

JUNE 2017

**Chief Executive
Hampshire Police and Crime Commissioner
Appointment Process**

Independent Member Report
Carolyn Dhanraj MBE JP

1. Introduction

1.1 This report provides information on the appointment process for the role of Chief Executive for Hampshire's Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner:

- how the process met the principles of merit, fairness and openness and
- the extent to which the Interview Panel were able to fulfil their purpose, to challenge and test the candidates against the stated criteria.

1.2 Home Office Circular 20/2012 outlines that it is for the Police and Crime Commissioner to decide how they wish to run their appointment process and which candidate they wish to appoint as Chief Constable. However, they should involve an Independent Member as soon as practicable in the process: job specification, shortlisting and interviewing of candidates.

1.3 There is currently no such guidance for the appointment of a Chief Executive to the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner, and as such, there is no requirement to include an Independent Member in the process. The Police and Crime Commissioner chose to add this additional level of scrutiny, to demonstrate his openness to ensure there was a fair and robust appointment.

1.4 This report is the Independent Member's Report (Carolyn Dhanraj), relating to the appointment process for the role of Chief Executive, which was the responsibility of the Police and Crime Commissioner Michael Lane and refers in most part to the above guidance.

2. Aim

2.1 The aim of this report is to provide an assessment of the extent to which the appointment process has been conducted fairly, openly and based on merit. It will also comment on the extent to which the Interview Panel fulfilled their responsibility to challenge and test the candidates' suitability against the requirements of the Chief Executive role.

3. Independent Member Role

3.1 For information, the role of the Independent Member is laid out in Home Office Circular 20/2012. It is described more fully within the College of Policing's 'Guidance for the Appointment of Chief Officers'. This Guidance was produced in November 2012 and is maintained by the College of Policing in consultation with a wide range of stakeholder groups within policing including Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, Association of Police and Crime Commissioners, Association of Policing and Crime Commissioners Chief Executives, Senior Police Officers Association, Police Superintendents Association and the Home Office. This was produced under the direction of the Police Advisory Board England and Wales Sub-group on Chief Officer Appointments.

3.2 I am currently an Independent Member from the list provided by the College of Policing. In order to become a member of this list I was required to undergo a fair, open and merit-based selection process. This process focussed on my suitability as someone skilled in assessment, capable of quality assuring assessment processes; I also had an induction to this role from the College of Policing and I am continually quality assured in my delivery of services as an Independent Member of Chief Officer Appointments Processes. Further details of my background are set out in the role profile in Appendix One.

4. Independent Member initial involvement in the Chief Executive Appointment process

4.1 I was invited to join the process by the College of Policing to seek my participation on 8th June 2017. I contacted Jo Brown (Hants Council) on the 9th June introduce myself and to see what was expected along with any indicative timescales. I was advised that she was going to visit the PCC that afternoon to deliver the applications forms that been received that day, and she advised that she would inform the PCC that I had made contact and suggested I would be contacted that afternoon.

4.2 I was contacted by email on Monday 12th June by Richard Andrews, Acting Head of Governance and Policy from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire and we spoke on Wednesday 14th June. I was impressed that Mr Andrews was open to my advice about the remaining part of the process, this demonstrated an openness and transparency to the process.

5. Interview panel

5.1 The Interview Panel role is set out in the Guidance on Chief Officer Appointments (4.2.2 of the guidance). This outlines that the Interview Panel should be convened by the Police and Crime Commissioner, before any stage of the appointment process takes place and that consideration may be given to having Interview Panel members involved in helping to define the requirements of the role.

5.2 In addition, it states the purpose of the Interview Panel is to challenge and test that the candidate meets the necessary requirements to perform the role and that the Police and Crime Commissioner should select an Interview Panel capable of discharging this responsibility.

5.3 The Police and Crime Commissioner should ensure that Interview Panel members are diverse and suitably experienced and competent in selection practices and that they adhere to the principles of merit, fairness and openness (Principles of Appointment Section 3). It is also the Police and Crime Commissioner's responsibility to ensure that appropriate briefing/assessor training is undertaken by all Interview Panel members. It is suggested that an Interview Panel of approximately five members is convened but this is at the discretion of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

5.4 The Interview Panel appointed by the Police and Crime Commissioner were selected to provide an expertise and experience to test potential candidates at an executive level.

5.5 There were four Interview Panel members comprising of two male and two female members; two white men, one white woman and one minority ethnic women, who was also the Independent Member.

5.6 INTERVIEW PANEL:

- Michael Lane, Hampshire Police and Crime Commissioner;
- Roger Hirst, Essex Police and Crime Commissioner;
- Jenny Lewis, Head of HR and Workforce Planning, Hampshire Shared Service Partnership
- Carolyn Dhanraj, Independent Member (College of Policing).

6. Role profile and attraction strategy

6.1 The advertisement was placed on the Police and Crime Commissioner's website, the Hampshire Chronicle and The Guardian newspaper; this approach demonstrated an openness to enable a range of candidates to apply for the post.

6.2 The post was advertised from 18 May – 9 June 2017 inclusive which was three weeks; the Home Office Circular and the College of Policing guidance point 5.3.3 states that 'the vacancy must be advertised for at least three weeks and must be advertised through a public website or some other form of publication that deals with policing matters'.

6.3 I am fully satisfied that the Police and Crime Commissioner advertised the vacancy openly (Guidance 3.4.1) to attract the best possible candidate pool.

7. Shortlisting and Panel briefing

7.1 By the closing date, twenty application forms had been received for the role of Chief Executive.

7.2 I was not invited to participate in the shortlisting meeting, however I am advised it took place on Monday 12 June, by two of the four members of the Panel (Mr Lane and Ms Lewis). The guidance indicates that all members of the Panel should be involved in the shortlisting process.

7.3 I was advised in my conversation with Mr Andrews, that four candidates had been shortlisted and that one candidate was an internal applicant; I emphasised that the short listing process and any further assessment should be based on the evidence provided in the application and not on previous knowledge. This is to ensure fairness (Guidance 3.3.1) and transparency throughout all stages of the assessment.

7.4 I was emailed on 17th June 2017, the following documentation for the Chief Executive role:

- Advertisement;
- Role profile;
- Panel timetable
- Scenario for the assessment day and
- Four shortlisted candidate's CV and supporting statements

7.5 I raised with Mr Andrews by email, on the 17th June that I was concerned that the application for the Chief Executive was based on a C.V. and supporting statement only, and requested what criteria and rating scale the two panel members used to short list. I also suggested that the time allocated to each candidate interview was not sufficient, this was lengthened following my advice which demonstrated an openness.

7.6 A shortlisting grid populated with the essential and desirable criteria, against which each of the twenty applications were assessed against was provided. I am satisfied that this aspect was conducted in a fair and merit based manner.

7.7 The Panel were advised on the 21st June that one shortlisted candidate had withdrawn from the process; this left three candidates to assess for the Chief Executive role.

8. Assessment design

8.1 I discussed with Mr Andrews the merits of assessment through methods such as interview, presentation, in-tray exercise and stakeholder panels. The PCC agreed a process of:

- a presentation, where the topic was provided on the day with limited time to prepare, and
- a competency based interview.

9 Assessment delivery and Panel briefing

9.1 On Thursday 23rd June, the full Interview panel met to review the OPQ personality profiles and confirm the questions and the remaining process. I invited Michael Lane (PCC) to advise the Interview Panel what he was looking for in the new Chief Executive and the challenges facing Hampshire and the OPCC.

9.2 I also checked whether there was any friendship, family or other connections that would indicate a potential bias. I am satisfied this aspect of the process was fair, having re-affirmed that this process was based on the evidence provided in the application/supporting statement.

Appendix B

9.3 The Interview Panel were briefed on the documentation contained in each Interview Panel member's folder, which outlined the competencies being tested. The Interview Panel was chaired by the PCC and the questions were evenly asked by the Interview Panel members. The ORCE (observe, record, classify, evaluate) approach to assessing was reinforced to ensure the Panel gathered evidence and a further confirmation of what each scale descriptor represented in terms of evidence observed and the resultant score between 1-5, once again this was beneficial as it ensured that we assessed the candidate in a fair, merit based and transparent manner.

9.4 The candidate followed the process of:

20 minutes	Presentation preparation
1 hour	Presentation delivery and interview, with flexibility to probe

10.0 Assessment Decision Making

10.1 Each Interview Panel member's folder enabled the Interview Panel to record and mark the presentation and the interview questions independently.

10.2 To reinforce the open and transparent process, I asked Mr Andrews to draw up an overall grid with the candidate's name, presentation and interview competency areas and we openly populated the grid with the Panel's individual scores for each of the three candidates. One candidate scored 77.9% of the maximum score possible, with the second scoring less and the third substantially less than that score.

10.3 The Interview Panel unanimously supported Michael Lane (PCC) in his recommendation to the Police and Crime Panel (PCP) that James Payne, currently the Interim Chief Executive, be the preferred candidate for Chief Executive for Hampshire Office for the Police and Crime Commissioner

10.4 I am confident that the Interview Panel appointed, performed their duty on Friday 23rd June 2017 to challenge and assess the candidates in manner that was fair, transparent and merit based, following the best practice recruitment principles such as those articulated in the College of Policing Guidance.

Carolyn Dhanraj MBE JP BPS
College of Policing Independent Member

APPENDIX A
COLLEGE OF POLICING – INDEPENDENT MEMBER

CAROLYN DHANRAJ MBE JP BPS

Carolyn brings a breadth of experience, skills and enthusiasm to make a successful contribution in delivering transparent, fair and robust recruitment processes. She has won and managed several successful Executive Search and Selection recruitment campaigns and Assessment Centres for the appointment of central and local Government roles with OCPA and central government/sponsor department scrutiny. She is British Psychological Society (BPS) qualified and has worked in the private sector, specialising as a Client Partner for Government and Public Services (headhunter), designing and running Assessment Centres and personality testing for senior civil servants. Key clients have included the Home Office, Parole Board, Metropolitan Police Authority, ECHR Commission for Equality and Human Rights, Cabinet Office, Ministry of Justice.

Carolyn has eight years experience as a College of Policing Non Service Member, assessing for Senior Police National Assessment Centre (SPNAC), High Potential Development Scheme (HPDS), the Met Police Graduate Entry process and Direct Entry for Inspectors and Superintendants. She has acted as an College of Policing Independent Member for over ten Chief Constables and Deputy and Assistant Chief Constables appointments.

Carolyn has also had a varied career within Local Government as a senior local government officer, focusing on establishing and embedding a range of effective Multi Agency Partnerships (Community Safety, Voluntary Sector & Diversity portfolio), with an expertise and skill in engaging with a range of stakeholders and community groups. She has a notable and substantial history of volunteering, including being the first Chair of Metropolitan Police Service Independent Advisory Group (IAG) on Rape and Sexual Assault – leading to the establishment of Project Sapphire and The Havens (SARCs); Member of the Stephen Lawrence Sub Group – Stop and Search, as Trustee of a National Domestic Violence charity and as a Magistrate.

Carolyn will offer you credible advice and guidance, she will support you in a practical way which will ensure the delivery of a bespoke recruitment campaign, reviewing with you the job description and personnel specification, discussing the best attraction strategy; she will train and guide the appointments panel members throughout the process, ensuring they are aware of their responsibilities to allow the recruitment process to be managed in an accountable, fair and transparent manner. Her firm but fair style of engagement is built on an ethos of openness, transparency and most importantly integrity and accountability.