

Minute of Scottish Police Authority Audit and Risk Committee

Meeting	Scottish Police Authority Audit & Risk Committee – public meeting	Date/Venue	Tuesday 20th October 2015
Meeting Called By	David Hume, Chair	Start Time	14:00
Reference Meeting No	SPAARC-201015	End Time	15:40

Members Present		In Attendance	
Name	Title	Name	Title
David Hume	Chair, Authority Member	John Foley	Chief Executive, SPA
Moi Ali	Authority Member	Amy McDonald	Director of Financial Accountability (SPA)
Iain Whyte	Authority Member	Graham Stickle	Risk Manager (SPA)
Paul Rooney	Authority Member (observer)	ACC Wayne Mossan	Assistant Chief Constable, Police Scotland
Elaine Wilkinson	Authority Member (observer)	CS Andy McKay	Chief Superintendent, Police Scotland
		Susan Mitchell	Director of Corporate Services, Police Scotland
		Janet Murray	Director of Finance, Police Scotland
		Martin Leven	Director of ICT, Police Scotland
		CI Lynne Ratcliff	Chief Inspector, Police Scotland
		CI Fergus Bryne	Chief Inspector, Police Scotland
		Sarah Jane Hannah	Head of Financial Accountancy, Police Scotland
		Alison Dougall	Head of Management Accounting, Police Scotland
		Gillian Woolman	Assistant Director, Audit Scotland
		Esther Scoburgh	Audit Manager, Audit Scotland
		Karen Vallance	Business Services Assistant (SPA)

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

1. Chair's Opening Remarks: (David Hume)

D Hume welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

There were apologies from Morag McLaughlin and Iain Whyte who were anticipated to arrive later.

There were no declarations of interest.

2. Minute from Meeting held 30 June 2015: (David Hume)

Reference ITEM NO 2 for the papers contained within pack.

Approval was sought for the Minutes of the meeting held 23 January 2015.

The Minutes were approved with no amendments.

There were no matters arising.

Members **APPROVED** the minutes from the meeting held on the 30 June 2015.

3. Rolling Action Log: (David Hume)

Reference ITEM NO 3 for the papers contained within pack.

Refer to the updated action commentary reflected in the Rolling Action Register.

M Ali raised concern and sought clarity on the process for closing and amending actions. J Foley responded that SPA actions are not amended without consultation with the Chair. F Byrne and L Ratcliff confirmed that changes are highlighted through the SPA Liaison team. J Foley advised that with the creation of the CEO Business Unit, any proposed changes to actions will be highlighted quicker.

Members **NOTED** the updates and status of actions as recorded in the Rolling Action Register.

4. Whistleblowing (Amy McDonald)

Reference ITEM NO 4 for the papers contained within the pack.

A McDonald noted that the report had been tabled at the previous Committee but the management actions had not been agreed. The actions had since been accepted and the report updated to which A McDonald referred Members to.

E Wilkinson referred to 2.4 of the main findings and sought confirmation on if reporting would be to the Complaints and Conduct Committee and if so, when it would be implemented. D Hume added that during previous discussions it had been noted that there was a degree of flexibility needed in reporting due to the nature of the different complaints but the restatement of management response noted it was relevant to Complaints and Conduct Committee. A McDonald responded that the Audit and Risk Committee would generally be the Committee that Whistleblowing activity would be reported to but if it related to conduct of officers and staff within the organisation then it would be more appropriate for that information to be reported to the Complaints and Conduct Committee. D Hume sought clarity that the results of what comes out the whistleblowing system would come to Audit and Risk in the first instance and would then be passed to Complaints and Conduct and/or Human Resources and Remuneration Committee if necessary and appropriate. A McDonald confirmed that was the case. E Wilkinson sought clarity on when reporting would commence. A McDonald

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

confirmed that reporting would come to Audit and Risk Committee quarterly and be reported within the private session. E Wilkinson requested that the ARCPL – 004 be amended to include Audit and Risk Committee reporting cycles.

E Wilkinson questioned when the Committee would expect to see the Internal Audit Plan for the current year and the progress against the audit plan. A McDonald responded that an update on internal audit and the internal audit plan would be provided under AOCB in the closed session.

M Ali requested that a cover paper be provided for each paper brought to the Committee.

Members **NOTED** the paper.

5. Improvement Tracker

5.1 Scottish Improvement Tracker (Graham Stickle)

Reference ITEM NO 5.1 contained within pack.

G Stickle referred Members to the paper highlighting that, as agreed at the June Audit and Risk Committee, the full tracker was not provided, however, the link to the full tracker within the paper which had also been agreed had proved challenging therefore G Stickle noted that if any Members wished to see the full tracker it could be sent to them.

G Stickle referred Members to the summary update of the SPA Continuous Improvement, highlighting that there had been significant changes in percentage increases of actions completed which was a result of actions with target dates of June to August 2015. G Stickle noted that there was a number of targets which are due until March 2016 therefore there will not be a great change in the continuous improvement action at the next meeting.

G Woolman noted that within the draft annual audit report, due for reporting in the closed session, it is noted that it is important that the Members of the Audit and Risk Committee feel that they have appropriate mechanisms to monitor progress of actions from all the scrutiny inspections and audit that is undertaken. G Woolman noted she felt the paper provided did not provide enough information.

D Hume suggested that more thinking was need on visibility of the full tracker and noted while the full tracker was a lot of information, the paper that had been provided was not clear for a member of the public. G Stickle agreed he would reconsider how the full tracker can be provided to Members and how the improvement tracker can be reported publically.

ACTION – 20102015-ARCPL-001 Graham Stickle to consider how the full SPA Improvement Tracker is made visible to Members and how it can be reported clearer as a public paper.

D Hume referred to the recommendation regarding HMICS Thematic Inspection of Road Policing and sought more information on the type of local engagement work mentioned. G Stickle replied that the full tracker would have shown the information to answer the question and suggested that the tracker be sent out to Members for information. J Foley added that it had been agreed that the increase in engagement with local authorities was not just in respect to the thematic inspection but across all work and noted that the Community Accountability is up to full strength so progress will be made sooner.

ACTION – 20102015-002 Graham Stickle to forward full SPA tracker to all Members.

M Ali questioned whether G Woolman had had sight of the tracker and if she had, questioned if it was useful. G Woolman replied that she had seen the improvement tracker and noted that it had become unwieldy. There needs to be a way of providing information to Members which is something between today's cover pages and the current long detailed improvement tracker.

Members **NOTED** the paper and **AGREED** the actions.

5.2 Police Scotland Improvement Tracker (Lynne Ratcliff)

Reference ITEM NO 5.2 contained within pack.

L Ratcliff referred Members to the Police Scotland HMICS Improvement Tracker and circulated an additional document with further details of the tracker including strategic owner, tactical lead, reference number and current RAG status. L Ratcliff noted that the additional document does not contain the specifics of each recommendation and sought guidance on whether the document should be evolved to include that additional information.

L Ratcliff referred to page 2 of the paper noting that there was an error and that there were four amber assessed items although none posed a risk of moving to red. L Ratcliff sought guidance on how updates on amber assessed items are reported and suggested a one page summary on ambers.

E Wilkinson welcomed input into an exercise and D Hume suggested it may be helpful to have an informal meeting to discuss on how it is presented graphically. L Ratcliff added that it would be helpful for G Stickle to also attend.

M Ali felt that the important items for the Committee to know were the high risk ones with assurances that they were being progressed whether they were green or amber.

Martin Leven joined the meeting.

G Woolman noted that a summary of a set action plan of progress would be beneficial to allow Members to know that there are processes in place

L Ratcliff agreed that an informal meeting would be helpful and suggested that once Members were comfortable on the HMICS Layout, it can be transferred to the Police Scotland Improvement Tracker.

ACTION – 20102015-ARCPL-003 – Informal meeting with L Ratcliff, Andy Morris, Graham Stickle and Audit and Risk Committee Members to discuss what information is brought and how it is presented.

E Wilkinson agreed with the proposal but sought assurance that there was nothing currently that would be a cause of concern from both Improvement trackers which L Ratcliff confirmed there was nothing.

G Woolman raised concern that there was no mention of Audit Scotland recommendations which L Ratcliff replied that the recommendations were in progress but was not being reported in public.

Members **NOTED** the paper and **AGREED** the actions.

5.3 Crime Recording Audit (Fergus Byrne)

Reference ITEM 5.3 contained within pack.

F Byrne referred Members to the paper and provided an overview.

D Hume congratulated F Byrne on the effectiveness of the planning that has been put in place and the results that it is generating.

M Ali referred to the regional variation and sought clarity on what happens when there are low levels of compliance. F Byrne responded that there is effective governance through the Performance Board and through the corporate governance board. F Byrne added that the Performance Board is Chaired

by the Chief Constable who challenges the numbers. F Byrne further added that there is increased training and bulletins circulated to cover areas of good practice and that any failings are put back into learning.

Iain Whyte joined the meeting.

E Wilkinson sought clarity on what is being done on learning from areas that are doing well and how that is being shared. F Byrne replied that it is a range of communications such as bulletins, presentation and one to one contact with crime managers and confirmed that good practice is being brought to all areas.

D Hume referred to paragraph 2.3 and sought clarity on what was meant by individual scrutiny and engagement committees. F Byrne confirmed that audits were shared with local authorities who receive performance reports as the reports have crime recording information that is relevant to that local authority.

Members **NOTED** the report.

6. Stop and Search Improvement Plan Progress Update (ACC Mawson)

Reference ITEM NO 6 contained within pack.

ACC Mawson referred Members to the paper and provided an overview and progress update on the testing phase 1 and overview of the interim phase 2 2015/16.

D Hume sought confirmation that it is only the interim phase 2 report that would be going to the Board meeting on 27 October. ACC Mawson confirmed it was.

E Wilkinson requested information on the lessons learned from the testing phase 1 and questioned what the implications of the IAG report since the testing began. A McKay confirmed that the crucial learning had come from the database as officers were now capturing information on the circumstances around why searches had taken place and there was 100% review on all searches. A McKay added that any learning from these reviews were being communicated and noted that the testing phase had also been a learning phase.

I Whyte referred to the shift from consensual to statutory searches and sought clarity on background numbers, specifically if the overall number of searches had dropped and questioned if there was any operational difficulties due to the change. ACC Mawson confirmed that there were still consensual searches so it was not possible to currently analyse the gaps and noted that the John Scott report wanted further consultation around what legislation, such as alcohol, would be and that consultation would not be before January 2017. ACC Mawson noted that the reduction in numbers before the consultation was a good news story for Police Scotland and that 84% of all searches in September 2015 were done on a statutory basis. I Whyte sought clarity on the period of change for statutory searches as noted in the report. ACC Mawson confirmed it was June-October 2014 compared to June-October 2015.

D Hume noted that within the second report the governance structure seemed very complicated and questioned if there was any prospect for an independent review for further assurance. ACC Mawson responded that the HMICS were going to do another audit review in 2016 and there was a scrutiny review group set up involving HMICS, Scottish Government, Police Scotland, CIPRA and SPA.

Members **NOTED** the paper.

10. AOCB (David Hume)

There was no other business.

11. Date of Next Meeting: tbc

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

End.

APPROVED