

**ORIGINATOR:
BUSINESS CO-ORDINATOR,
OFFICE OF THE PCC FOR SUFFOLK**

DECISION NUMBER: 50-2016.

REASON FOR SUBMISSION: FOR DECISION

SUBMITTED TO: CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**SUBJECT: THREE YEARLY REVIEW OF INDEPENDENT
CUSTODY VISITOR APPOINTMENTS**

SUMMARY:

1. The Home Office Code of Practice for Custody Visiting requires each Scheme to undertake a reconstitution process every 3 years. The key factors considered in maintaining appointments are:
 - i) The continuing ability and willingness of the individual in question to conduct the role effectively having regard to the role profile for an Independent Custody Visitor (ICV);
 - ii) Ensuring that the individual is operating within the Scheme Guidelines, in accordance with the Home Office Code of Practice and other National Standards, and within the spirit of the Scheme.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Chief Executive review the contents of this report and endorse the proposal to renew the appointments of 13 ICVs in Suffolk as of 1 January 2017 for a three year term and also approve three long standing ICVs continuing until the end of March 2017 until some further recruitment has been achieved.

APPROVAL BY: CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The recommendations set out are agreed.

Signature

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized initial 'C' followed by a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Date *19 December 2016*

DETAIL OF THE SUBMISSION

1. **BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The Home Office Code of Practice for Independent Custody Visiting provides guidance in respect PCC duties in discharging the independent custody visiting function.
- 1.2 In respect of individual appointments to custody visiting schemes, the Home Office provides the following national guidance:

“29. Appointments as an ICV must initially be for three years and must not be confirmed until a six-month probationary period has been satisfactorily completed. Full re-assessments of suitability must take place at regular intervals but no longer than three years apart. The key factors in renewing appointments for further periods must be the continuing ability and willingness of the individuals involved to do the job effectively. Any decision not to renew the appointment must follow the principles of natural justice and must be publicised in the scheme’s memorandum of understanding or guidance.”

- 1.3 The current ICV appointments to the Scheme in Suffolk are effective until 31 December 2016. The last full review of all appointments to the Scheme was undertaken in December 2013.
- 1.4 The PCC’s Scheme of Governance and Consent (at section 3 - Delegations) sets out the ‘Functions designated/delegated to the Chief Executive of the Office of the PCC’ which includes the administration of the Independent Custody Visiting Scheme and any other volunteer schemes including the appointment, suspension and removal of custody visitors and other volunteers. This report is therefore submitted to the Chief Executive for consideration.

2. **REVIEW OF INDEPENDENT CUSTODY VISITOR APPOINTMENTS IN SUFFOLK**

- 2.1 The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk has commenced the three yearly review processes in line with Home Office guidance, being particularly mindful of the designated Role Profile and Person Specification for an Independent Custody Visitor in Suffolk.
- 2.2 A letter was circulated to the 20 volunteers appointed to the Scheme in September 2016 to establish if they were willing and able to continue in the role. 16 of the 20 ICVs responded stating that they would like to continue after 31 December 2016. One member resigned for personal reasons in October, two visitors decided that this was a natural time to step down so will be leaving at the end of December and one member resigned to take on another voluntary role in early December.
- 2.3 Three visitors on the Bury St Edmunds Panel have served over six years so will be stepping down from the role but, as there are also three new members on the Panel that are still in the probationary period, those experienced members have agreed to continue until the end of March 2017 to allow for some further recruitment and the continued development of the three relatively new ICVs to take place.

3. **INDIVIDUAL APPOINTMENTS**

- 3.1 A comprehensive overview of the number of visits undertaken by the 16 visitors who wish to continue, their attendance at Panel meetings, training and conferences is provided at Appendix 1 (Confidential appendix - NOT FOR PUBLICATION). Feedback from each of the Panel Co-ordinators was also sought with regard to the

performance of individuals, their commitment/flexibility to the Scheme and consideration of issues such as effective interaction with detainees and this is included in the attached.

- 3.2 In light of the continued willingness, satisfactory level of performance and positive feedback received the Chief Executive is recommended to consider renewing the appointments for 13 ICVs with effect from 1 January 2017 and allowing three long standing ICVs to continue until 31 March 2017 for some further recruitment to be undertaken.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.3 All 13 ICVs continuing for a further three year period will be required to attend a training session on 4 February 2017. The costs of that training will be covered by Independent Custody Visiting Scheme element of the PCC's Corporate Budget.

5. OTHER IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS:

- 5.1 There are no other implications or risks associated with consideration of the recommendations contained within this report.

ORIGINATOR CHECKLIST (MUST BE COMPLETED)	PLEASE STATE 'YES' OR 'NO'
Has legal advice been sought on this submission?	NO
Has the PCC's Chief Finance Officer been consulted?	NO
Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered including equality analysis, as appropriate?	YES
Have human resource implications been considered?	YES
Is the recommendation consistent with the objectives in the Police and Crime Plan?	YES
Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?	YES
Has communications advice been sought on areas of likely media interest and how they might be managed?	NO
Have all relevant ethical factors been taken into consideration in developing this submission?	YES

