

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Police and Crime Panel

21 November 2022

INDEPENDENT MEMBER'S REPORT RECRUITMENT OF CHIEF CONSTABLE FOR HAMPSHIRE & ISLE OF WIGHT CONSTABULARY

1. Introduction

1.1 This is the Independent Member's report relating to the appointment process for the next Chief Constable for Hampshire & Isle of Wight Constabulary. It provides my assessment of the appointment process used by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire & Isle of Wight (HIOW) which I consider to have been conducted fairly, openly and based on merit. It also details the extent to which members of the Appointment Panel interview fulfilled their responsibility to challenge and test the candidates' suitability against the requirements of the role.

2. Independent Member's role

2.1 The role of the Independent Member is laid out in Home Office Circular 013/2018. It is described more fully in the Guidance for Chief Officer Appointments produced by the College of Policing.

2.2 Home Office Circular 013/2018 outlines that it is for the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to decide how they wish to run their appointment process for a Chief Constable. However, the PCC should involve an Independent Member in the assessment, shortlisting and interviewing of candidates. It is for the PCC to decide at the end of the process which candidate they wish to appoint, subject to confirmation by the Police and Crime Panel.

2.3 The independent panel member should not be a:

- PCC
- member of the PCC's staff
- member of the PCP
- Member of Parliament
- Member of the European Parliament
- local councillor
- serving or retired police officer or member of police staff
- civil servant
- member of the National Assembly for Wales
- member of the Northern Ireland Assembly
- member of the Scottish Government
- employee of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

- employee of the Independent Police Complaints Commission
- employee of the College of Policing

2.4 The types of people suitable for the role of independent panel member might include, but is not limited to, Magistrates, Chief Executives of local authorities, and representatives of community organisations.

2.5 The role as set out in College of Policing Guidance for Appointing Chief Officers requires the independent member to:

- be suitably experienced and competent in assessment and selection practices
- undertake appropriate briefing/assessor training
- be aware and have an understanding of the needs and interests of the recruiting force and local community
- in collaboration with the PCC and other panel members, shortlist and assess applicants against the agreed appointment criteria and consider which candidate most closely meets the appointment criteria
- produce a written report on the appointment process, to be submitted to the Police and Crime Panel at the same time as the name of the preferred appointee
- expressly and explicitly address the appointment principles of merit, fairness and openness and the extent to which the panel was able to fulfil its purpose (e.g. to challenge and test that the candidate meets the necessary requirements to perform the role).

It is important that the Independent Member is suitably experienced in selection and assessment practices, so they can determine the extent to which the appointment process is conducted in line with the principles of merit, fairness and openness.

As a UK Business Development Director, BAE Systems Naval Ships (Portsmouth) and Chair of the Solent Freeport Consortium, I meet the specified criteria as an Independent Member and was selected by the Police & Crime Commissioner for this purpose. The Appointment Panel (see 3.3 below) specifically reviewed my independence and were entirely satisfied that I met the requirements.

2.6 I was invited by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to become involved in this appointment process prior to the Chief Constable advert being placed. The application pack with the role requirements and person specification was assembled by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC). It adhered to the Guidance for Chief Officer Appointments and was supported by the College of Policing who provided guidance and advice.

2.7 The PCC and her staff actively demonstrated from the outset that in the interests of public accountability, they were committed to adhering to the principles of openness, fairness and merit.

3. Appointment Panel

3.1 The role of the Appointment Panel is set out in the Guidance for Chief Officer Appointments. This outlines that the panel should be convened by the PCC before any stage of the appointment process takes place. There should be no conflicts of interest between panel members and the applicant pool.

3.2 The purpose of the Appointment Panel is to challenge and test if the candidates meet the necessary requirements to perform the role, and that the PCC should select a panel capable of discharging this responsibility. The PCC should also ensure that panel members are diverse, suitably experienced and competent in selection practices. They must adhere to the principles of merit, fairness and openness. All members were provided with a copy of this guidance when they were invited to join the panel to ensure they are familiar with its content prior to the beginning of the appointment process.

3.3 It is the PCC's responsibility to ensure that appropriate briefing/assessor training is undertaken by all panel members, and this was arranged by the Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. This training specifically covered all aspects of the appointment process and the CVF framework. This was a good session and absolutely underpinned the Appointment Panels' suitability and understanding of the openness and fairness required for the task.

3.4 It is suggested that a panel of approximately five members is convened, but this is at the discretion of the PCC. Donna Jones PCC for Hampshire & Isle of Wight actively followed this advice. Within this appointment process the panel had been agreed at the outset as consisting of the following members:

- Donna Jones - PCC for Hampshire and Isle of Wight
- Brian Johnson - UK Business Development Director, BAE Systems Naval Ships and Chair of the Solent Freeport Consortium
- Sara Glen - previous Deputy Chief Constable of Hampshire and Isle of Wight Constabulary
- Lou Taylor - Sales and Marketing Entrepreneur
- Gemma Gair - Hampshire and Isle of Wight Constabulary, Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development

All panel members scored the candidates in the final interview stage.

3.5 The panel included an appropriate range of stakeholders from different parts of the public sector, while Sara Glen also brought extensive experience from local policing within H10W.

3.6 All panel members were identified for their strategic leadership experience to allow them to challenge and test others at executive level. Noting the briefing and access to a copy of the College of Policing Guidance, this ensured they were well informed on their duties in this appointments process. I consider the panel to be sufficient diverse in terms of ethnicity, sex and experience.

3.7 All panel members were provided with a detailed pack before the interview which included the application forms, results of Behavioural Preference Testing, College of Policing Competencies, information on unconscious bias and a set of interview questions which had been drafted by the Police and Crime Commissioner. All question clearly reflected the assessment and scoring criteria set out by the College of Policing.

3.8 Support and advice from the College of Policing Senior Leaders Hub was used throughout, including at the interview stage. The College of Policing did not have a role in the decision-making process.

3.9 The role of the Chief Executive (as defined in College of Policing guidance) is to support the PCC by ensuring the appointment procedure is properly conducted in line with the requirements set out in legislation and meeting the principles of fairness, openness and selection on merit. In addition, the Chief Executive is required to ensure appropriate monitoring of the procedures.

3.10 Jason Kenny, Chief Executive of the OPCC, worked consistently to maintain standards, collaborating openly and helpfully with all of the panel members on the main panel and stakeholder panels' members throughout the planning and administration of the appointment process.

4. Recruitment Advert

4.1 College of Policing guidelines refer to the overall time lines for the process being agreed in advance. I observed that this was completed and approved by the Appointment Panel prior to the advertisement of the post.

4.2 The application pack was drawn up in line with the national guidance. The post was advertised on the 7th September 2022 with applications closing on 9th October 2022.

4.3 My observation was that every effort was made to be transparent about the availability of the post and to encourage all potential applicants to consider it. The aim was to attract the strongest possible field of applicants. In this way all eligible applicants in the UK pool were made aware of the opportunity.

4.4 I reviewed the published application pack and consider it to have been comprehensive, with links offering more detail, the pack included terms of appointment and met legal requirements.

4.5 I also reviewed the application form that was used and deem that it was in line with the College of Policing guidance. It required details of the professional qualifications, training and development the candidate had undertaken, evidence of roles, responsibilities and achievements in the last three years. In being based on evidence of previous achievements, it was an appropriate tool to support merit-based judgements. Candidates were also asked to provide evidence against the required Competency and Values Framework (CVF).

4.6 The application form included setting a word limit for each answer, thereby being fair to candidates in giving them clear expectations of the length of response required.

5. Role profile

5.1 The Appointment Panel received a briefing on the role profile as advertised. This reflected the national guidance, including primary accountabilities, the competencies required and the terms and conditions offered. In the introduction to the candidate pack by the Police and Crime Commissioner, she was very clear about her expectations of the role.

6. Shortlisting

6.1 Shortlisting was undertaken by all panel members. However it should be noted that one panel member was not able to be present for the shortlisting discussion owing to a personal commitment. Final decisions were therefore based on the four other members scores and the discussion that followed.

6.2 At the meeting all members were asked whether they had a conflict of interest with any of the candidates and none were identified. I can confirm that I did not know any of the candidates being shortlisted. The PCC and some panel members had met some of the candidates previously in a professional capacity. In order to ensure fairness of the process, it was noted that judgements would be based only on the evidence available in front of the panel, not on prior knowledge. This was to ensure impartiality, consistency and fairness.

6.3 Three candidates were shortlisted for interview and were provided the following documents to prepare for their presentation and understanding of Hampshire & Isle of Wight Constabulary;

- structure chart
- summary of the Chief Superintendents and their areas of responsibility
- short statement in relation to shared services
- copy of the latest Peel assessment
- The force management statement.

Both candidates were provided with identical information throughout the process.

7. Behavioural Preference Testing

7.1 Insights Colour Works were completed by the candidates, but this was not a scored part of the process. Appropriate information and briefing regarding its use and purpose was provided to the candidates and panel members.

8. Stakeholder Panels

8.1 Two stakeholder panels were used the day before the formal interviews.

- (i) Internal Stakeholder Panel The composition of the internal stakeholder forum included a mix of representatives of workforce representatives.
- (ii) External Stakeholder Panel The composition of the external stakeholder forum included a mix of representatives from partner agencies from across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.

8.2 A common set of questions was put to each candidate, to ensure consistency and fairness. The two stakeholder forums were supported by an independent facilitator and a chair was selected from within each group by its members. Each stakeholder forum spent 45 minutes with each candidate, with timing spread equally between the question areas. Feedback was captured by the independent facilitator and reported to the Appointment Panel the following day, including to inform areas which might need further exploration by the Appointment Panel. This was further evidence of how the process sought to be fair to all.

8.3 Questions asked by stakeholders were well considered, appropriately challenging and probing. The feedback comments collated afterwards were balanced and insightful. The sessions were well chaired and managed, with good time management, again to ensure consistency and fairness.

8.4 It was agreed in advance that the opinions of the two stakeholder forums would not be scored or totalled numerically in such a way as to rank candidates, this was because members were not measuring responses linked to the competency areas. They were to be advisory only to ensure that all final assessments and decisions were merit based. The observing panel's comments were fed back to the final Appointment Panel.

9. Assessment design

9.1 The interview questions produced by the PCC in liaison with Hampshire Police Recruitment were of good quality in that they were open questions, allowed opportunities to probe, and were linked to the Competency and Values Framework and to local priorities.

9.2 The choice of interview questions were based on demonstration of evidence against the Competency and Values Framework for policing, with a focus that spanned all 6 competency areas and 4 core values. Panel members were asked to rate candidates on a four-point scale against each competency. This was designed to give transparent evidence of a fair and equal process for all candidates.

9.3 The timetable for the semi-structured stakeholder panels and final interview allowed adequate time for each element spread over two days. The carefully planned timetable helped to ensure that the process would be objective, fair to all shortlisted candidates, and clearly based on merit.

10. Assessment decision making

10.1 Each panel member first scored separately at the interview stage. Scores were collated and any differences of opinion were discussed, in order to agree a moderated consensus view. This enabled the candidates to be carefully assessed on merit, with reference to evidence throughout. Consensus was reached throughout after objective, evidence-based discussion, leading to a jointly agreed recommendation regarding the preferred candidate, Mr Scott Chilton. The successful candidate achieved high scores on all the selected areas of the Competency and Value Framework and was considered to be the best fit with local priorities.

10.2 Overall consensus scores were reviewed by the Chief Executive including verification with the PCC.

10.3 The Police and Crime Commissioner undertook the delivery of the final decision to candidates and to co-ordinate feedback as required to the unsuccessful applicant.

11. Conclusions

11.1 Through the steps outlined above, the Police and Crime Commissioner fulfilled her responsibility to ensure the selection process was properly put in place in accordance with the responsibilities set out in the national guidance. Well planned use of the Competency and Values Framework throughout the process allowed clear evidence to be recorded and evaluated in order to make objective decisions. The panel rigorously challenged and tested the candidates against the necessary requirements for the role, giving assurance that the recommended appointment was appropriate. There was also carefully considered discussion between panel members before coming to a conclusion.

11.2 As the Independent Member I found that the process was demonstrably open and fair, with good efforts applied to seek the best available field of candidates. It was clearly based on merit, with decisions taken on careful analysis of evidence. Adherence to the highest standards throughout was taken seriously.

11.3 I can also confirm that the representative from the College of Policing acknowledged the validity of the recruitment and selection processes that were put in place by the Chief Executive of the OPCC.

11.4 Therefore as the Independent Member I can confirm that the selection of the preferred candidate to be Chief Constable of Hampshire & Isle of Wight Constabulary met the principles of fairness, openness and merit.

Brian Johnson (UK Business Development Director, BAE Systems Naval Ships (Portsmouth) and Chair of the Solent Freeport Consortium)

Dated – 9th November 2022