

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

## Ethics Referral/Outcome Form

1. <i>Topic or event being considered</i>	<b>Cleveland Sub 25 – Tattoos</b>  Advice as to whether restrictions should be placed on Officers and staff having tattoos on display whilst on duty and whether the force can place restrictions on officers having new visible tattoos that can't be covered.
2. <b>Desired outcome</b>	Force guidance
3. <b>Potential options and option appraisal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Accept advice provided by the external committee</li><li>• Offer views/guidance to the force</li><li>• Do nothing – existing guidance is sufficient</li></ul>
4. <b>Actual option chosen and appraisal of decision making and application</b>	<p>Do nothing – Both the internal &amp; external ethics committee believed that tattoos were socially acceptable and it would be difficult to place restrictions on what is and isn't acceptable. Officers should observe the code of ethics, especially around Accountability, Integrity, Leadership &amp; Respect when having new tattoos.</p> <p>The existing Dress Code already specifies:</p> <p><b>Whilst on duty, any tattoos should be covered which may cause offence to other officers, staff, members of the public or other agencies. If this is not practicable, or if officers are in doubt as to whether their tattoo could be offensive they should consult their supervision. Flexibility should be exercised in those instances of religious/cultural observances. Henna tattoos used for religious/cultural reasons (marriage ceremonies) will be permitted</b></p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

## Ethics Referral/Outcome Form

<b>5. Recommendations</b>	<i>Individual</i> Cascade the message that officers have a personal responsibility to ensure they act ethically and adhere to the Dress Code
	<i>Cleveland Police</i> Cascade the message that officers have a personal responsibility to ensure they act ethically and adhere to the Dress Code. Any proposed changes to the wording of the Dress Code should be in line with the view of the Ethics Committees.
	<i>External</i>
<b>6. Action taken (including referral to External Ethics</b>	

**Ethics Referral/Outcome Form**

<b>Committee)</b>	
<b>7. External Ethics Committee Comments/ Recommendations</b>	<p>In principle the External Ethics Committee considered tattoos to be acceptable as long as they do not cause offence. For instance, the Committee are working on the basis that force policy would not accept, at the point of joining Cleveland Police or Durham Constabulary, an individual with a tattoo deemed offensive / inappropriate towards groups with protected characteristics i.e. on the basis of ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and religion. Also, issues around the visibility of tattoos when officers are in full / partial uniform were considered, particularly given the increased social acceptability of tattoos on hands and neck areas. The committee's view would be to apply existing force policy, i.e. ensure that visible tattoos are non-offensive or inappropriate. However, given that final decisions will be subjective, it is important that this should be a group decision independent from the officers concerned in the recruitment process, rather than the responsibility of one individual</p>
<b>8. Outcome</b>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

## Ethics Referral/Outcome Form

--	--