

## CARE OF POLICE SURVIVORS

### Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting Saturday 20 February 2016 at 9am Held at Drayton Manor Hotel

ITEM		ACTION
1	<p>Present: Trustees: Jan Berry (JB), Mick Foster (MF), Angela Ham (AH), Rob Atkin (RA), Sir Peter Fahy (PF), Denis Gunn (DG), Chris Sims (CSi) Staff: Richard Kotulecki (RK), Claire Stewart (CSt) Apologies: Ali Gibb, Sir Keith Povey</p> <p>There were no retirements, resignations or appointments</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of last meetings Minutes of the meeting of 15 December 2015 were agreed. There were no matters arising</p>	
3	<p><b>From cause to impact: Understanding our purpose and developing our vision and mission</b></p> <p>As outlined in the Three Year Plan (3YP), the meeting considered the purpose of COPS – why we are here, what the charity is for and who the charity is for. The following is a synopsis of that discussion and the decisions made.</p> <p><b>Why is COPS here? (What need in society do we meet?)</b></p> <p>In society, any service deemed essential to the wellbeing of that society is provided by the state (e.g. basic health, education, security). A service from which a profit can be made is provided by private enterprise. A charity exists between these two (hence sometimes called third sector) – providing services which may be highly desirable but are not deemed by society to be essential, and from which a profit cannot be made. A charity should not, in other words, exist to replace what the state already provides, but should provide something more. It was acknowledged that in the current political climate, the definition of “essential” was being continuously squeezed, leaving more a charity could do (and perhaps should do).</p> <p>So as well as providing something which is not already provided by the state, and from which it will not make a profit, in order to qualify for its charitable status, a charity must also provide some wider benefit for society. This is, in essence, the reason why we are here. The meeting discussed the many benefits available to survivors as a result of our existence and agreement was reached that we could provide more to benefit survivors in a number of ways – ranging from more inclusive support at events, more localised activities, plus the introduction of professional services such as counselling and other support for those who need it.</p> <p>The benefit for society that we provide was also agreed as being clear cut: Society, as a whole, benefits from the safety and security provided by police officers. Police Officers are asked to take risks on our behalf to ensure our safety. As such, it is entirely reasonable for us to provide something in return to the families of those officers if they pay the ultimate price. In other words, the societal need COPS fulfils is to deliver society’s part of a “Police Officers’ Covenant” – they protect us when serving, we look after their families if the worst happens. Both police officers and COPS perform our roles on behalf of our “society.”</p> <p>We should also recognise that we provide a benefit to the police service as a whole – not only through the work that we do in direct support of survivors, but also through the information that we can provide to the police service about survivor needs.</p>	

### **What is COPS for? (What is our role? How do we fulfil it?)**

Undoubtedly we are here as a means of enabling people to come together whilst recognising the uniqueness of the wider police family. This is the main pillar of our role. But other than this coming together, what else do we do, what else should we do?

These questions take us back to the services and benefits we provide. If we are here to provide support for the families of police officers who have died protecting us, then we need to consider what support these families need and want. Listening to Police Survivors, the consultation completed in autumn 2015, is instructive.

Respondents identified four key ways in which we could support them:

1. Helping them to meet and talk with others in a similar situation, who genuinely understand what it feels like. This was the main pillar of support.
2. Helping them to access professional support (e.g. counselling, financial advice, legal advice) that fills the gaps that peer support alone cannot fill. These were things that people may or may not need at various stages during their lives.
3. Helping them with practical support, such as providing information on other services available, or helping with day to day tasks if possible.
4. Providing information and advocacy to external agencies so that they understand the needs of survivors and how to address these.

1 and 4 fall clearly within the scope of our current charitable objects – which state that, in short, COPS is here to provide peer support and some form of campaigning on survivor issues. 2 and 3 are areas that the charity has already ventured into: we have for some years been providing funding that allows people to access a fixed number of counselling sessions (point 2) and providing the funding to allow youngsters to learn to drive (point 3).

So whilst it is reassuring that what we are doing matches with what survivors want, it does present us with some challenges. With our increased resources, we would like to do more. We are no longer a charity with income measurable in £10,000s – our annual income is now approaching £300,000, so we must find a way of doing more. To achieve this, we have to find the right combination of making more support available and/or making it available to more people.

We are gradually increasing the number and scope of the peer support events we organise (including trying to recreate the intimacy of the first few survivor weekends by creating a much smaller, open event for all survivors). We also have plans to increase the number of peer led events such as coffee mornings. Peer support is essentially free of cash cost, so any expansion in this area will still leave us with plentiful resource to do something more.

An active campaigning organisation, as discussed in 3YP, has a very different set of characteristics to a support organisation. Whilst it is right that we campaign on specific issues, the consultation showed that there were more areas in which we could offer support. So campaigning is important, but increasing our ability to do so is not a priority at the moment.

This leaves the provision of professional support and practical support as the two “growth areas” for the charity. From the base that we have, this is what we would like to offer more of – we have already been discussing how we can partner with organisations such as Winston’s Wish to provide counselling for children. We have reviewed our guidelines for funding counselling sessions for adults to be in line with NICE guidelines. And we have several more opportunities that we could explore – services which we could fund (or part fund), but which would be provided by specialists directly to survivors. We would be unlikely to step into the field of direct grant giving as there are other charities that do this, and it would present us with additional legislative requirements for which we are not resourced.

The meeting agreed that our first priority should be – to support survivors, not just with peer support, although that is the main pillar of our “offer”, but in any other meaningful (and non-direct-grant-giving ways that would work to survivors’ benefit. Different people will have different needs at different times and we should aim to support these as best we can within the resources we have available. Furthermore, as we are in the process of incorporating the charity (a process that requires us to re-submit our charitable objects) we should include this expanded role in our incorporated constitution and charitable objects.

**Who is COPS for? (Who is a beneficiary?)**

The original charitable objects state that we are here for “survivors of police officers who have died on duty.” We understand the term “survivors” to mean family members, but we do not define which family members. It is right that we do not define this strictly as we recognise that family relationships can be complex and that it would, therefore, be wrong to exclude anyone simply because of birth line. In many cases “family” is understood to mean partner, parents, siblings, children of the officer, but this is not prescriptive and we are not limited by this definition. Although we have yet to develop fully our charity values, we are clear that we want “inclusive” to be one of these – among other things, this means that our default response to requests for support should be “yes” unless there are very clear and unambiguous reasons to the contrary.

The more complex questions arise from the phrase “police officers who have died on duty.” Increasingly more police work is undertaken by “Police Staff” who will put themselves in similar risk and carry out tasks similar to those carried out previously by police officers. If we are here, in part, to carry out society’s part of the “police covenant” then it is right that we include the families of police or contracted staff who are carrying out de facto police duties as potential beneficiaries as evidenced by the inclusion of the helicopter pilot in November 2013. We should recognise that this is because of the “police officer type” nature of the duties being carried out (and hence being exposed to the same risks), and not simply by virtue of being employed by the wider civil service or a contractor.

A similar question applies to “on duty.” We have taken as our definition for this the police pension definition – i.e. any time spent “clocked in” and travelling to and from work. Whilst offering the comfort of straightforwardness, this does present some challenges. For instance – we already include as beneficiaries, families of officers who were neither on duty nor on their way to work but who either showed courage in helping others or were singled out for criminal acts because of their job. We have also excluded families of officers who were involved in very dangerous work who died subsequently at home. We have also no defined stance on the families of officers who have committed suicide – arguably most in need of support.

If we are recognising the risks taken to protect us, and we recognise that the emotional toll of stressful events manifests itself in different ways in different people, we should formally extend our definition to beyond just those at work or on their way to and from work.

The meeting agreed that our purpose should be defined as follows:

1. To support the survivors of police officers who have died on duty, and on a discretionary basis survivors suffering the impact of bereavement of a member of the police family, by bringing together survivors to allow them to provide mutual peer support and guidance, and providing professional support services and advice to survivors.
2. To work in partnership with the police service and other agencies to ensure that survivors’ concerns are recognised and addressed.

As detailed in 3YP, future work will include developing our vision, mission and values

3	<p><b>Choices in the new constitution</b></p> <p>The draft constitution follows the model for a Foundation CIO as set out by the Charity Commission. This will not only speed up the incorporation process with the Commission, but it will also reduce any legal costs associated with incorporation.</p> <p>In the circulated draft RK had already made decisions on the more prosaic clauses pertaining to matters such as whether email was an allowable form of communication between trustees (it is) and whether any sub committees should include any trustees (they should). Some key decisions remained for the meeting, and were made as follows:</p> <p>Clause 1: The incorporated charity will retain the same name as the current charity: Care of Police Survivors</p> <p>Clause 3: The charity's objects will be defined as per the definition agreed above, keeping to the principles of support and campaigning, but formalising the extension of support to include the wider police family, some circumstances of off-duty deaths and access to professional support and services.</p> <p>Clause 8: The nominal liability of members in the event of winding up is agreed at £10.</p> <p>Clause 9: The minimum number of Trustees is set at 3. The maximum is set at 15, with an optimum set at 12. The proportional make up of this number is addressed in item 5 below. The names of the first trustees will be those of the current trustees and their initial terms will be agreed with the Nominations Committee that will lead on the appointment of the new trustees (c.f. item 5 below).</p> <p>Clause 10: The duration of a normal term of office of a trustee is 3 years.</p> <p>Clause 12: The maximum number of consecutive terms that can be served by a trustee is two, and the minimum interval between successive appointments for up to the two consecutive terms is one year.</p> <p>RK will incorporate these decisions into the new constitution and submit to the Charity Commission</p>	RK
5	<p><b>Appointing new Trustees and the Nominations Committee</b></p> <p>In accordance with Charity Commission guidance (set out specifically in document CC24 Users on board: Beneficiaries who become trustees, clause 9: "...as a guide, the commission would suggest that where the proportion of user trustees makes up a third or less of the trustee body, there are unlikely to be any problems with any one group of trustees with a single interest or motivation being accused of taking control of the direction of the charity") the proportional make-up of the board of trustees will be as follows:</p> <p>1/3 survivors (4 of the 12 optimum number)</p> <p>1/3 police linked (4 of the 12 optimum number)</p> <p>1/3 independent – neither police nor survivor (4 of the 12 optimum number)</p> <p>To get towards this optimum, we will recruit four new trustees – 2 survivors and 2 independent. The independent trustees will replace two of the current police trustees, and the 2 survivor trustees will be added to the board, taking the board composition to: 4 survivors, 4 police, 3 independent. A fourth independent trustee will be appointed in due course.</p> <p>The independent trustees will be asked to bring skills identified in the recent board skills audit, specifically legal, finance &amp; audit, and sector experience. These appointments will be independently supported by Trustees Unlimited (TU) as agreed previously, who will make recommendations to RK and the Nominations Committee.</p> <p>The key requirement for survivor trustees will be their experience of being survivors, so the skills sought will be less specific than for the independent trustees. All trustees will be</p>	RK

	<p>referred to Charity Commission guidance CC3: The essential trustee, for a detailed appraisal of what the roles involve. The process of appointment of survivor Trustees will be handled internally by RK and the Nominations Committee.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Nominations Committee should be comprised of equal numbers of survivor, police and independent trustees. Consequently, DG, JB and AH were appointed to the committee. RK will support the committee. The committee will confirm the terms of office of the first trustees of the new incorporated charity.</p> <p>RK and TU will work to define the recruitment processes and these will be announced as soon as ready. It is anticipated that proposed new trustees will attend their first meetings in July.</p>	<p>JB, DG, AH</p> <p>RK</p>
6	<p><b>Update on launch of the new Memorial</b>  Launch for potential funders, sponsors and media will take place on Wednesday 24 February. Arrangements would be made for Royston Martis to receive an invite to prepare a news item for COPS</p>	MF
7	<p><b>Dates of spring and summer meetings</b>  Were agreed as  Thursday 5 May, 9am at Drayton Manor  Thursday 7 July, 9am at Drayton Manor</p>	
8	<p><b>Any other business</b></p> <p><b>Media Training</b>  Following the death of PC Philips on Merseyside we were inundated with media requests some friendly, some potentially hostile. We became very reliant on a small number of individuals to front the charity. We recognise that, regrettably, there will be another time when an officer is killed, but we are not prepared for the media scrum that follows. RK has, therefore, arranged a media course for up to 6 people to help us be better prepared for the next incident. The 6 should comprise 1 member of staff, 1 trustee and 4 survivors. RA and DG were agreed as two, and DG would discuss the other 3 survivor places with the Survivor Committee. The training could make survivors more willing to talk to the media in the future. RK will confirm details for the training which is likely to be at the end of May. RK will also make contact with Police Press Offices to explore possible support available[JB1].</p> <p><b>New staff appointments</b>  Alison Sutton joins as new Fundraising Co-ordinator on 14 March. She brings account management and small charity experience and joins from Viola Environmental Trust. Alison will take on responsibility for managing our funders and building the professional relationships to make sure that our income continues to thrive.  Cara Russon joins on temporary contract as Policy and Resources Co-ordinator also on 14 March. She brings huge HR experience and will help develop the policies and resources we need in the complex situation that we have with survivors being both beneficiaries and resources. Her work will lead to the eventual production of a “survivor resource pack” bringing together much of the information requested by survivors.</p> <p><b>Head of Operations</b>  RK and CSt left the meeting  JB referred the meeting to the 3 year plan agreed by the trustees on 15<sup>th</sup> December and the performance of RK since his appointment in May 2015. JB reminded the board RK was appointed on a one year fixed contract which was due to end in May. JB proposed an</p>	<p>DG, RK</p>

	<p>extension of this contract to May 2018 and amending the job title to Chief Executive which better reflects the role being undertaken by RK. The board considered RK's performance since appointment to be exemplary and unanimously agreed with both proposals. JB indicated she would discuss uplift in line with the outcome of the benchmarking pay review RK is undertaking for COPS staff. This was agreed.</p>	
	<p><b>Meeting closed at 1:30pm</b></p>	