

Chief Constable Selection Process

Assessor Training

Ian Drysdale, Director of HR



Overview:

- Training will be approximately 45 minutes
- Agree Roles
- Clarify Process and Questions
- Agree format and schedule
- Rating Process
- Equality and Diversity
- Data Protection



The Process:

- 3 Exercises over 2 Days
- Agreed Timetable contained within pack
- Assessment Exercises:
 - Media Exercise
 - Presentation
 - Competency Based Interview



Assessment Instruments:

Competencies:

- •All assessments will assess specific behaviours
- •Rating will be awarded against each behaviour:

Presentation	Media	Interview
Serving the public	Effective communication	Serving the public
Decision making	Serving the public	Leading strategic change
Working with others	Leading the workforce	Managing performance
Leading strategic change	Professionalism	Leading the workforce
	Decision making	Delivering value for money



Questioning of candidates:

- Focus on past events and evidence
 - Critical and specific tangible evidence
- •Require examples that support statements
 •"When", "How", "Outcome"
 - Link probes to competencies and specific area of assessment



Question Techniques:

- Open ended questions
 - "What approach will you take to..."
- Follow on/probing questions
 - "What was the tangible performance outcome?"
- Link questions where appropriate
- Problem centred questions



Questions to avoid:

- Closed questions
- Leading questions
- Multiple questions
- Complex questions
- Discriminatory questions



Assessors should avoid:

- Making their mind up too early
- Basing decisions on feelings rather than evidence
- Preconceived assumptions about the candidate
- Remember this is a two way process
- Evidence of selection; Essential



Use ORCE:

- Observe/Record record what is said
- •Classify Once the candidate has provided evidence you should classify evidence against the behavioural criteria
- •Evaluate Evaluated classified between using scoring key panel agreement on overall rating awarded



Interview Rating Guide:

A 1 - 4 rating scale will be used for assessing candidate's performance during the Interview Process. A score of 1 represents an area for improvement and 4 represents an area of considerable strength of the

candidate.

Rating	Definition	
4	Strong Evidence The candidate provides strong evidence of many descriptions within the area tested at an appropriate level for the role, with direct relevance to the policing priorities as set by the PCC.	
3	Acceptable Evidence The candidate provides some evidence of the area tested at an appropriate level for the role, has acceptable relevance to the policing priorities as set by the PCC.	
2	Area where improvement is needed The candidate provides some, but limited evidence of the area tested at an appropriate level for the role, has gaps in the relevance to the policing priorities as set by the PCC and / or does not respond to all the issues in the question.	
1	Evidence Not Provided The candidate provides no evidence of the quality / competency area, or the evidence is at a level below that required for the role applied for or does not have relevance to the policing priorities as set by the PCC.	



Equality Act/Equality Duty:

- Equality Duty 2011 requires Police Forces to have due regard to:
 - Eliminate unlawful discrimination
 - Advance equal opportunity
 - Foster good relations with individuals who have protected characteristics
 - Guiding principles must give due regard to the need to promoting equality



Equality Act (2010):

- Protected characteristics covered by Act:
 - Age
 - Disability
 - Gender Reassignment
 - Marriage and Civil Partnerships
 - Pregnancy and Maternity
 - Race
 - Religion or Belief
 - Sex
 - Sexual Orientation

As assessors it is unlawful to:



•Directly Discriminate:

(e.g. treat an applicant worse than another applicant because of a protected characteristic)

•Indirectly Discriminate:

(e.g. apply a criteria which will indirectly disadvantage people with a particular protected characteristic)

Discriminate by Association:

(e.g. because they associate with a person who has a protected characteristic)

Discriminate by Perception:

(e.g. direct discrimination against an individual because others 'think' they have a protected characteristic) - Even if they don't

As assessors it is unlawful to (Cont):



Harassment

Third Party Harassment

Victimisation

(e.g. treat a candidate less favourably due to past actions, (for example due to a Grievance linked to a complaint regarding previous treatment surrounding a protected characteristic))





- •Only use data provided for process for a legitimate business purpose
- •Transparency is key and all records are disclosable (including written notes)
- •Ensure that data is **used** in a way that the candidate would reasonably expect it to be
- •Ensure data is accurate
- No data/information from this process should be shared with any third party



Questions?