



## **JOINT INDEPENDENT ETHICS COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on 24th June 2024**

### **PRESENT**

Dr Gill Strachan (Chair)

Mrs Tricia Whiteside

Ms Victoria Blakeman

Mr Khalid Ibrahim

Dr Julie Cook

Dr Ade Oladapo

Mr Mark Hindle

Dr Camilla De Camargo

Dr Janet Howe

Miss Debbie Storr

### **IN ATTENDANCE**

Mrs G Routledge

Lancashire Constabulary

Mr Carl Melling (for Item 5)

Lancashire Constabulary

Mr James Marginson (for Item 5)

Lancashire Constabulary

Ms Tracey Hailwood (for Item 6)

Lancashire Constabulary

Ms Pamela Hudson (for Item 6)

Lancashire Constabulary

PS Weronika Wallis (for Item 9)

Lancashire Constabulary

Mrs Carol Benton

OPCC

Dr Strachan welcomed everyone to the meeting.

## **2. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Angela Harrison.

## **3. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2024**

The minutes were accepted as a true record.

## **4. Matters Arising**

**Action 1/24:** That JIEC members be given the opportunity to feedback on the ethical scenarios once drafted.

Action ongoing.

**Action 2/24:** Robotics in Policing added as a substantive agenda item.

Action discharged.

**Action 3/24:** Arrangements to be made for custody panel members to visit a custody suite if they felt it would be helpful to them. A request has been sent to the Custody Inspector at Preston and a reply awaited.

Action ongoing.

**Action 4/24:** Mark to attend the PSD training.

Action Discharged.

**Action 5/24:** Members reminded to forward their views about what to include on a web-page designed to improve public trust to Carol.

Action Discharged.

### **Actions**

**6, 7, 8/24:** These were actions for PS Wallis to take back to the TEC. PS Wallis advised that a decision had been made that officers and staff will have their membership of the TEC suspended whilst they are under investigation.

Actions Discharged.

## **5. Robotics in Policing**

Members were given an update covering what AI is, its current uses in policing, the current regulatory landscape, the EU AI Act, associated opportunities and risks, the NPCC / force position and the next steps, locally and nationally.

It was noted that the UK Government hope to regulate AI with principles and not rules and that there is a new EU AI Act agreed which takes a risk-based approach. Members were updated on the current force position, which is some limited use and development of re-active AI and the next steps, which nationally will include further work around the National Covenant and development of associated guidance, and locally will involve work around policy development, risk management, supply chain management, transparency and monitoring and assurance.

A debate ensued with members discussing issues such as data quality, the potential for savings, the level of skills required and the issue of public confidence and trust in terms of how the data is used. All agreed transparency was key, and it was noted that for live-time monitoring data is not retained unless there is a match.

Members acknowledged that some AI just replicates what is already being done in a different way. It was also confirmed that there will always be some sort of human element to decisions, with AI being used as a decision support tool.

It was agreed that in the future a 'use case' will be brought to the JIEC for members views and thoughts.

**Action 9/24:** That going forward 'use cases' be brought to the JIEC for members views and thoughts.

## **6. Code Of Ethics Implementation Update**

Members were given an update on the progress made in force regarding implementation of the Code of Ethics which had been reviewed and relaunched in January 2024. The aim is to connect everyone to the Code as, although the previous one was well used for promotion purposes, it was widely associated by many with misconduct matters, therefore Organisational Development are leading on implementation and not PSD. The aim is for people to make good ethical decisions and treat others with respect and empathy, whilst linking to the force vision.

The internal launch was discussed, the inputs given to various groups and an update given around the PDR implementation plan, where there was now a requirement to submit better quality evidence about how individuals achieved their results, how they did things, and to evidence reflective practice. PDRs have a feedback function, and should be used to celebrate successes and, for example, all letters of thanks received from members of the public will now go on the PDR. There is a real focus on helping staff to reflect and building the CVF into PDRs and all frontline staff had received an input on procedural justice.

Members were asked for their thoughts as to how the force might widen the scope of reflective practice. It was acknowledged that various factors combine to generate team success and that individuals judge themselves against those around them. It was suggested that individuals might be encouraged to discuss examples in team meetings, good and bad ones or an internal system of thanks could be set up on the intranet for staff to highlight good practice. The use of role models was suggested, or reverse mentoring, making training mandatory, engaging with communities for their lived experience to feedback and the need to ask people whether they used the Code, what for, how useful was it etc to start the conversation/ self-reflection. Culture in teams was discussed alongside generational differences that were evident in force.

It is perhaps more difficult from a customer's perspective, with post encounter follow up questions and the Cultural Maturity Model discussed.

Members views were sought on what themes they thought the scenarios should cover, in addition to those already identified, and it was suggested that dealing with vulnerable customers be also included.

**Action 10/24:** That a Teams meeting be set up with some members and OD to further discuss the thematic areas for the scenarios.

## **7. Members Updates from Thematic Areas since the last meeting:**

It was confirmed that, since the last JIEC meeting, there had been a Custody Detention Scrutiny Panel meeting held and the PSD Training had taken place, with the first PSD meeting scheduled for 8 July 2024.

## **8. Development of OPCC Confidence Web-Page**

Members were reminded of the ongoing action from the last meeting to feedback to CB what messaging they would like to reflect on an OPCC web-page with the aim of increasing public confidence.

## **9. Update from Tactical Ethics Committee**

Members were updated with regard to the items discussed at the recent TEC meeting, which two JIEC members had attended and reflected that it had been an interesting meeting with lots of views shared.

### *Use of Artificial Intelligence in the application stages of recruitment*

Members were advised that the original force stance had been that the use of AI was not accepted at the application stage of the recruitment process and members views had been sought.

It was acknowledged that this stance supported applicants from a neurodiverse background or those for whom English wasn't their first language. Also, that the technology is here and is not going away.

As AI can produce a perfect response it was unacceptable from an academic perspective for assignments, being classed as plagiarism, and proper referencing must be used to account for sources used. Application form submissions are a good way of checking literacy, qualifications and the quality of the written work, all impossible when AI is used. Members questioned how the force would know AI had been used, and it was confirmed there is software available that can detect it, and equally software that makes the text appear as it hasn't been generated by AI. If AI was allowed it might create a discriminatory gap between the old and the young.

There were lots of questions raised, such as are the force checking how well the example is written or is it about the example itself? If the example is genuine does it matter? The content can be probed at interview to better establish it's veracity? Should it be allowed as a personal aid providing the examples used are genuine? Is using AI any different to asking a friend to review your answers? Would AI remove nepotism?

Members acknowledged the use of AI in the private sector and the ongoing testing being undertaken by the home Office into the use of AI for recruitment purposes and again agreed that some form of external checking/review has always happened in a different format. The importance of the interview was stressed, that human element, and the bottom line was whether the police were getting the right results. One member questioned why not use it, the technology should be embraced as it is only one part of the process so long as there is some fact checking built in. A disclaimer could be added at the end for applicants to declare they had used AI?

There had been no conclusions drawn at the TEC, views were split, the outcome being that the HR representative had taken the issue and the views of the TEC back to the Head of HR for further consideration. Similarly, the force could add a statement that applicants may use AI but the veracity of the examples given would be tested at different stages of the process.

*How can the TEC continue to influence change across the organisation?*

The discussion at the TEC centred initially around what does a good TEC look like, and was there anything lacking in force? What opportunity did it have to influence in force and how best can the TEC pull on the lived experiences of the JIEC members?

They debated whether the TEC updates could be presented at any more corporate meetings, to brief Chief Officers, maybe the Organisational Learning Board to help inform practice and decisions?

It had been suggested that upcoming/planned changes might be presented to the TEC to seek their views although timeliness may be an issue as the TEC only meets quarterly. Another suggestion was whether members of the JIEC could sit on recruitment or promotion panels? It was about raising the profile of the TEC across the force, reporting into different forums such as the Custody Police Management Group, maybe a blog on the intranet or encouraging staff to submit dilemmas for consideration at the TEC as they tend to come from members currently. This could be done anonymously.

The pace of change in the force was acknowledged and one member reported he had spoken to a number of serving officers who felt change was done to them and were unsure how they could get involved so there is an issue of engaging with more people and getting their 'buy-in'. However, a lot of change is driven nationally and the force have to implement it, often to tight deadlines. The force need to make people invest in the change and help them through it. Staff needed somewhere they could vent and make their views known. Two areas were identified as requiring work, the response investigation teams and custody. Good practice does exist however, with one senior officer making time in their diary each week for staff to go and talk to them about any issue.

## **10. Any Other Business**

It was queried whether a portal could be set up for the secure sharing of papers to avoid members using personal email and whether using personal email was appropriate as a point of principle? The difficulties in setting up a portal were explained and that it was a matter for members whether they were happy to use their personal emails. It was confirmed that nothing had been circulated that was sensitive.

**Action 11/2024:** The Constabulary Data Protection Officer to be asked to review the previous minutes and associated papers for re-assurance there had been nothing sensitive or protectively marked.

**Action 12/2024:** That consideration be given to providing members with guidance relating to the retention and disposal of documents circulated.

## **11. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held at 9.30 am on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> September 2024, at County Hall, Preston.