

**Chief Constable of Kent Police**

**Appointment Process**

**Independent Member Report**

**Professor R A Field-Smith MBE MA  
12 December 2013**

## Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Introduction .....                             | 3 |
| Aim .....                                      | 3 |
| Role of the Independent Member (IM) .....      | 3 |
| Involvement of the IM in the selection process | 3 |
| Appointments Panel .....                       | 4 |
| Role Profile/Terms and Conditions .....        | 5 |
| Advert .....                                   | 5 |
| Assessment Design .....                        | 5 |
| Assessment Delivery .....                      | 5 |
| Decision Making .....                          | 7 |
| Final panel and PCC recommendations ...        | 7 |
| Report conclusions .....                       | 7 |

### Annexes:

- A. Independent Member role description
- B. Robin Field-Smith's bio
- C. Letter to potential applicants
- D. CC Application form
- E. Police Professional Framework (PPF)
- F. Shortlisting process overview
- G. Selection timetable
- H. Slides for HR Director's panel briefing
- I. Assessment rating scale
- J. Selection scoring sheets:
  - J1 – Presentation
  - J2 – Media Interview
  - J3 - Interview

## Introduction

1. Home Office Circular (HoC) 20/2012 says that it is for the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to decide how they wish to run their appointment process and which candidate they wish to recommend for appointment, for subsequent confirmation by the Police and Crime Panel.
2. They must, however, involve an independent member during the conduct of the selection process, from initial job and person specification through to final selection.
3. This is the Independent Member's report on the appointment process for the Chief Constable (CC) of Kent Police, which is the responsibility of Mrs Ann Barnes, the PCC for Kent.

## Aim

4. The aim of this report is to provide an objective assessment of the extent to which the selection process was conducted fairly, openly and based on merit. It will also detail how the selection panel fulfilled their responsibility to challenge and test the candidates' suitability against the requirements of the role.

## Role of the Independent Member (IM)

5. The role of the Independent Member (IM) is set out in Home Office Circular (HOC) 20/2012, and described more fully in the "Guidance on Chief Officer Appointments", produced and maintained by the College of Policing.
6. Full details on the role are contained in **Annex A**, and on myself as the relevant Independent Member at **Annex B**.

## Involvement of the IM in the selection process

7. Mr Ian Drysdale, Director of Human Resources, Kent and Essex Police Directorate of Support Services, contacted me on 17 October 2013 on behalf of the PCC to check my availability. On 22 October I received a formal letter from the PCC inviting me to be the IM. I then corresponded with Ian Drysdale by e-mail over the coming days, leading up to a meeting at my home on 4 November, also including Richard Leicester, Head of Resourcing. By this stage the role description and person specification had already been decided, and an advert placed. At the meeting they briefed me on all the plans for the selection process, and sought or received my advice on specific issues. I received a further letter from the PCC on 11 November outlining the arrangements for the shortlisting. Subsequently I had my first contact with the PCC's office on 22 November 2013.

8. From my initial discussions with Ian Drysdale I have been fully involved in the process, and commend the commitment and inclusiveness of the PCC and her team, both from her own staff and the Kent and Essex Police Directorate of Support Services.

## **Appointments Panel**

9. The role of the Appointments Panel is detailed in the College of Policing's Guidance for the Appointment of Chief Officers (section 4.3.2).

10. The Panel selected for this process comprised:

Mrs Ann Barnes, PCC

Mr Paul West, Policing Adviser (from Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC) list)

Mr Michael Bax – local land owner, Champion of Victim Support, and Chair of the Crime Rural Action Group (CRAG)

Mr Nadeem Aziz – CE of Dover District Council

Mr Robin Field-Smith, Independent Member (from College of Policing List) – observing and advising

Assisted and further advised by:

Mr Ian Drysdale, HR Director

Mr Richard Leicester, Head of Resourcing

Ms Laura Steward, PCC's Policy Officer for Professional Standards

Mr Mike Hill, Chair of the PCP, observed the presentations and interviews by each candidate, and watched the video recordings of each media interview, but, on my advice, was not present for the panel scoring and discussion.

11. The make up of the Panel was:

- a. 3 male/1 female
- b. 1 BME
- c. No declared disabled

12. The panel members' experience covered making senior appointments across the public sector, especially in Kent, and they received the following training and briefing:

- a. An explanatory letter from the PCC.
- b. A written briefing surrounding the shortlisting.
- c. Prior circulation of the selection documents, a 60-minute briefing on day 1 of the selection, and a 30-minute briefing on day 2.

This helped ensure that the panel fully understood the processes to be used, and were properly prepared to challenge and test the candidates fairly, while looking to make merit-based judgements.

13. Panel members were involved in the following parts of the process:
  - a. Shortlisting.
  - b. Approval of the selection processes, based on the experience of, and the lessons from, the shortlisting process.
  - c. Selection over 2 days.

## **Role Profile/Terms and Conditions**

14. The role profile, and the terms and conditions for the CC role, were developed by the PCC with advice from the Chief of Staff and Chief Finance Officer. The PCC is providing details of these.

## **Advert**

15. An advert was drafted by the PCC, and developed on the basis of advice from the Directorate of Support Services and the Chief of Staff. It was placed on the APCC website, and subsequently on the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) website, as well as on the force internal system. A reminder was sent out a week before the closing date. The PCC wrote to all those who registered interest, and a copy of her letter is at **Annex C**. This shows a clear intention to be transparent. There were 3 applicants, 1 from within the force, 1 from another force, and 1 from an international appointment, but eligible through all the previous service in an England and Wales police force. A copy of the application form is at **Annex D**.

## **Assessment Design**

16. The HR Director led on the choice and design of the various assessment tools, assisted by the Police Advisor and the Independent Member, and following direction from the PCC. Good use was also made of the "Toolkit for the Selection of Chief Officers" produced by the College of Policing. The HR Director regularly sought my advice on the application of the options available both before and during the shortlisting and selection processes. I was also regularly asked to advise the PCC and the panel on the validity and fairness of the process. The PCC and her team consistently emphasised the importance of having a process which was fair, transparent and merit-based.

## **Assessment Delivery**

17. Shortlisting was conducted initially through Panel members marking individually the applicants' forms, and rating their input against the Executive

section of the Police Professional Framework (PPF) (see **Annex E**). The details of the process are at **Annex F**. The Panel were asked to decide whether each candidate had provided enough positive evidence to merit proceeding to the full selection process. The scores given were then collated and, as all the panel members had recommended that all 3 candidates should go forward to final selection, this was agreed. There was clearly a wish to be transparent and fair in inviting all candidates to the full selection process, as, although the information presented in the written applications did not provide all the evidence of suitability, the panel felt there was insufficient evidence to make a merit-based judgement to deselect any candidate at this stage.

18. The 2-day selection process was run according to the timetable at **Annex G**. It comprised 3 elements:

- a. A 20 minute presentation to the panel on how to handle victims of crime, following 30 minutes preparation, and allowing 25 minutes questioning from the panel.
- b. A 10 minute media interview with a professional journalist.
- c. A 1-hour panel interview.

There was a clear intention to be as transparent as possible with the candidates about the process being used.

19. Day 1 started with an hour's briefing of the panel, comprising a declaration of interests in any of the candidates, the PCC outlining the requirement, and the HR Director describing the process, including equality and diversity, and data protection (the slides used are at **Annex H**)

20. Applicants were marked first individually, against selected competencies from the PPF, and then scores were compared and a final score for each competency agreed. The assessment rating scale is shown at **Annex I**. The scoring sheets, showing in each case the relevant components of the PPF being assessed at each stage, are at:

**Annex J1** - Presentation

**Annex J2** - Media Interview

**Annex J3** - Interview.

The well-planned use of the PPF enabled the panel to seek out evidence to enable a merit-based judgement, and the use of a 4 point rating scale helped the panel members to judge whether there was sufficient evidence or not. The PCC personally volunteered to give her scores last for the internal candidate in order to minimise any influence on panel member colleagues.

21. Only after the panel had viewed (twice for each) and scored the media interview were they given the interviewer's comments on each candidate. This was to ensure that there was no unintentional bias provided to the panel in advance of their own scoring. There was a significant correlation between his views and the scores given, which underscored the judgments made by the panel members on the merits of each interview.

## Decision Making

22. The scores for each assessment component were agreed and recorded by the HR Director/Head of Resourcing. After the interviews had been assessed and scored, the scores given for each component by the panel were added up to provide the final scores, and the panel then allocated a score for general suitability for the role.

23. In the light of the final scores the Panel found that on the evidence presented one candidate stood out in front with adequate evidence on all competencies, and higher scores on a significant number. He was the only applicant to score consistently “above the line”.

## Final panel and PCC recommendations

24. As the panel scores produced a clear preference in favour of one particular candidate, the panel satisfied themselves that he was appointable. At this point due account was also taken of the written references which had been sent to the PCC but not previously disclosed to the panel members.

25. After a final check of the quality of the process, where the scores allocated showed a fair result based on merit, the panel made a unanimous recommendation to the PCC that DCC Alan Pughsley should be the preferred candidate. The PCC accepted this and has now published her nomination to go to the Police and Crime Panel on 20 December 2013.

## Report conclusions

**26. Largely due to the careful preparation done by the PCC’s staff and the HR Director’s team, and the professional attention devoted to the process by the panel, the selection of the preferred candidate to be Chief Constable of Kent was:**

- a. Fair.
- b. Transparent.
- c. Merit based.

**The selection panel robustly and rigorously challenged and tested the candidates against the necessary requirements for the role.**

Robin Field-Smith  
Independent Member  
12 December 2013