reports to be strong need make robust decisions
 - Important to consider what questions police have which are important ethical questions – what do the Police want from the committee?

- College of Policing has nine ethical principles and standards – how could these be used in the work of the committee?

Following discussion the members agreed:

1. The Committee should decide what topics they would like to ask the police about.
2. The Chair will reflect on what the Committee wants for the next meeting and will feedback this to the OPCC/GMP. Discussion will take place with all committee members outside of the meeting via email.
3. The Chair and the Committee to consider where they can get legal advice if needed for future topics under discussion.

28. FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE ITEMS

Following the discussion in item 27 the possibility of holding an away day/getting to know you day was suggested. The Ethics Committee are to discuss this outside of the meeting.

29. TERMS OF REFERENCE

30. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No other items of business were risen.

31. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on 23rd March, 2015, commencing at 5.30pm.