



Keeping People Safe

MINUTES OF MEETING

NAME OF COMMITTEE: Strategic Promotions & Examinations Board (SPEB)

DATE: 20th July 2020

TIME: 11.00am

LOCATION: Dial in Conference

CHAIRPERSONS: ACC Alan Todd & [REDACTED]

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

MEMBERS:

HR	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
HR	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Note Taker	[REDACTED]
------------	------------

Apologies

[REDACTED]

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

Item No	
1.0	Introduction, apologies noted.
2.0	Review of Previous Minutes – approved.
3.0	<p>Chief Superintendent Promotion Process</p> <p>■ asked that SPEB agree the competencies and values for the Chief Superintendent Promotion Process. The following was proposed and she would agree the priority order with the CC.</p> <p>Presentation – We Analyse Critically, We are Innovative and Open Minded, and We Take Ownership. Interview – Public Service, We are Emotionally Aware, Integrity, and We Deliver, Support and Inspire.</p> <p>■ referenced the Open Day for external candidates that was being planned and advised would welcome involvement from Superintendents Association. ■ agreed to support. ■ updated the CC will progress with the webinar to all candidates 7th August.</p> <p>■ asked can we now invite external candidates to attend for interview as travel</p>

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>arrangements have relaxed.</p> <p>█████ advised travel would not be against current guidance and would be okay to proceed as normal. Overall principal would be for consistency in regard to attendance at interview however consideration can be given on a case by case basis if required. Cases can be considered further if a person has raised any concerns.</p> <p>█████ added that ██████ would sit on the panel as the external representative.</p>
<p>4.0</p> <p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p> <p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>4.0 Superintendent Promotion Process and Feedback</p> <p>█████ advised that SMAP will look at all promotions on 14th September</p> <p>█████ advised feedback questionnaire had been prepared and asked for any thoughts.</p> <p>█████ said the feedback from the panel was that the use of post its was distracting for candidates but how they dealt with this was up to themselves and getting individual views via a questionnaire was probably the best way forward.</p> <p>█████ asked if everyone was content that we go ahead and look at this when the replies are back.</p> <p>AT said that the availability of post it notes and the candidates not being aware of this until the day of interview raises the challenge of giving as much information to the candidates before they attend for interview so they are not caught out with this possibly preventing any challenges to the process. AT also said in regard to advising re panel members we should always know who we are drawing from regarding this and there is transparency around letting candidates know who the 'panel members' will be in advance.</p> <p>█████ advised that on the back of this and going forward we will be letting candidates know who will be on the panel with a caveat in regard to possible changes to the panel. We will be learning from processes going forward which will assist in future processes.</p>

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

████ confirmed that moving forward we will be providing panel member names before day of interview.

████ raised the point re the post it notes in that these would be awkward to make notes on and would cards possibly be better.

████ advised the post its query arose around whether candidates should be provided with full question written down on a card. Post- it's were to just jot down some key words.

AT In fairness this was discussed before and people read/process information in different ways. Began as possibly providing a copy of question which has moved to post its.

This board sits to make decisions for the panel to execute, why have we made a decision to use post its 2 days before the process starts – tweaking towards the end.

████ There is possible confusion here as we have discussed previously re the use of post its.

AT – The challenge to us is to ensure timely communications moving forward.

████ There was discussion re providing the full question and was thought that this could be more distracting.

████ If queries come up again so close to a process these should not be included in the process.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

5.0 EO2 Promotion Process

████ There will be a 2 person panel with interviews held at ██████ Similar measures will be in place as for Superintendents process and it will progress as scheduled in September.

████ In regard to Moderation is there a separate moderator for this process as he has not been involved in non-police promotion processes before.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>■ We do have moderators in place for use in this process</p> <p>■ Should have same moderation processes for both Police and Police Staff</p> <p>■ We should be moving to a moderation team containing both officers and staff which can be deployed to any process and ■ should have a key role to play in this</p> <p>■ I am happy to do this and will agree some moderators for this</p> <p>■ Would ■ like to be involved?</p> <p>■ If I could have sight of the process and I can nominate persons</p> <p>■ I will link in with ■</p>
<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p> <p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>6.0 Chief Inspector Promotion Process and Operational Brief</p> <p>■ Should we be looking for consistency with the Superintendents process – currently the Chief Inspector process has 4 areas for the Op Brief and 5 for the Interview.</p> <p>What would the thoughts be around 9 being too many in one day, could it be 3 and 4. It has been raised by a potential candidate re last year's process that it was communicated it was fairer to reduce to 3 and asking therefore how is it now fair to raise to 4 this year for the Op Brief.</p> <p>■ recommends it should be 3 for the Op Brief as 4 does not give candidates enough opportunity for providing more detail. I would propose 3.</p> <p>■ feedback from the Superintendents re the balance across Brief/Interview (4 and 5) was that some individuals almost passed on completion of the Op Brief.</p> <p>■ there would be more opportunity in interview to demonstrate one's experience.</p> <p>■ currently 4 Op Brief 5 Interview. 2019 was 3 and 4.</p> <p>■ I think 3 Op Brief and 5 for interview.</p> <p>■ I agree 3 and 5 is fair.</p> <p>AT 5 interview questions is onerous.</p>

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

█ C/S have gone for 4 and 3 – need to think about the assessors as well with only one panel assessing. Better 3 and 4 with the weight still going to interview this way.

AT Happy to support █ with 3 Op Brief and 4 Interview.

█ have checked my Jan 2020 minutes which said number of competencies should be kept in line with Superintendents though agree there is a need to change as this process will all be done in one day with candidates going straight into interview which was different from the Superintendent's process which used 4 and 5. What will be assessed/removed?

█ I would suggest dropping Transparency(T)

█ Dropping one from interview as well – possibly We are Emotionally Aware (EA)

█ we could drop █

█ Transparency for Op Brief and Emotionally Aware for Interview to be dropped off.

█ this leaves us with no values for Op Brief

█ everything is being assessed in one day so it should tie in with other values on the day

█ 3 values/4 behaviours. Only 1 value not being picked up.

█ what about keeping █ and dropping Impartiality. Drop Transparency drop Impartiality.

█ These are the ones to be removed then?

AT happy with that.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

7.0

EO2 Panel Members

█ candidates are to be advised who their panel members are

█ agreed

8.0

Study Guide

█ I will have a more comprehensive update after an upcoming meeting with the College. Option would be exam on same day or if we don't get a technical solution we may need to bring back spreading exams over 3-4 days, and would support latter at this stage.

█ has submitted a proposal re a podcast concerning exam material – █ thinks useful.

█ I can send the full proposal if required. Question is to see if SPEB are supportive.

AT could we have some views around the direction of travel in regard to the exams first - how to be conducted.

█ advised quite a bit of work has been done with the College and Police Scotland. COP exams will take place after our exams. I would say probably look at running over multiple venues with more than 1 sitting – support █ thoughts.

AT we should set out workings for the planning team re pencil paper/social distancing etc. Should consider morning/afternoon on Fri/Sat/Sun which would remove any issues re integrity. What we decide will help the planning team in moving forward.

█ we have been looking at this and it is tending more towards using Police Establishments as can't get Colleges currently. Inspector's exam should be less of an issue however there may be a problem with Sergeants exam and getting enough accommodation within Police Establishments.

AT possible option would be 3 sessions a day, give student officers a Friday off so could use Fri/Sat and Sunday.

█ we could possibly bring students in the following weekend to catch up.

█ I will start looking at Fri/Sat/Sun and take this forward.

AT consecutive weekends may cause problems re integrity. We can agree

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

parameters here re over 1 weekend and possibly the Friday.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

█ I agree with this.

█ we will link in with █ re a more condensed approach.

█ can we discuss the podcast?

AT How do we see the benefits of a podcast?

█ people learn in different ways and to support these people and those who would have less time – doing other things and listening to podcast at the same time may be the answer. █ thought it was a good idea.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

█ The study guide is what we have published. We would need a level of assurance around what would be put on the podcast – some people could possibly be listening to it and saying ‘1,2,3,4 are wrong’.

AT time investment – a significant amount of work would be involved. Getting to final space would require more research and not sure would get across the ground quickly enough.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

█ I would raise the point about new ideas coming across with limited time to carry them out. It would need further explored through governance to ensure was a corporate product. █s team could link in with █ to ensure it was standardised but not for this process. Could say to █ we are not convinced it would be available for the current process but would certainly look at his with his help for future processes.

AT happy to support that █ There is likely to be a high level of work required behind the scenes. From personal experience, these things require a lot of time commitment, both of the organisation and of personal time. Flag this as something we would seek to do in the future.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

█ accept support and build for the future. Thoughts?

█ all content.

█ I will update █ and he can link in for the future.

9.0	AOB [REDACTED] nothing for this. Does everyone agree nothing for AOB? AT nothing from me. Thanks to the team for their work on this.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

Meeting ended 12.05pm

Next meeting:

DRAFT



Keeping People Safe

MINUTES OF MEETING

NAME OF COMMITTEE: Strategic Promotions & Examinations Board (SPEB)

DATE: 23rd November 2020

TIME: 11.00am

LOCATION: Dial in Conference

CHAIRPERSONS: ACC Alan Todd & [REDACTED]

s.F40

s.F40(2)

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(A)(a)

MEMBERS:

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
HR [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
HR [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

s.F40

s.F40(2)

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(A)(a)

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Note Taker	[REDACTED]
------------	------------

Apologies

[REDACTED]

s.F40

s.F40(2)

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(A)(a)

1.0	Introduction, apologies noted.
2.0	Review of Previous Minutes: [REDACTED] Highlighted correction in relation to previous minutes – 3.0 New

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F31
s.F31(1)
s.F31(1)(a)
s.F31(1)(b)
s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

Superintendents Promotion Process: 'Same *respective projected pool...*'

Apologies where not noted in previous meetings minutes.

3.0 Sergeant Examination Plans and Essential Travel

No requirement to change any plans in place at the moment. Health and Safety are happy with the set-up of current exam centres. will assess the remaining exam locations that haven't yet been assessed those being

Any other Health & Safety considerations?

AT Concerns as we haven't got the new regulations as yet. Working assumption is they will remain a direct lift of stay at home piece where possible and no further travel restrictions so can progress.

is there a date confirmed for the release of new regulations?

AT Likely to be Thursday/Friday, come into force midnight Friday.

We should plan as if we are going ahead and review again once the forthcoming regulations are released. and AT can take back to SET as necessary and link with for advice.

Useful to circulate communications to let all relevant parties know that the exams are to be going ahead as planned. We should plan on the basis that we are proceeding as normal.

We will feature in the Covid update.

Risk Assessment will be carried out at other locations – is everyone happy with this?

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

Content

AT No issues or concerns from the Inspectors Process?

No there were no track and trace issues advised.

4.0 Superintendent Promotion Process

gave an overview of the Superintendent's promotion process and asked if there were any queries about the forthcoming Superintendent Promotions Process?

No queries raised.

5.0 Chief Inspector and Inspector Debrief & Results

asked if there were any concerns regarding the dates that we plan to proceed with the panel de-brief and the issuing of result to candidates on the 7th of December.

also updated that Inspector Exam mop-ups were held on Saturday 21st November – all went very smoothly without any issues.

AT advised to proceed and he would put out an updated communication covering all ranks.

No other queries raised.

6.0 Requests for Alternative Exam/ Interview Dates

For the Inspectors and Sergeants exams and have been jointly reviewing alternative dates for candidates who aren't able to attend exams. Is everyone happy for & to have delegated authority to approve alternative dates?

and AT agreed they were content with delegated authority for these alternative dates to be issued by & and only refer to AT and in extreme circumstances. It was agreed the process should be reviewed after the Covid period ends as will not always hold exceptional boards.

Happy with the current arrangements – vast majority of issues relating to

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>alternative exam dates were Covid related and easy to deal with, and can use [REDACTED] as required for consensus.</p>
<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>7.0 AOB</p> <p>[REDACTED] nothing for this. Does anyone have anything for AOB?</p> <p>[REDACTED] Need to start soon with getting ready for the next wave of processes over the next 12 months.</p> <p>[REDACTED] this is planned for the agenda in the SPEB meeting planned early 2021 and we need to factor in SO and EO1 processes.</p> <p>AT Any provisional mop-up dates for the Sgt's Exams?</p> <p>[REDACTED] Yes Saturday 13th December – only around 14 candidates so far.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Aiming to release results before Christmas w/c 21st December. [REDACTED]?</p> <p>[REDACTED] Yes w/c 21st December is the date we are aiming for the release of results.</p> <p>[REDACTED] SMAP now in January regarding Superintendent and C/ Insp. appointments. [REDACTED] can you link in with [REDACTED] please.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Yes I will get in touch to confirm this for Monday 11th January 2021 with [REDACTED] as Chair.</p>



Keeping People Safe

MINUTES OF MEETING

NAME OF COMMITTEE: Strategic Promotions & Examinations Board (SPEB)

DATE: 30th September 2020

TIME: 15.00pm

LOCATION: Dial in Conference

CHAIRPERSONS: ACC Alan Todd & [REDACTED]

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

MEMBERS:

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
HR [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
HR [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Note Taker	[REDACTED]
------------	------------

Apologies

[REDACTED]

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

Item No	
1.0	Introduction, apologies noted.
2.0	Review of Previous Minutes – approved.
3.0	<p>Temporary Superintendent Promotion Process</p> <p>█ advised that █ had updated her after SET earlier today. Process would be initially an expression of interest and competencies and values for process would then be chosen.</p> <p>█ said that the staffing requirement for 8 or 9 Superintendents was too many not to do anything and the first decision was to either run a substantive or temporary process. It was decided that a temporary process would be best as substantive pool would not be any larger than recent process.</p> <p>Next decision was for generic or individualised process and was thought the best way forward was to set out details for each individual post to meet business requirement.</p> <p>█ was content with this approach.</p> <p>█ advised what was to happen with colleagues already in Temporary Promotion posts to Superintendent and as of Monday those currently in post which will not be filled from existing list will remain in post until these posts are filled. Colleagues in posts which will be filled on Monday 5th October will revert back to Chief Inspector.</p> <p>█ asked if we would be using paper sift.</p> <p>█ advised that expression of interest should be issued 1st October with return date close of play Tuesday 6th October. On the back of this we will decide on the</p>

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>methodology to be applied and issue further communication. Does anyone have anything further to add?</p> <p>AT nothing to add. DPC is a good case study – 3 posts incorporating all the same competencies – people should pitch for the job that they are prepared to do.</p> <p>█ asked if persons could apply for as many roles as they are qualified to do</p> <p>AT content that yes this will be the proposals we will adopt.</p> <p>█ Who decides what posts people will be allocated if they are successful in several - organisation or the individual.</p> <p>AT SMAP principles will guide.</p>
<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>4.0 Superintendent Promotion Process and Feedback</p> <p>█ advised feedback questionnaires had been returned and asked would the report be forwarded to AT and █ Two key issues from the questionnaire were post-its – generally negative - distracting and 7 minutes for each question – generally positive – allowed time to expand. Some replies also stated the Operational Brief was not overly relevant to the role of Superintendent.</p> <p>█ happy that the report shared with AT and █</p> <p>AT happy with this.</p>
<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>5.0 EO2 Promotion Process - Update</p> <p>█ advised the process was all completed and final interview was on 29th September which means we can now release merit details. Anything from █?</p> <p>█ everyone was content with the information already released.</p>

6.0

Chief Inspector Promotion Process - Panels

█ could we have █ thoughts on the best option to proceed with. What would his thoughts be as to how these have worked in previous processes

█ advised that he had noted problems when Operational Brief and Interview were split as the separate marking of these creates problems in regard to possibility of having already been unsuccessful on the completion of the first part. One panel could sit and do the process all at once. Challenge would be obtaining people for the panels.

█ would be in favour of 1 panel dealing with the person in totality as recent processes which highlighted the benefits of one panel.

█ we would be talking about a maximum of 4 candidates per day and is there any preference regarding 3 panels for 2 weeks or 2 panels for 3 weeks.

█ What would be the projected pool?

█ in the region of 100 plus.

█ more panels would get through the process quicker and I would favour 3 panels for 2 weeks with the panel carrying out both aspects of the process.

█ stated that the challenge with more panels would be moderation and consistency but we could work through this.

█ I would prefer 3 rooms as we need consistency throughout the process.

█ helped before re-obtaining panel members. Could you assist again?

█ happy to have a chat.

█ to confirm are we happy with 3 panels with 3 panel members or would we consider 2 person panels.

█ 2 panel members may be an option.

█ 2 on the panel running both the brief and interview would put more pressure on the panel.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

	AT Just check on any current candidate instructions.
<p>8.0</p> <p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p> <p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p> <p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>	<p>Inspector and Sergeant Exams and Communication</p> <p>■ We had difficulty in obtaining venues but these have now been secured and hopefully things will not change. Sergeant Exam will be over 1 weekend of 28/29th November. The Chief Constable has asked if communication could go out about the exams proceeding and I am happy to draft a communication for SPEB. Can I ask if we could include that candidates must notify us of withdrawal 4 weeks before the exam to assist us with the managing of numbers.</p> <p>AT I am sympathetic with the desire to have this included however we need to remember the pandemic and people may need to isolate at short notice, we would also need to have a sanction in that if persons didn't withdraw within 4 weeks then they could not apply next year. I am not sure about the practicalities.</p> <p>■ it may assist if people do actually withdraw at the last minute as this would assist with seating arrangements and spacing.</p> <p>■ may have a detrimental effect on females who may need to withdraw at short notice re childcare arrangements.</p> <p>■ this would lead into a possible mop up date regarding anyone isolating as per COVID-19. Do we need to have in place a mop up date for 2 weeks after the date of exams?</p> <p>AT I would be concerned about advertising it.</p> <p>■ we would need to set strict parameters. Would be looked at on a case by case basis.</p> <p>AT we will need to have this as a contingency plan. We understand we are in the middle of a pandemic and will carry out a post exam review to address any issues.</p> <p>■ this would be our response to any issues raised – post exam review</p> <p>AT there are people every year who are unable to do the exam. There is no right to be able to sit the exam.</p>

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

█ - we may risk candidates coming to sit the exam with COVID symptoms if they thought that there was no alternatives

AT potential temperature taking on arrival

█ no one who has symptoms should attend and this will be included in the email being released with details about the exam

AT and █ agree there should be a back-up plan in place

█ I will draft communication to be released.

█ has asked in regard to the exams and temporary promotions if we are able to use the score positions when the exams are completed in November before the 2nd stage is completed.

AT I think last year the process was completed when this was used

█ I believe the problem this is the time gap between exam and the interview

AT I would be broadly in favour of it as there is a ring of fairness about it

█ we would leave any current temp promotions in place but it is okay to use scores from the exams in November moving forward?

█ no objection

AT no objection

█ I will draft communication and AT and █ will release this. Other information re competitions can be added into this as decisions that have come out of SPEB meeting on 30th September

█ we have the opportunity in this communication to share some of the feedback received recently, we can highlight the opportunities people have had.

█ and █ all agree

█ can I raise about officers coming back into the workplace after being risk assessed and asking is it safe for me to do the exam? All is can say is arrangements will be in place to make everything as safe as possible – the core

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

role is as a Police officer as opposed to doing an exam.

█ if there was someone who fell into that bracket would they be able to come in to do the exam – we previously went out to houses for persons who were shielding and couldn't leave – we could consider this. Procedures we have in place for exams would cover people as they would have been risk assessed in that they could now attend the workplace.

AT temperature devices for the exams may be useful, also act as a deterrent for anyone deciding to attend with possible symptoms

█ we can certainly look into this for procedures for the day. We asked for masks to be worn to previous exams and there were no issues with everyone complying fairly well.

s.F40
s.F40(2)
s.F40(2)(a)
s.F40(2)(b)
s.F40(3)(A)(a)

9.0

AOB

█ nothing for this. Does everyone agree nothing for AOB?

AT nothing from me.

Meeting ended 15.45pm

Next meeting: