

METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY ICV PROGRAMME BOARD
11th MAY 2006

REVIEW OF THE FUTURE ADMINISTRATION OF ICV PANELS IN LONDON

1. Summary

This paper examines the present arrangements for the provision of administrative support to the 32 Independent Custody Visiting Panels in London, and considers five options for change. Three of the options preserve the present decentralised pattern of part time administrators, with some changes to the detail. The other two options involve centralised, full time administrators.

9 criteria have been used to assess the five options, and each option has been scored on each of the criteria. The overall conclusion is that the option that best meets the criteria is centralised administration with 8 MPA staff supporting the 32 ICV Panels between them.

2. Current arrangements for providing admin support

Currently (April 2006) the 32 London ICV Panels make separate arrangements for administration. MPA files show that 21 of them use the services of the local authority, 6 have an independent administrator, one has a Service Level Agreement with its local Council of Voluntary Service, one has an SLA with their local Victim Support scheme and three have no paid administrator in place at present.

The current arrangements were critically reviewed in the 2004 Review of the ICV Scheme, which recommended that they should be replaced.

3. Criteria for Review

The criteria used in this review of administrative support to Panels are:

- implementing the 2004 Review of MPA Independent Custody Visiting
- moving the London Scheme closer to full compliance with the Code of Practice and other guidance
- repositioning MPA as the duty holder for the provision of the London ICV Scheme
- addressing the funding imbalances between Panels
- arriving at a defensible standard number of hours of administrative support and (therefore) total number of administrative staff required
- freeing resources for developmental work for the Scheme as a whole by saving money on the cost of administrative support and thus
- standardising the role description of the Panel Administrator

- achieving a higher degree of consistency between Panels in respect of their administrative support
 - building in resilience to the administrative support arrangements.

4. The Options

The ICV Programme Board, on 16th February 2006, received an interim paper on the future administration of ICV Panels. That paper put forward four options:

- Option 1: status quo with capping
- Option 2: status quo with standardised hours
- Option 3: clustered Panels with outsourced administration
- Option 4: clustered Panels with MPA administration

The February Programme Board also asked for a fifth option to be considered - a combination of options 1 and 2.

Under options 1, 2 and 5 there would be one part-time administrator per panel – 32 in all. Under options 3 and 4 there would be a smaller number of full time administrators, each servicing a number of panels. A copy of a Job Description for a full time Panel Administrator is attached as Appendix 1.

The distinction between the part time and full time patterns of administration is so important to the practicalities of running the scheme that the choice of options needs to be made as a two stage process: first whether to retain the decentralised pattern of part-time staff or whether to have centralised full-timers; second to consider the implementation of each option, i.e. whether options 1, 2 or 5 (if decentralisation is chosen) or options 3 or 4 (if centralisation is chosen at stage 1).

The key difference between the decentralised and centralised options is that the decentralised options would continue the present model of a fragmented, localised and borough based service supported by the MPA, whereas the centralised options would represent a change to a London wide service provided by the MPA with local delivery by volunteers working within a consistent framework.

The selection of either of the centralised options would involve the termination of all the current local administration arrangements. The precise implications would need to be worked out case by case because there are a number of factors to be taken into account. It is possible for example that TUPE¹ might apply in some cases so that employed administrators would transfer to the employment of the MPA. If one of the centralised options is chosen there will need to be a period of intense activity to identify the employment law implications, which could however be accommodated within the time table

¹ Transfer of Undertakings, Preservation of Employment regulations. Best known in the context of outsourcing public sector jobs to the private sector, TUPE also applies to previously outsourced work being brought back in house.

presented to the last Programme Board (i.e. implementation of new administrative arrangements to start in April 2007).

For the purposes of this paper the five options are classified in the following way:

OPTION	CENTRALISE	DECENTRALISE
Capped funding		D1
Standardised hours		D2
Outsourced	C3	
In-house	C4	
Capped and standardised		D5

5. Implementing the 2004 Review of MPA Independent Custody Visiting

The natural starting point for any review of the administrative support given to ICV Panels in London has to be the independent review by Ian Smith, Chief Executive of the Independent Custody Visitors Association.

That review recommended that Panels should be grouped into five geographical clusters for administration purposes. However the report suggested that these clusters would not be of equal sizes, since the two Westminster Panels would form one cluster, the other boroughs being grouped geographically – North East, North West, South East and South West.

In terms of the role of the Panel administrator, the Review found that

Panel Secretaries are seen by many as administrative secretaries only and the importance of this role needs further investment and support.
(Review section 5.7.3, p. 21)

The Review also made three key recommendations regarding the Development Objectives for the Scheme:

- a) *raise the grade and status of staff towards management functions, as opposed to an administrative support role*
 - b) *create new staffing structure to include scheme manager and up to five full time co-ordinators with each running one of the 5 new MPA independent custody visitor panels*
 - c) *review the use of a central London office for co-ordinators.*
- (Review section 7.3, p. 25)

Thus a new role for the administrators was being envisaged, one that would see them taking on a much more wide ranging and professional remit. The review was predicated on this being the only way in which the yawning gap between an effective and efficient scheme and the existing reality of the London Scheme could be bridged. MPA broadly accepted this recommendation and work has progressed on redefining the administrative role.

One thing the Review did not cover was the consequential effect of this change on the role of the Panel Chair, which in some cases is largely administrative – arranging visiting rotas for instance – and in others is more managerial. The role of the Chair is outside the remit of the present review, but it is flagged up here for future consideration. What does need to be emphasised however is that there is no intention to downgrade the role of the Panel Chair. On the contrary MPA wants to see Panel Chairs concentrating on leadership and maintaining and improving the quality of custody visiting, rather than administration and budgeting.

As to the recommendation that Panels should be merged into “super-Panels”, i.e. not just clustered for the provision of administrative services but actually losing their Borough links and local identity, there is no compelling case at present to move away from one Panel per Borough. Local exigencies are likely to create a patchwork of variations on the general theme, such as in Havering and Redbridge for example. In the future, the creation of large custody centres by MPS may also lead to the need to review the geographical base of schemes.

In terms of the five options considered in this paper the 2004 Review points unequivocally towards Option C4.

6. Compliance

There are significant concerns about the extent to which the present scheme complies with the requirements imposed on MPA by the Police Reform Act 2002 Paragraph 51 and stated Codes of Practice. These are now discussed. The overall conclusion is that one or other of the two centralised options would be best to bring MPA into compliance, while the decentralised options would perpetuate existing difficulties for achieving this. There is little to choose between C3 and C4 in this respect, although C4 has a slight edge.

6.1 Raising matters of concern with the police (CoP paras. 60 – 62)

The Authority has responsibility, shared with the Visitors, to raise matters of concern with the Police. The present structure militates against the Authority doing this in a systematic manner. Centralised staffing would reduce the number of people collecting information from visitors and liaising with the police, making this process much more efficient. Decentralisation would not address this issue. Either option C3 or C4 would be appropriate. However, in-house provision (option C4) would have the added advantage of rectifying the existing lack of MPA/Police liaison on ICV matters at the Borough level.

6.2 Marketing and publicity (paras. 8 and 10)

Currently marketing and publicity are done entirely by individual Panels. Some Panels use posters produced by ICVA and some have developed their own individual marketing materials. There is no

consistency and no branding of the scheme. The MPA has no involvement in marketing and publicity at the moment and therefore cannot ensure that marketing and publicity materials meet equal opportunities requirements, deliver a consistent message or help brand or promote the scheme as a whole in the minds of the general public. These arguments point towards a centralised scheme, but there seems little to choose between C3 and C4.

6.3 Recruitment, interview and selection (paras. 11 – 15, 17, 18)

The Code of Practice clearly places the responsibility for recruitment with the Police Authority. Currently the MPA has no involvement in ICV recruitment, interview or selection and no meaningful engagement in who is or is not selected as an ICV. Recruitment and interviews are all done locally by individual panels and a recommendation to appoint candidates is sent to the MPA, without MPA staff ever meeting the candidate.

It is quite likely that each Panel is following a different process for selection, asking different questions, making different assessments, based on different criteria and coming to different decisions from their neighbouring panels. There is a need to standardise existing practices across all boroughs to ensure that the scheme is being recruited to at a set standard – set key areas are being tested at interview and good practice around interview techniques, equal opportunities etc is being followed.

The need for standardisation tends to indicate centralisation, but not necessarily. Options C3 and C4 make it easier to enforce standardisation, although this could in theory be achieved by the decentralised options if sufficient time, training and attention could be devoted by the existing MPA staff to attending recruitment events and selection interviews. On balance, it is more credible that full time centralised staff would be able to maintain a consistent standard on behalf of MPA.

6.4 Accreditation and review of probationary periods (paras. 8 and 10)

Currently the MPA performs a 'rubber stamp' function in terms of accreditation. MPA staff have not met and do not know most of the volunteers that are being accredited. Initial accreditation should take place on the basis of the successful completion of a probationary period – this is set out in the Codes of Practice. Currently, not all panels operate on this basis and the MPA has no involvement in a new ICVs probationary period.

Re-accreditation should take place every 3 years and only happen after a meeting with the ICV, a review of their performance over the period served and their willingness to continue. This is set out in the Codes of Practice. Currently this is just an automatic process if the ICV wants to continue.

These are compelling arguments for a centralised scheme, since decentralisation cannot deliver. There is however no particular reason to prefer C3 to C4.

6.5 Monitoring of Panel performance (paras. 4, 62, 64)

Currently Panel performance is only looked at once a year through the annual reviews provided by (some) panels. Panels provide statistics on number of visits undertaken, time and frequency, against their own targets. The MPA has not formally set a target for these and currently has almost no involvement in the operation of individual Panels. At the moment all the London panels operate differently to each other and it is difficult to get more than a very subjective impression of how 'good' or effective they are.

Either centralised option would make monitoring performance – and, crucially – taking corrective action much easier because there would be many fewer people involved and a dedicated staff team to undertake this work. There is little to choose between C3 and C4. Conversely, the decentralised options make it much more difficult for the MPA to monitor and take action on performance issues.

7. Repositioning MPA as the responsible owner and manager of the London ICV Scheme

Much of the current unease about the state of the London scheme can be attributed to a perception - right or wrong - that it is out of MPA's control. If this perception is accepted then the only appropriate course of action is one of the centralised options. In this case the in-house option would have the edge over outsourcing because there would be more direct ownership and leadership by the MPA and one less layer of management between the Scheme Manager and individual ICVs.

8. Addressing the funding imbalances between Panels

An earlier paper to the Programme Board (3rd November 2005) presented cost data for the different Panels and illustrated the consequences of a range of different funding regimes for ICV Panels. Figure 1 below shows the amount spent by MPA on each Panel during 2005/06. It also shows the number of cells for which each Panel is responsible for visiting and the cost to MPA of providing an independent custody visiting service to each cell.

Figure 1 MPA 2005/06 Spend on ICV Panels

Borough	MPA spend		No. of cells	MPA spend	
	£	on Panel		£	per cell
Kingston	£	7,757.60	10	£	775.76
Merton	£	6,712.20	10	£	671.22
Kensington and Chelsea	£	12,551.43	20	£	627.57
Lambeth	£	17,108.00	31	£	551.87
Enfield	£	8,610.00	16	£	538.13
Richmond	£	6,825.75	14	£	487.55
Wandsworth	£	12,603.40	26	£	484.75
Harrow	£	5,017.38	12	£	418.12
Camden	£	14,593.17	35	£	416.95
Barnet	£	8,586.25	21	£	408.87
Newham	£	11,477.23	29	£	395.77
Waltham Forest	£	6,103.85	16	£	381.49
Croydon	£	8,852.05	24	£	368.84
Barking and Dagenham	£	5,683.50	16	£	355.22
Hackney	£	8,846.70	25	£	353.87
Hammersmith and Fulham	£	12,465.43	36	£	346.26
Hounslow	£	8,140.70	24	£	339.20
Tower Hamlets	£	8,919.20	27	£	330.34
Ealing	£	5,132.00	16*	£	320.75
Southwark	£	14,039.00	51	£	275.27
Hillingdon	£	5,380.93	20	£	269.05
Islington	£	8,827.95	33	£	267.51
Haringey	£	4,603.10	18	£	255.73
Brent	£	10,416.36	43	£	242.24
Westminster (x 2)	£	23,991.55	133	£	180.39
Lewisham	£	6,433.00	45	£	142.96
Sutton	£	4,251.07	30	£	141.70
Bexley	£	2,026.00	19	£	106.63
Havering and Redbridge	£	4,721.00	45	£	104.91
Greenwich	£	1,200.00	12	£	100.00
Bromley	£	2,508.00	38	£	66.00
TOTAL	£	237,362.57	855	£	277.62

* 33 as of January 2006

There are a number of caveats and qualifications to make about the raw data presented here which need to be taken into account when looking at Figure 1:

- it can be argued that the number of charging stations in a borough is a better indicator of the administrative burden
- the number of cells in use in a Borough can and does fluctuate from week to week for MPS operational reasons
- some Panels have special situations, such as Westminster North (Paddington Green High Security Police Station), Hillingdon (Heathrow Airport) and Camden (links to British Transport Police)
- some Panels are currently administered by local authority staff and others by independent administrators; this is known to affect the cost, since the average MPA spend per cell in 2005/06 was £269 for the “independent” panels but nearly 1 ½ times as much, £394 per cell, for the Local Authority administered panels
- 80% (on average) of the MPA spend goes on administration, the rest goes on assorted Panel running costs.

Despite all these caveats, it is clear from Figure 1 that there is an unjustifiable disparity between the most expensive Panel and the cheapest. It is simply not credible that the volume of the administration task in Kingston is 11 times greater than it is in Bromley, or that there is such a large qualitative difference in the nature of the task as to warrant MPA spending 11 times as much on it in South West London as it does in South East London. Even on a per station basis the difference between highest cost and lowest cost per station is over 7 to 1.

A useful benchmark for cost comparisons is the actual ICV Budget for 2006/07 (detail in Appendix 2):

MPA central staff costs:	£116,519
Panel administration:	£217,056
Panel running costs:	£53,200
Other (central) costs:	£64,600
<u>Total</u>	<u>£451,375</u>

If we assume that MPA will retain some kind of central administration and management function even under a decentralised regime it is reasonable to take the 2006/07 costs attributable to panel administration and panel running costs as the starting point for the decentralised options, i.e. £ 270,256. (It is of course always possible that in future years different budget decisions by MPA will lead to an increase or a decrease in this amount.)

Under option D1, capped funding, the cap might be set at £ 8,190 per Panel (£270,256 divided by 33). This would be rough justice and would cause considerable problems in some places. Alternatively a range of caps could be set within the global allocation of £ 270,256, although having different caps in different places would simply perpetuate the funding imbalances. Perhaps some kind of transitional regime could be devised to ease the pain of moving from the status quo to a single capped regime, but this would be an administrative nightmare for all concerned. Option D1 does not look very

promising in practice although it is the simplest way to redress the funding imbalance.

Option D2, standardised hours, goes one step further than option D1 in that it would start from the position that each Panel has the same requirements for administration, requirements which could be defined in terms of an average number of hours per week. (See next section for discussion of standard hours.) The rate of pay per hour could then be set by MPA with reference both to MPA pay rates for comparable work and to the available budget. It might be advisable in this case to set a range of pay rates to allow for differences in local labour markets in different parts of London. The total cost could thus be constrained to somewhere near the budgeted allocation for 2006/07, although local differences might cause the spend to over- (or indeed under-) shoot. The cost of option D2 could therefore be close to the existing budget, but not necessarily identical to it. The funding imbalance would be addressed by this option, albeit by a slightly indirect route.

The combination of these two decentralised options, namely option D5, would work in much the same way as option D2, except that it would open up the possibility of a local Panel in a high labour cost area not being able to afford all the administrative hours it was entitled to because of the £ 8,190 cap. In this sense option D5 offers the worst of both worlds and can not be recommended.

The two centralised options both take a sword to the Gordian Knot of local panel funding imbalances by changing the paradigm – instead of 32 local panels each with its own funding based on historical factors, there will be one adequately funded London ICV Service

9. Standard Hours/Number of staff required

The concept of standard hours is relevant to the decentralised options D2 and D5, but also to the centralised options C3 and C4 because the latter need some calculation as to the amount of administrative support to be provided. This can be expressed either as hours per Panel per week, or as a fraction of a full time member of staff. This paper considers four different ways of calculating the standard hours/number of staff required.

9.1 The 2004 Review recommended 5 full time staff, so that each panel would get just over 5 ½ hours per week on average. However, experience over the year or so since the Review was published gives reason to question whether five coordinators would actually be enough. The idea of five coordinators, one per super-Panel is logical, but since the super-Panels have been ruled out there is no longer any necessity to adhere to this number. Experience also shows that there is a need for some central resource (in addition to the Scheme Manager) to work on pan-London issues and procedures. This need not mean dedicated staff, as this work could be combined with support for panels.

9.2 Another approach, developed by the ICV representatives on the Programme Board is to identify the component parts of the Panel Administrator role, estimate an amount of time for each component over the year and sum the result. On this basis an estimate of 97 days support per panel per year has been arrived at, which equates to about 45% of a full-time post per panel, under the decentralised options. Under the centralised options it equates to 14 full time administrators, which would mean each one looking after 2.3 Panels on average, or in practice some such arrangement as 7 administrators responsible for 2 panels each, 6 responsible for 3 each, and one floating.

9.3 The average number of administrative support hours currently paid for by MPA is fractionally under 9 hours per panel per week, or 25% of a full time post per panel (options D2 and D5), or 8 full time administrators (options C3 and C4).

9.4 A fourth way of arriving at a standard number of hours is to base it on practice in other parts of the country. In the Greater Manchester Police Authority and Leicestershire Police Authority ICV schemes the typical ratio of ICVs to full time equivalent administrators is about 80 to 1. If we assume that there are 480 ICVs in the London Scheme at any one time this gives a total requirement of 6 full time administrators, or 19% of a post per panel, or 6.75 hours per week.

One could expect a centralised administration with trained staff, using standardised processes and technology, to be more capable of delivering efficiencies and scale economies than a decentralised model.

Ultimately the number of standard hours and the consequential number of staff required comes down to a matter of judgement: how best to strike a balance between what one would ideally like each panel to be able to do, and the financial and managerial resources which MPA judges it can devote to this aspect of the Authority's work. The existing arrangements point in the direction of there being 8 full time staff, or 9 hours per panel per week. The rest of this paper works on the assumption that the standard hours will be set at this level.

10. Saving money on the cost of administrative support²

While not the primary driver for this review of administration cost is always a consideration. The costs of the different options have been estimated as follows.

10.1 Option D1

² No allowance has been made in these costings for a London ICV conference in 2007.

Capping the expenditure on Panels within the present overall total allocation and leaving the central expenditure unchanged does of course leave the overall budget unchanged. A saving/cost of 0% in other words.

10.2 Option D2

The cost of standardising hours does of course depend on the level set for the number of hours. For the purposes of illustration a figure of 9 hours per panel per week is assumed here. Since this is very close to the average number of hours currently paid for by MPA there should not be any significant change in the cost of panel administration. However, the local labour market factors mentioned earlier might cause some slight variation – which could go either way. An estimated saving/cost in the region of $\pm 1\%$ overall seems reasonable.

10.3 Option C3

Estimating the cost of Option C3 (centralised with outsourced provision) is difficult since by definition it depends on the tenders that might be submitted by outside organisations. There is a further complication, in that informal enquiries suggest that it would be very difficult to find sufficient pan-London voluntary and community sector organisations (VCSOs) to make up a tender list. Some likely candidates turned out not to be truly pan-London in the way that effective provision of an administrative support service would require but to be a loose federation of largely autonomous borough based bodies instead. One VCSO agreed to give us an informal estimate of what their prices would probably be, to serve as a guide price for the purposes of this review. For reasons of commercial confidentiality their name is not given here.

Based on informal discussions with the one VCSO it is assumed that any VCSO tender would include the cost of employing 8 coordinators and one supervisor. It is also highly likely that any tender would incorporate a management charge. In addition MPA would still need a Scheme Manager to oversee the Scheme and to manage the contract. MPA should not need any other directly employed staff under this option. Panel running costs and other central costs are assumed to be the same as in the 2006/07 ICV budget (detail in Appendix 3).

Staff costs (inc. MPA):	£329,439
VCSO management charge:	£22,000
Annual IT costs:	£5,741
Panel running costs:	£53,200
Other (central) costs:	£64,600
Meeting room hire	£15,000
<u>Total</u>	<u>£489,980</u>

[Plus IT set up costs, first year only: £7,000]

The tendering process might well secure some reductions on this estimated figure, but this could not be guaranteed. Compared with the current ICV budget the first year **cost** would be about + 10%, or about + 8.5% if the first year IT costs are ignored.

10.4 Option C4

In option C4 (in-house centralised) if we make the assumption that there would be 8 full time co-ordinators plus one manager all directly employed by MPA at the current salary and on cost levels, and that direct Panel costs would not change from the ICV budget for 2006/07, then the total cost (detail in Appendix 4) would be of the order of

Staff costs:	£302,519
Panel running costs:	£53,200
Other (central) costs:	£64,600
Contingency (to cover e.g. charges for meeting rooms currently provided free by local authorities)	£15,000
<u>Total</u>	<u>£435,319</u>

This would represent a **saving** of about 3.5% on the 2006/07 ICV budget. If the number of central staff were reduced then the savings would be greater, but conversely there would be less flexibility and less scope for pan-London and developmental work.

MPA has assessed the accommodation needs of 8 full time Coordinators plus the Scheme Manager, bearing in mind the likelihood that the working patterns of the Coordinators might well lead them to prefer to work from home for a proportion of their time. MPA has concluded that there is enough room at Dean Farrar Street to provide desk space for them so there will be no additional accommodation costs. The presumption is however that the coordinators will spend at least half their time in their local areas.

10.5 Option D5

As a combination of options D1 and D2 the cost of this option is likely to lie somewhere between the costs of the other two, i.e. a saving/cost of less than 1% either way.

11. Standardising the role description of the Panel Administrator and achieving a higher degree of consistency between Panels

None of the decentralised options would achieve complete standardisation of the role of the Panel administrator, although D2 would come quite close by

standardising the number of hours. Many of the existing inconsistencies between Panels would be preserved under any of the decentralised options.

Both the centralised options would have the effect of standardising the role of the administrator and of achieving a higher degree of consistency between Panels in respect of their administrative support. Standardisation and consistency might perhaps come more easily under the in-house than the outsourced option.

12. Resilience

Building in resilience to the administrative support arrangements is the final criterion used in this review. By definition there is little resilience in any of the decentralised options, since the Panels would have just enough administrative support for their own needs, without any to spare. Temporary increases in contracted hours to cover another Panel would of course be possible, but could not necessarily be relied upon, would probably mean bringing in people with no prior knowledge or experience of ICV Panels and would incur extra cost.

The centralised options on the other hand have resilience built in. The suggested levels of staffing would allow for a temporary switch of resources to areas of most need without undue damage to the other Panels in a particular cluster. This would have the advantages of continuity, local knowledge and cost saving.

13. Conclusions

This section ranks each of the five administration options in terms of each of the criteria enumerated in Section 3 of this paper. Each option is awarded between four points for the closest fit to the enumerated criteria and zero points for the worst fit. Ties are possible. While ranking in this way inevitably includes a subjective element, as a process it has the merits of being transparent and of permitting other people to see the effect of substituting their own evaluations.

The objective of all reviews such as this is to reach some overall conclusion. The last step in this review process is therefore to rank the five options according to the total number of points that they have been awarded. (It should be noted that there was no attempt to weight the different criteria.) Figure 2 below shows the results.

Figure 2 Ranking the options

CRITERIA	Option				
	D1	D2	C3	C4	D5
Implementing the 2004 Review	●○	●○	●○	●●●●	●○
Compliance	●	●	●●●	●●●●	●
MPA as owner & manager	●●	●	●●●	●●●●	-
Addressing funding imbalances	●●	●●	●●●	●●●	-
Standard number of hours	-	●●	●●●●	●●●●	-
Saving money	●●●	●	-	●●●●	●●
Standardising role description	-	●●	●●●●	●●●●	-
Higher degree of consistency	-	●●	●●●●	●●●●	-
Resilience	●	●	●●●	●●●●	●
<i>Total points</i>	10.5	13.5	25.5	35	5.5
Final ranking	4th	3rd	2nd	1st	5th

Key

- 1 point
- ½ point
- 0 points

14 Matter for consideration and decision, and provisional timetable

The Programme Board is invited to consider the options described in this paper.

Proposals approved by the Programme Board will be taken to the Strategy and Policing Committee on 6th July 2006. All Panels and Administrators will be advised of the options under consideration, following this meeting of the Board and taking into account any comments of the Board. They will have the opportunity to submit views on those proposals endorsed by the Board. It is suggested that this consultation period should run to 30 June This will give Panels and Administrators six weeks to view copies of the Programme Board's proposals and to submit comments.

Strategy and Policing Committee on 6th July will be invited to decide on which option to implement. In order to smooth the introduction of the new arrangements the Committee will also be invited to extend the funding agreed for the first half of the current financial year to the second half year, with the new arrangements coming into force on 1st April 2007. Panel Chairs and administrators will be kept fully informed throughout the transitional period.

If the Committee chooses one of the decentralised options the consequential administrative changes to the London ICV scheme will be relatively minor and there should be no impediment to full implementation from 1st April 2007. If the Committee choose one of the centralised options there will be a transitional period during which a contractor will be selected (Option C3) or additional MPA staff will be recruited (Option C4). In either case advertisements for a contractor or new MPA staff will need to be placed early in September. Recruitment of contractor or MPA staff, clearances and staff training will then take place until March 2007. If the contractor route necessitates advertisement under EU procurement directives, the timescales will be considerably longer, and an April 2007 start is not feasible.

From July 2006 onwards notification and consultation will take place with local panels and administrators and existing administrative support service providers. The operation of TUPE will be assessed case by case and any necessary consultation arising under TUPE will be commenced. Other consequential actions will be dealt with from December 2006 onwards, to permit the introduction of the new arrangements on 1st April 2007.

John May
Community Engagement Unit, MPA
28/04/2006

List of Annexes

- A. Job Description for full time Panel Administrator
- B. ICV Budget for 2006/07 – *note: this is a separate document*
- C. Option C3 budget
- D. Option C4 budget

MPA Independent Custody Visiting

PANEL ADMINISTRATOR

The Panel administrator will be responsible for ensuring the effective functioning of a cluster of ICV Panels. The Administrator will need to develop good working relationships with the Chairs of the Panels they support and to maintain excellent communication with the MPA Scheme Manager. In consultation with Panel Chairs, Administrators will be expected to carry out the following duties:

MAIN TASKS

Panel Meetings

1. Co-ordinate Panel meetings at regular intervals for all Panels
2. In liaison with the Panel Chair prepare and circulate agendas and other relevant papers to Panel members and Police representatives 7 days before then meeting is due to take place.
3. Collate issues of concern arising from report forms & liaise with the Police prior to the meeting to get response to questions raised by ICVs
4. Book the venue and make the necessary arrangements for refreshments and any equipment (e.g. overhead projector, power point presentation equipment etc) that may be needed
5. Attend Panel meetings and take minutes of the meeting and circulate them to Panel members within 14 days of the meeting taking place
6. Undertake any activities that arise from the meetings, e.g. write letters, arrange speakers etc.

Custody Visits

1. Prepare and circulate the rota of visits to police stations to all custody visitors on the Panel
2. Where appropriate, receive the written reports of the individual visits carried out, and transmit them to the MPA
3. Copy and collate reports for the Panel meetings, ie: station analysis reports etc as required
4. Enter details of all visits on the ICVA database and run off reports as required

5. Check panel members' attendance against rota of visits and monitor this along with attendance at Panel meetings. Communicate any significant problems with this to the Panel Chair and the MPA
6. When Police stations are closed or when new/spill over/temporary or mobile suites are in use, liaise with Police staff and other Panels as required. Keep Panel members informed.
7. Report any serious issues arising from Custody Visits to the MPA in consultation with the Panel Chair

Finance

1. Manage the Panel's budget, liaising with the Treasurer (if one appointed), Chair and Scheme Co-ordinator where relevant
2. Remind volunteers to submit their expenses before the end of each quarter
3. Process expenses payments to Panel members on a quarterly basis and other payments as necessary, including payment for meeting rooms and catering, in line with MPA guidance
4. Maintain adequate financial records and monitor payments and receipts

Recruitment, Support and Training of Custody Visitors

1. Ensure that recruitment notices are circulated when appropriate – e.g. posters in public places, newspaper advertisements etc.
2. Arrange interviews for new applicants, circulating the appropriate papers to those interviewing and dealing with the related correspondence
3. Ensure that the MPA receives a copy of each interview assessment sheet
4. Issue vetting forms to successful applicants and once these have been completed, ensure that they are returned with the relevant supporting evidence, to the MPA
5. Keep in touch with new Panel members until their security clearance has come through
6. Ensure that arrangements are in place to monitor and support new volunteers during their 6 month probationary period and that probationary reviews take place and the MPA is notified of the outcome (NB: the probationary period starts when volunteers receive clearance and can start making visits)

7. Ensure that all Panel members are made aware of training opportunities and under go training as necessary; keep records of training undertaken by Panel members
8. Arrange and co-ordinate training opportunities where appropriate by liaising with the MPA and trainer(s)
9. Report any breaches of conduct or serious problems to the Chair as soon as possible. Where appropriate and following discussion with the Chair, take any follow up action required, in accordance with MPA guidelines
10. Ensure that security passes and any relevant documents (such as training manuals etc) are returned to the MPA when an ICV leaves

General

1. Keep a stock of stationery (report pads, envelopes, headed paper etc)
2. Ensure that relevant documents from the MPA are circulated to all visitors as appropriate
3. Produce the Annual Report and other documents as required, liaising with the Panel Chair. Ensure that the final document is distributed.
4. Liaise with the MPA on a regular basis
5. Ensure that the MPA receives a copy of the Panel's minutes and is informed of any significant changes to the Panel
6. Liase with other Administrators, Panels, local Police Stations etc as appropriate
7. Ensure that any papers/minutes from the MPA are circulated
8. In consultation with the Icv Scheme Manager, liaise with the press around the work of ICVs as required
9. Keep personnel and other files and records as appropriate
10. Attend meetings as required by the MPA
11. Attend training as required by the MPA
12. Carry out any other tasks reasonably required within the role

Person specification

Essential

1. Experience of working with community groups and/or volunteers
2. Excellent administrative skills including taking minutes, good attention to detail with data entry and the ability to use Microsoft Office suite effectively to produce documents and spreadsheets
3. Strong organisational skills and the ability to multi-task
4. The ability to innovate when appropriate
5. Excellent communication skills, both verbal and written and the ability to get on well with a wide range of people
6. The ability to maintain high levels of motivation and work well without direct supervision
7. The ability to follow organisational guidance and to support others to do so
8. Experience of record keeping and management of finances.
9. The ability to maintain an objective/neutral stance, to see both sides of a situation and to be assertive when necessary
10. The ability to work some evenings and occasionally weekend days (with prior notice) as required

Desirable

1. Knowledge and interest in the criminal justice system
2. An understanding of custody visiting and the Police and Criminal Evidence Act

Annex C

Option C3 costs

VCSO costs

Co-ordinator	£	30,160 inc. on-costs @ 16%
8 x Coordinator	£	241,280
Supervisor	£	33,640 inc. on-costs @ 16%
Sub-total (staff)	£	274,920
Management charge	£	22,000
IT costs (annual)	£	5,741
Total VCSO	£	302,661

MPA costs (Option 3)

MPA manager	£	54,519 inc. on-costs @ 16%
Panel expenses	£	53,200
Other MPA costs	£	64,600
Room hire	£	15,000
Total MPA	£	187,319
Total Option C3	£	489,980

Annex D

Option C4 costs

Co-ordinator	£	31,000 inc. on-costs @ 16%
8 x Coordinator	£	248,000
Manager	£	54,519 inc. on-costs @ 16%
Sub-total (staff)	£	302,519
Panel expenses	£	53,200
Other MPA costs	£	64,600
Room hire	£	15,000
Total Option C4	£	435,319