

## Summary: Intervention & Options

<b>Department /Agency:</b> Home Office	<b>Title:</b> Impact Assessment of Police Green Paper: Leadership	
<b>Stage:</b>	<b>Version:</b> 1.5	<b>Date:</b> 23.5.08
<b>Related Publications:</b>		

Available to view or download at:

<http://www>.

Contact for enquiries: Bettina v. Hornhardt

Telephone: 020 7035 1885

**What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?**

The policing leadership landscape has changed and now requires Chief Officers to have greater range of experience in resource management and stakeholder/partnership skills [these skills need to be developed throughout the management ranks e.g. from sergeant onwards].

The current selection process does not appropriately acknowledge the relevant challenge that different Chief Officers posts offer and plan selection procedures in order to manage this against the level of experience and skills of Chief Officers applying to posts.

**What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?**

Police officers throughout their career will develop resource management and stakeholder/partnership skills appropriate for their role

Those aspiring to chief officer ranks will have or will acquire the appropriate skills

An infrastructure will be in place which enables learning and development during each officer/staff members career (e.g. High Potential Development Scheme, Strategic Command Course etc)

The selection process for chief officer ranks will be improved to rigorously matching the best candidates to the right jobs and give officers appropriate development opportunities

**What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.**

**A Development of leaders:** 1. Implement NPIA leadership strategy but do nothing further, 2. Support improvement in leadership building on the NPIA Leadership Strategy (2 sub options) 3. Consider HMIC work on sergeants' front-line supervision role and any recommendations that follow (2 sub options), 4. Give more prominence to national work of Chief Officers (2 sup options). All options, except sub options under 2, to be taken forward

**B Selection of chief officers:** 1. do nothing, 2. Reform of the Senior Appointments Panel (4 sub options) Preferred option, reformed Senior Appointments panel, independently chaired, assessment done by HMIC

**When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects?**

2 years after implementation of policy

**Ministerial Sign-off** For SELECT STAGE Impact Assessments:

*I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.*

Signed by the responsible Minister:

..... Date:

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: A 2.1

Description: Accreditation of Training Courses

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' Training courses are accredited, cost is based on £ 7,500 per course, based on 5 courses accredited each year
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition)	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£		
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)		
	£ 37,500	5	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b> £ 169,000
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' Administration of course accreditation			

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b>	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£ 0		
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b> £ 0
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' Accredits and professionalises skills for officers and staff in order to raise standards and skills level.			

### Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Assumes 5 courses a year over 5 years from 2009/10 to 2013/14

Price Base Year 2008	Time Period Years 6	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £ -169,000
-------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England and Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2009			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	NPIA			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)		
Increase of	£	Decrease of	£	<b>Net Impact</b>	£

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: A 2.2

Description: New fast track scheme for officers

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition)	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£ 180,000	1	Development of scheme over 2009 and running cost of administration of new scheme for 4 years from 2010
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)		
£ 1,000,000	4	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b>	£ 3,723,000
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'			
Officers' time to attend additional training/development under the fast track programme			

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b>	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£ 0		
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)		
£ 0		<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b>	£ 0
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'			
Attract and speed up promotion for those with strong ability and wider experience. Higher quality individuals attracted to the force and in higher ranks.			

**Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks**

Estimates assume scheme developed in 2009/10 and runs for 4 years from 2010/11 to 2013/14.

Price Base Year 2008	Time Period Years 6	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £ -3.7m
-------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England and Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2010			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	NPIA			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of £	Decrease of £	<b>Net Impact</b>	£

Key:

Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices

(Net) Present Value

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: A 3.1

Description: People management module compulsory in sergeant training

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' All existing sergeants, who have not taken the people management training module, will be trained over a two year period (cost between 4.75 million and 7.1 million pa). People management training for all new sergeants compulsory (between 1.35 million and 2.03 million each year)
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition)	<b>Yrs</b>	
	<b>£ 9,024,000</b>	2	
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)		
	<b>£ 1,350,000</b>	5	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b> <b>£ 13,815,000</b>
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' Opportunity cost of sergeants' time to attend training courses			

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b>	<b>Yrs</b>	
	<b>£ 0</b>		
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)		
	<b>£ 0</b>		<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b> <b>£ 0</b>
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' Better people management will lead to better performance, morale and deployment of officers, increasing productivity and providing better customer service.			

**Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks** Figures are based on the assumption that at present only 25% to 50% of sergeants receive people management training. Transition costs assume there is capacity to train existing sergeants in 2009/10 and 2010/11 and new sergeants in 2010/11 to 2013/14. Costs assuming training is additional rather than as replacement to alternative training

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> <b>£</b>	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> <b>£ -£13.8m</b>
-----------------	-------------------	--	--

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England and Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2009			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	Home Office, NPIA			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£ N/A			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£ N/A			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)
Increase of £	Decrease of £	<b>Net Impact</b>	<b>£</b>

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: A 3.2

Description: PDR process – better management of constables

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' Opportunity cost to forces for each extra hour spent on the PDR process.
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition)	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£		
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)		
	£ <b>4,750,000</b>	5	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b> £ <b>21,446,000</b>
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'			

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b>	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£ 0		
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b> £ 0
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' Constables' performance is monitored more effectively, leading to better skills development and enhanced productivity.			

### Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Cost assumes that the PDR process requires additional time for Constables and sergeants. Assumes 1 hour per PDR per year from 2009/10 to 2013/14 though exact time required is not yet known

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £ <b>-21.4m</b>
--------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?			England and Wales		
On what date will the policy be implemented?			2009		
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?			Forces		
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?			£ N/A		
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?			N/A		
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			N/A		
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?			£ N/A		
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?			£ N/A		
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?			N/A		
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)		Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?		Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)		
Increase of	£	Decrease of	£	<b>Net Impact</b>	£

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: A 4.1

Description: National work at ACPO Rank

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition)	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£		Opportunity cost for each additional day's national work undertaken by all ACPO ranks
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)		
£ 100,000	5	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b>	£ 452,000
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'			

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b>	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£ 0		
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)		
£ 0		<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b>	£ 0
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'			
Greater national co-ordination of national projects and wider experience for potential leaders			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Estimate assumes an additional 1 day per year per ACPO rank from 2009/10 to 2013/14

Price Base	Time Period	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b>	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b>
Year	Years	£	£ -0.5m

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?		England and Wales	
On what date will the policy be implemented?		2009	
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?		ACPO	
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?		£	
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?		Yes/No	
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?		Yes/No	
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?		£	
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?		£	
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?		Yes/No	
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A N/A

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of £	Decrease of £	<b>Net Impact</b>	£

Key:

Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices

(Net) Present Value

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: B 2.1

Description: Reformed SAP with bigger secretariat

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition)	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£		Existing secretariat enhanced by three or more new members of staff
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)		
£ 200,000	5	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b>	£ 903,000
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'			

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b>	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£ 0		
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)		
£ 0		<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b>	£ 0
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'			
Better succession planning for chief officers leading to improved recruitment of appropriate officers into senior roles.			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks 2013/14

Estimates assume changes take place from 2009/10 to 2013/14

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £ -0.9m
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?		England and Wales	
On what date will the policy be implemented?		2009	
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?		Home Office, HMIC	
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?		£	
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?		N/A	
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?		N/A	
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?		£	
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?		£	
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?		N/A	
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A N/A

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of £	Decrease of £	<b>Net Impact</b>	£

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

**Policy Option: B 2.2 and 2.3**

**Description: Reformed SAP with bigger Secretariat and independent chair**

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'  Enhanced secretariat as in B 2.1 either located in HMIC (B2.2) or in the Home Office (B 2.3) and independent chair
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition)	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£		
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)		
	£ <b>250,000</b>	5	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b> £ <b>1,129,000</b>
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'			

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b>	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£ 0		
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b> £ 0
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'  Better succession planning for chief officers leading to improved recruitment of appropriate officers into senior roles. Independent chair providing greater transparency and equality to the recruitment process.			

### Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Appointing an independent chair will require primary legislation. Estimates assume changes take place from 2009/10 to 2013/14

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £ -1.1m
--------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?		England and Wales	
On what date will the policy be implemented?		2009 (Primary Legisl.)	
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?		Home Office, HMIC	
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?		£	
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?		N/A	
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?		N/A	
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?		£	
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?		£	
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?		N/A	
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium      Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A      N/A

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)
Increase of £	Decrease of £	<b>Net Impact</b> £

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: B 2.4

Description: Reformed SAP with bigger secretariat, independent chair and external assessment of candidates

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition)	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£		Costs as for options B2.2. and B 2.3 plus cost for independent assessment of candidates
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)		
	£ 500,000	5	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b>
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'			

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'
	<b>One-off</b>	<b>Yrs</b>	
	£ 0		
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b>
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' External assessors will focus on candidates and feed in HMIC assessment properly.			

### Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

HMIC may perceive this as diminishing their role. Estimates assume changes take place from 2009/10 to 2013/14

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £ -2.3m
--------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England and Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2009 (Primary Legisl.)			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	Home Office			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	N/A			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	N/A			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of £	Decrease of £	<b>Net Impact</b>	£

Key:

Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices

(Net) Present Value

## Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

[Use this space (with a recommended maximum of 30 pages) to set out the evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Ensure that the information is organised in such a way as to explain clearly the summary information on the preceding pages of this form.]

### The issue

The policing leadership landscape has changed and now requires Chief Officers to have greater range of experience in resource management and stakeholder/partnership skills. Initial consultation and discussion with stakeholders (HMIC, NPIA, ACPO, APA and CPOSA) have raised issues around the development of leaders (which are addressed in section A) and issues around the selection of leaders (which are addressed in section B):

#### A: Development of leaders

The following issues have been identified by stakeholders:

Leadership development needs to begin at the first line management role

Insufficient resource and business management skills in police leadership (widely agreed)

Challenges on strategic people management skills (challenges of managing workforce modernisation; difficulty of operating: PDR process without huge bureaucracy, and to make a real difference; operation of SPPs).

The PDR process does not sufficiently encourage personal and professional development

Operationally decisive leaders seem less so at strategic level (e.g. lack of focus on and success in improving deployment of officers and staff)

The view from ACPO is that not enough Chief Officers make use of wide range of experiences offered by different forces.

The view from ACPO is that more prominence needs to be given to national work of ACPO officers

### Proposals

The following proposals will be consulted on through the Green Paper

#### **A1 Implement Leadership Strategy, but do nothing further**

**Rationale:** Continue implementation of the NPIA leadership Strategy, which aims to launch the revised High Potential Development Scheme in 2008, review the content of the Strategic Command Course (SCC) and redesign SCC in 2009 and revise the Police National Assessment Centre (PNAC) in 2008 and implement a new PNAC in 2009.

**Objective:** Increasing resource management skills of Chief Officer, through training (SCC module) or inclusion as Core Competency.

**Benefits:** Links to proposals on Efficiency & Productivity more widely – incl. deployment and embeds resource management as a required skill

**Cost:** nothing, work is already ongoing

## **A 2 Support improvement in leadership building on the NPIA Leadership Strategy.**

**Rationale:** The cadre of future leaders need to have the right skills to match current policing environment, particularly resource management and greater partnership skills, which will be necessary for success elsewhere. National work is not always considered a high priority amongst Chief Officers despite the importance of strategic issues and the need for national consensus amongst Chief Officers. Graduates and those with wider experience may be discouraged to join the police due to the time it takes to gain promotion.

### **Sub options**

#### **A 2.1 Accreditation of Bramshill courses to the “National College of Policing”**

**Objective/change:** Bramshill courses are externally accredited

**Benefits:** Accredits and professionalises skills for officers and staff in order to raise standards and skills level.

**Cost:** Approximately £ 7,500 for each new course accredited

#### **A 2.2 Introduction of new fast track development scheme**

**Objective/change:** a route for new entrants (e.g. graduates) to progress more quickly through the ranks

**Benefits:** Attract and speed up promotion for those with strong ability and wider experience.

**Cost:** Development of the scheme (NPIA): £ 180,000 over one year

Running cost (NPIA): £ 1,000,000 per year

## **A3 Consider HMIC work on sergeants’ front-line supervision role and any recommendations that follow.**

**Rationale:** Sergeants manage over 80% of workforce but anecdotal evidence suggests that improvement needed in supervision (esp. response) and PDR process. Federation research on 24/7 response policing and HMIC research identifies supervision as an area needing improvement. Discussion with NPIA training leads also suggests that Sergeants are required to undertake people management either before taking up or during their Sergeant role.

### **Sub options:**

#### **A 3.1 Introduce people management as part of Sergeants required training (currently voluntary module).**

**Objective/Change:** All sergeants receive people management training as part of their overall training

**Benefits:** Would ensure that Sergeants begin role being trained in people management and supervise constables effectively

**Cost:** To make people management module compulsory for all new sergeants, between £ 1,350,000 (assuming 50% uptake currently) and £ 2,025,000 (assuming 25% uptake currently)

To train all existing sergeants, between £ 9,500,000 (assuming 50% uptake) and £ 14,200,000 (assuming 25% uptake)

This cost would be met in part by reprioritising training towards people management.

#### **A 3.2 Review PDR process undertaken by Sergeants**

**Objective/change:** Sergeants spend more time on performance management; constables receive better, constructive feedback and are encouraged to develop skills

**Benefits:** Constables are better managed and developed, leading to better skills development and more effective frontline policing.

**Cost:** Opportunity cost to the service £ 4,750,000 in officer time for each additional hour that is spent on the PDR process

## **A 4 Give more prominence to national work of Chief Officers**

**Rationale:** National work is not always considered a high priority amongst Chief Officers despite the importance of strategic issues and the need for national consensus amongst Chief Officers. ACPO view is that national work is not highly regarded by all Chief Officers and is often opposed by APA.

### **Sub Options**

#### A 4.1 National work to form part of core terms and conditions

**Objective/change:** Chief officer contracts specify that carrying out national work is part of their role

**Benefits:** Would ensure greater national co-ordination over the leadership of national projects (such as international policing assistance)

**Cost:** Cost neutral if the same national work is undertaken as at present, opportunity cost to the police service for each additional day of national work (all ACPO ranks) is £ 100,000

#### A 4.2 Recognise secondments to other forces or public and private sector.

**Objective/change:** Officers will be able to be seconded to a wider range of organisations than those currently specified in Section 97 of the Police Act

**Benefits:** Wider experience for potential chief officers

**Costs:** None

We propose to take all options forward but wish to consult in particular on the proposal to increase the time sergeants spend on constables' PDR as this not be easily measurable

## **B: Selection of chief officers**

### **Issues**

The following issues have been identified by stakeholders:

The similarity of the pool of candidates for officer leadership given their common career path. This tends to make any weaknesses more of a concern as they tend to be widespread.

The current selection process does not enable active career management, succession planning or independent scrutiny of candidates

The current arrangements lack transparency and equality (CPOSA)

The current system may seem to empower individual authorities and officers, it provides them with little basis on which to exercise their freedom of judgement.

The current selection process does not appropriately acknowledge the relevant challenge that different Chief Officers posts offer and plan selection procedures in order to manage this against the level of experience and skills of Chief Officers applying to posts.

Short term problem with chief officer supply, and in particular encouraging refreshing of managements by geographical moves (clear from applications recently, and belief of SCC co-ordinators about current class)

Perception that medium to long term problem in attracting leaders of sufficient calibre (Widely held ACPO view)

### **Proposals**

#### **B 1 Do Nothing (no changes to the Chief Officer appointment process)**

**Rationale:** retain the existing SAP process of Police Authorities advertising and submitting a shortlist to the SAP, who screen shortlists, can remove candidates from the shortlist and then recommend the agreed shortlist to the Secretary of State. After that the appointment process is managed by the Police Authority with an input from HMIC.

**Objective:** Process is managed in line with current legislation

**Benefits:** All stakeholders are familiar with the system.

**Cost:** none

## **B 2 Reform of the Senior Appointments Panel (SAP)**

**Rationale:** Currently, the system is one in which police authorities exercise one of their relatively few powers – of chief officer appointment – in a context which is in practice very lightly managed from the centre. Many police authorities are likely to see the changes to a much more managed system as encroaching heavily on a core role and protest accordingly. Likewise, currently individual aspiring chief officers are fairly lightly managed. The new system would be more directive – but also more supportive and transparent. A reform of the SAP would enable the SAP's role to link into the NPIA leadership strategy, which identifies particular skills for senior roles. If appraisals of candidates are based on these skills areas then SAP can better match candidates to skills required for particular posts. Implementing the leadership strategy will also send a clear signal to potential candidates and enable them to prepare better for the Senior Police National Assessment Centre (SPNAC).

The reform of SAP would also look at the sequencing of SAP scrutiny and introduce a model of co-ordinated appointment rounds, recognising that appointments at ACPO ranks are likely to leave a vacancy to fill at a lower rank.

### **Sub Options**

#### B 2.1 HMIC led SAP with more secretariat support.

**Objective/change:** As now HMCIC chairs and HMIC provides the secretariat function. Because of the change to the system the Senior Appointments Panel would be more powerful, with its secretariat needing to be correspondingly enhanced. The secretariat would then be able to monitor information on vacancies and potential candidates. Regional HMIs would continue to feed into this process as key assessors of candidates, but now with the criteria being based around the skills issues set out in the NPIA Leadership Strategy, and including more focus on national work. This provides continuity, but it may well undermine attempts to get HMIC to play a more robust performance scrutiny role. It is hard to move to a tough regulatory approach and be fully objective and detached in reviewing a force if the inspectorate also played the key role in deciding who should run it.

**Benefits:** Provides continuity with additional scope for succession planning but does not make process more robust.

**Cost:** £ 200,000 per year for the enhanced Secretariat for HMIC

#### B 2.2 Independently led, HMIC secretariat, HMIs feed in assessments.

**Objective/change:** An independent chair is appointed (could be a complete outsider, or an ex-HMCIC or another policing figure). This would also free up HMCIC time in line with proposals for the Inspectorate (elsewhere in the Green Paper). HMIC still provides the beefed-up secretariat; HMIs still feed in their assessments. Slight reduction in the problems of the first option, but a bit odd as HMIC still clearly implicated in decisions. Mitigate by making the new Senior Appointments Panel more weighted towards independents and with a top official.

**Benefits:** Improvement in problem but HMIC still involved in decision but with independent chair

**Costs:** £ 250,000 per year for the enhanced Secretariat and independent chair (about the same cost as the current independent member) for HMIC

B 2.3 Independently led, HO secretariat, HMIs feed in assessments.

**Objective/change:** Superior to second option in terms of strength of HMIC as inspectorate. However, more controversial

**Benefits:** Clear role for HMI as inspectorate and an independent chair. Role of the secretariat is moved from HMIC, separating the assessment process from the succession planning and monitoring process and freeing up HMIC time in line with proposals for the inspectorate.

**Cost:** £ 250,000 per year for the enhanced secretariat and independent chair to the HO (The costs might be administration costs rather than programme which could create further affordability pressures.)

B 2.4 Independently led, HO secretariat, independent assessors

**Objective/change:** This is the most radical option. The independent assessors could well be recruited in a broadly similar way to HMIs, but would be entirely focused on people. In some ways this is the best option, but it is the most expensive. HMIC would still need to feed in about force performance and the key issue that would need working through is how to ensure that works sensibly with the independent assessors' views of chief officers. However this may lead to duplication as HMIC would be assessing all chief officers as part of their role and independent assessors would assess candidates each time they apply for a post.

**Benefits:** Most radical - independent assessors focus on candidates and HMI assessment is fed in properly

**Cost:** £ 500,000 per year for enhanced secretariat, independent chair and external assessment to HO.

Our preferred option for a revised SAP is the third sub option (an independently led SAP with a HO secretariat and HMIs feeding in assessments) as it would provide a rigorous independent element to the selection process (independent chair and HO secretariat) without undermining HMICs' role in assessing officers performance and potential.

## Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

We have carefully considered the related impacts of this specific proposal and have concluded that it will not affect the private sector nor will it raise any issues around the other impacts listed. An Equality Impact Assessment has been produced for the Green Paper which can be seen at [\[link/page\]](#). We have considered whether a Privacy Impact Assessment was necessary and decided it was not.

<b>Type of testing undertaken</b>	<b><i>Results in Evidence Base?</i></b>	<b><i>Results annexed?</i></b>
Competition Assessment	Yes/No	Yes/No
Small Firms Impact Test	Yes/No	Yes/No
Legal Aid	Yes/No	Yes/No
Sustainable Development	Yes/No	Yes/No
Carbon Assessment	Yes/No	Yes/No
Other Environment	Yes/No	Yes/No
Health Impact Assessment	Yes/No	Yes/No
Race Equality	Yes/No	Yes/No
Disability Equality	Yes/No	Yes/No
Gender Equality	Yes/No	Yes/No
Human Rights	Yes/No	Yes/No
Rural Proofing	Yes/No	Yes/No

An equality impact assessment for the Green paper has been produced and can be seen at [www...](#)

## Annexes

< Click once and paste, or double click to paste in this style.>