



College of
Policing

college.police.uk

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot

Final report of the evaluation findings

Sarah Colover

Austra Jenner-Parson

Jenny Kodz

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

© College of Policing Limited (2016)

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Non-Commercial College Licence v1.1 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence visit http://www.college.police.uk/Legal/Documents/Non_Commercial_College_Licence.pdf

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

For enquires about this document, or to request an alternative format, please email the College Research inbox (research@college.pnn.police.uk).

Executive summary

During 2015, the College of Policing piloted and evaluated competence assessments for police constables (PCs) in seven police forces as part of a College-led programme known as Defining and Assessing Competence (DAC). Three assessments for PCs were piloted:

- foundation for those approaching the fourth point in the pay scale
- advanced for those approaching the seventh pay point
- reconfirmation of competence for longer serving officers.

The pilot evaluation involved surveys and interviews with assessment participants and supervisors to explore their perceptions about the appropriateness, fairness, implementation and impact of the assessments¹. The findings were used to inform the national roll-out of the assessments.

Summary of findings

Perceptions about appropriateness of the assessments

There is consistent evidence that the pilot foundation was perceived to be relevant and reflected the required level of competence for the target group. There was consistent evidence that the advance and re-confirmation of competence assessments were perceived to be less appropriate.

- Officers eligible for the foundation assessment generally felt the assessment criteria reflected their role, although some thought they were too similar to those for the Diploma in Policing². There were concerns about the appropriateness of some elements of the advanced and reconfirmation assessments. In particular, difficulties in meeting the criteria for officers in specialist or split roles were identified.

Fairness and consistency of the assessments

There was mixed evidence on the perceived fairness and consistency of the assessment models. This perception on consistency is supported by the very limited independent assessment undertaken.

- Overall, 84 per cent of officers, where the result was known (407 out of 485), were assessed as meeting the standard for their DAC assessment.
- The main reasons for assesseees not meeting the standard were that the required competencies were not part of their core role, or they were on restricted duties, sickness or maternity leave. Insufficient assessment evidence was the reason given for only 12 officers (out of 78).
- Qualitative evidence suggests there may have been a lack of consistency between assessors' approaches to the assessments and variation in the nature of the supporting evidence used.

continued...

¹ The evaluation sought to gather evidence against evaluation statements relating to the fairness, appropriateness, implementation and impact of the assessments. However, low survey response rates and low numbers of participants reporting an assessment result, alongside missing information on demographics, have limited the strength of the findings and mean that they need to be considered as indicative only.

² Qualification awarded following successful completion of Initial Police Learning and Development Programme.

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

- Most supervisor respondents felt they conducted the assessments fairly, but some felt they would be less confident if the assessments were linked to pay.
- Prior to the assessments almost half of assessees suggested they were not confident about the fairness of the assessment (122 out of 285 respondents). Post-assessment, the majority of assessees with an assessment result were satisfied that their own assessment had been fair (63 out of 68 respondents).

Impact of the assessments

Within the pilot period, across the pilot forces the evidence suggest that undergoing a competence assessment was perceived to have very limited impact on PCs' perceptions about the support they receive from their supervisor for their professional development and on their attitudes and behaviours relating to professional development.

- There seemed to be a connection between assessee's views of the time DAC would take and how the results would be used, with the potential for the process to seem burdensome.
- After completion of the assessments, very few assessee respondents thought the DAC process provided positive impacts such as more support from their supervisor, more one to one meetings or more professional development.

Implementation requirements

- Participants lacked understanding about the purpose and value of the assessments. The majority of assessees received information about the assessments by email, but satisfaction with these communications was low.
- Approximately 40 per cent of assessees reported changing supervisor during the pilot which may have affected the supervisor's familiarity with their work.

- Participants felt that standardisation in conducting assessments should be built into the process to ensure consistency within and between forces.
- Participants perceived that implementing DAC in its current format had considerable resource implications for both the College of Policing and forces.
- For all assessment types, pilot participants suggested reducing the number of criteria, providing clearer definitions of the criteria and removing ambiguities.

Suggestions to ensure an effectively implemented, consistent and fair competence assessment process that minimises impact on the business include:

- Minimal **number of criteria**, with **clear definitions** and no ambiguities.
- **Buy-in and clarity about the purpose and value of the assessments** among all those involved in the process.
- Effective **communication and guidance**. Relying on communications through email is insufficient and more innovative methods should be explored such as videos, web tutorials and online forms. Guidance should set out how to present evidence for competence assessments and clarify the type and amount of evidence required to meet the assessment standard.
- More formal **assessor training**. Receipt of a formal assessor qualification may have provided an incentive to participate in the DAC pilot.
- Consideration of how to overcome difficulties in meeting the assessment criteria reported by officers in **specialist or split roles**.
- Competence assessments should **complement and not duplicate existing PDR** processes.
- **Ongoing monitoring** and review of the roll-out of assessments to ensure they are being implemented appropriately.

Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	3
Acknowledgements	6
1. Introduction	7
2. Evaluation methods	10
3. Findings	13
4. Learning points that can be drawn	28
Appendices	29
Appendix A.1 Police Professional Framework	33
Appendix A.2 Police constable foundation threshold (Diploma in Policing units)	35
Appendix A.3 Police constable advanced threshold criteria	36
Appendix A.4 Assessment event – recording sheet	37
Appendix A.5 Pilot participants	38
Appendix A.6 Evaluation specification	39
Appendix A.7 Evaluation statements	40
Appendix A.8 Research methods	45
Appendix A.9 Findings	49
References	57

Acknowledgements

This study would not have been possible without the advice and support of a wide range of people. The authors would particularly like to thank the following for their invaluable contributions:

- The seven force SPOCs (single points of contact) for supporting the evaluation, including sending out surveys and taking part in interviews and workshops.
- The police officers in the seven pilot forces who took part in the pilot and gave their time to participate in the evaluation surveys and interviews.
- All the members of the College team involved in the development and implementation of the DAC pilot.
- Members of the College Knowledge Research and Practice Team: Sadie Lynch, Rory McKenna, Kristi Beak, Shayan Moftizadeh and Anda Bayliss for supporting the survey and interview design and analysis. Nerys Thomas and Levin Wheller for reviewing research materials and draft reports.
- TNS BMRB for their work on the interviews with officers and SPOCs.
- The two independent peer reviewers for their advice and comments on the evaluation report.
- The members of the academic advisory panel for their guidance and support.

1

Introduction

The College of Policing (the College) has developed and piloted competence assessments for police officers in the police constable (PC) rank, as part of a College-led programme known as Defining and Assessing Competence (DAC)³. The aim of the assessments is to provide a fair and equitable mechanism for an officer to demonstrate how they have enhanced their professionalism and skills.

Three assessments were devised for PCs:

- foundation for PCs approaching eligibility for the fourth pay point in the pay scale
- advanced for those approaching the seventh pay point
- reconfirmation of competence for longer serving officers.

During 2015, these three assessments were piloted in seven police forces and evaluated by the College of Policing. The evaluation sought to examine the extent to which the overall aim of DAC had been achieved at the pilot stage and to inform a decision about national roll-out of the assessments. This report is the final output from the evaluation and presents the findings from all the elements of the research and lessons learnt from the pilot for the national launch of the assessments (now renamed as Assessment and Recognition of Competence (ARC)).

1.1 The assessments

Key elements of the assessments were as follows:

- foundation and reconfirmation of competence – assessment against the 10 units of the Diploma in Policing
- advanced – assessment against 16 personal qualities. These personal qualities were defined for the DAC pilot in order to reflect an officer's standard of work and behaviour beyond that associated with a competent PC.

All three assessments also required officers to demonstrate evidence of:

- core learning – any required core learning linked to their role
- the Police Professional Framework (PPF) behavioural competencies for a PC
- self-directed CPD.

³ The recommendation for the introduction of police assessments originated from Winsor 2012. The Winsor recommendation proposed that the assessments would be linked to progression through the police constable pay scale. The Home Office, through the Police Negotiating Board (PNB), commissioned the College of Policing to develop an assessment model to address these Winsor recommendations (95–99). The College set up a Defining and Assessing Competence project to design and develop the assessments and established a project board in spring 2013 which included key representatives from the PNB.

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

Details of the PPF, diploma units and advanced personal qualities are provided in Appendices A.1 to A.3. Further information about the assessment process and the assessment criteria were published on the College website⁴. Officers were required to fill in an evidence recording sheet to demonstrate evidence against the assessment criteria. An example sheet was developed by the College which had space to give a description of the event and how they met the criteria units, as well as where the relevant evidence for the example is stored (see Appendix A.4). Supervisors were required to make a holistic assessment decision of whether the officer was deemed competent against the foundation or advanced threshold assessments.

1.2 The pilot

The three assessments were piloted in eight⁵ forces across England and Wales during 2015. An attempt was made to ensure that the participating forces included those that differed in size and in terms of their existing PDRs/appraisal processes. The participating forces included the Metropolitan Police Service, Thames

Valley Police, Greater Manchester Police, Cheshire Police, Sussex Police and Gloucestershire Police. Some further details about the pilot participants are provided in Appendix A.5. The piloting of these assessments ran from January to December 2015 and involved over 1,000 PCs and their supervisors. Each force appointed a single point of contact (SPOC) responsible for the implementation of the pilot in their force and liaison with the College of Policing.

It should be noted that in order to complete the pilot within the 12 months allocated, the forces could not replicate the proposed assessment model exactly. Key differences were that assesses in the pilot had a shorter period over which to complete mandatory learning and role-specific CPD, and prepare and gather the necessary evidence for the assessments (six months in the pilot compared to one year in the proposed model). Furthermore, during the pilot

period, the assessments were not linked with progression through the police constable pay scale as proposed in the Winsor recommendations⁶ for the live model.

Pilot monitoring data

In order to participate in the pilot, all PCs and their supervisors were asked to complete a College of Policing registration form that asked for personal information relating to the nine protected characteristics⁷, their force, role and length of service. The number of PCs who had registered as participants for the pilot are shown in Table 1 and more detail is provided in Appendix A.5. It should be noted that not all officers who participated in the pilot completed a registration form. At the end of the assessment process, the College of Policing also gathered data from forces on officers' assessment results and this was matched with registration details where possible.

Table 1: Number of registered DAC pilot participants by gender, as at October 2015

Gender	PCs	Assessors/supervisors
Female	309	79
Male	706	353
Not given	53	27
Total (n=)	1068*	459**

* 174 of the PCs were allocated to a control group and did not participate in the DAC assessment process.

** 59 of the assessors were also allocated to a control group and did not participate in the DAC assessment process.

⁴ College of Policing 2014 <http://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Development/Documents/DAC%20Pilot%20Overview%20Docv1.2.pdf>

⁵ One of the police forces participated in the pilot but not the evaluation.

⁶ Winsor 2012 (<https://www.gov.uk/police-pay-winsor-review>)

⁷ Equality Act 2010 (c.15) The nine protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

1.3 The evaluation of the pilot assessments

The pilot was evaluated by the College with the support of an external contractor and an independent evaluation advisory panel (see Appendix A.6).

The overall aim of the evaluation was to provide evidence to underpin three evaluation statements agreed with the programme board to inform decisions about national roll-out of the assessments. The statements were:

1. There is consistent evidence that the assessment model implemented in the pilot forces is/is not perceived to be fair, consistent, relevant and reflect the required level of competence for the target group. This perception is supported/not supported by evidence from independent assessors. Where there are variations in the evidence there are / are not reasonable explanations for the differences.
2. To ensure an effectively implemented, consistent and fair competence assessment process that minimises impact on the business (eg, in terms of resource costs), the model needs to be implemented with the following requirements in place: ...X, Y and Z (to be determined by the evaluation).

3. Within the pilot period, in X participating pilot force, the evidence suggests that undergoing a competence assessment had no /a positive/a negative impact on PCs' perceptions about their own professionalism and skills and the support they have received from their supervisor for their professional development, on their attitudes and behaviours relating to professional development and on supervisors' perceptions of assessee's professionalism and skills.

For each evaluation statement a series of indicators was devised against which evidence was gathered (see Appendix A.7). The detailed indicators and proposed evaluation methods were agreed by the DAC programme board and the evaluation advisory panel.

1.4 Reporting

Two interim evaluation reports were produced at the pre- and post-assessment stages and presented to the programme board, so that decisions about roll-out could be informed by the evaluation findings at the earliest point possible. This report is the final evaluation report, which brings together findings from both stages of the evaluation and other data gathered as part of the pilot and the evaluation. The presentation of the findings in the report has been structured as closely as possible around the three evaluation statements above in order to demonstrate the extent to which the data gathered has evidenced these statements. Prior to the presentation of the evaluation findings, the following section provides details about the research methods and the limitations of the evaluation.

2

Evaluation methods

In order to provide evidence against the three evaluation statements set out above, a range of data collection methods was used in addition to the gathering of monitoring data described in section 1.2 above. The sections below provide an outline of each of the methods. Further details of the elements of the evaluation are given in Appendix A.8, including a table setting out the evaluation statement that each method aimed to inform. Each data collection method had its own limitations, and three could not be completed to the extent that was set out in the original evaluation project specification.

2.1 Online survey of perceptions of the assessment process

Online questionnaires were designed to measure perceptions of the assessment process including views on fairness. Questionnaires were sent to pilot participants, both those being assessed and supervisors conducting the assessments, at two stages in the pilot: pre- and post-assessment. Respondents were asked to provide a unique reference number when they registered for the pilot and then to also provide this number in their survey response so that biographical details could be matched.

The surveys were limited by low response rates which may have been as a result of a lack of

engagement with the pilot among some participants from the point of registration to completing the post-assessment survey. This issue is discussed in more detail in section 2.5, Limitations of the evaluation methods.

- The pre-assessment survey was sent in June 2015⁸, 359 PCs responded compared with 894 registered DAC assessees. The number of supervisor respondents was 158, which compares with 400 registered supervisors who were acting as pilot DAC assessors.
- The post-assessment survey was sent in October 2015⁹, 135 PCs (compared with 894 registered) and 62 supervisors (compared with 400 registered) responded.

Table 2: Respondents to online survey of perceptions of the assessment process

Assessment stage:	No. of assessee survey respondents	No. of supervisor survey respondents	Evaluation statements covered
Pre-assessment June–July 2015	359	158	Statements 1 and 2
Post-assessment October–December 2015	135	62	Statements 1 and 2

⁸ The pre-assessment online survey was live and open to responses between 1 June and 16 July

⁹ The post-assessment online survey was live and open to responses between 16 October and 21 December

Table 3: Participants of in-depth interviews by assessment stage, participant type and evaluation statement

Assessment stage:	Number of assessee interviews	No. of DAC SPOC/HR/training professionals interviews	Number of supervisor interviews	Evaluation statements covered
Pre-assessment June 2015	25	7	15	Statements 1 and 2
Post-assessment October 2015	19	8	16	Statements 1 and 2

2.2 In-depth interviews

In-depth interviews (face-to-face and telephone) were conducted by an external contractor with force DAC SPOCs/HR/training professionals, assessees and their supervisors. The purpose of the interviews was to explore in-depth views relating to evaluation statements 1 and 2. At the pre-assessment stage, 47 interviews were conducted during June 2015. At the post-assessment stage, 43 interviews were carried out from October to November 2015 (see Table 3).

2.3 Review of assessment evidence

A number of visits were conducted within pilot forces to observe their internal verification (IV) process for the DAC assessments. The evaluation team also met with pilot forces to discuss what they did in terms of IV for the assessments and information was collected from the remaining forces on their decision whether to run an internal verification process and the reasons behind it.

Six members of the DAC project team formed an internal panel and reviewed a small sample of completed assessment recording sheets from across the pilot forces. A workshop was held to share findings and review the assessments in order to consider what good written assessment evidence looked like.

2.4 Baseline survey

A baseline survey of PCs eligible for the DAC assessments was conducted prior to the start of the DAC assessment processes in four of the pilot forces. The intention was to repeat the survey after the end of the assessment process. The purpose of the survey was to gather data on the possible impact and benefits of the assessments in relation to attitudes and behaviours towards professional development. The baseline sample comprised PCs who were participating in DAC and a comparable group of PCs who were not. It also included some officers who had not registered for the pilot. This resulted in a larger sample size for this survey than the perceptions surveys which only included PCs going through the assessment process. The PCs were randomised in order to divide them into two equal-sized groups: a control group who did not participate in the assessments and a group who did go through the assessment process.

The topics covered in the baseline survey were informed by the third evaluation statement and covered questions relating to:

- participation in CPD over the previous year
- attitudes towards CPD
- support received from their supervisor and force for their professional development.

The survey had a low response rate (320 out of 1,454 PCs, 22% responded) and, as discussed below, the second stage of the survey was not completed.

2.5 Limitations of the evaluation methods

There was a general lack of engagement with the pilot across all forces, both with assessees and supervisors. This had an impact on the pilot evaluation in a number of ways which are discussed below and in more detail in Appendix A.8.

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

Limited biographical information for DAC pilot participants – The initial communication from the College to participants about registering for the pilot was unclear to some PCs and supervisors; this led to confusion over whether or not participation in the pilot was compulsory. This may have had a knock-on effect on the proportion of PCs who registered, as well as resulting in a lack of provision of biographical details from those participants who did register.

Low survey response rates – All three surveys (pre- and post-assessment and baseline) had low response rates. The willingness of participants to engage with the surveys should be understood in the context in which the DAC assessments were introduced. Concerns about continued pay and promotion freezes as well as apprehension around DAC being linked to pay could have had a negative impact on the level of engagement with the surveys. These issues are discussed in more detail in section 3.1.

Limited assessment result information – There was no assessment result information provided for a high number of PCs, which suggests that a high number of participants did not fully complete the DAC assessment. It was also not possible to conduct a robust independent review of assessment evidence to measure consistency of assessment decisions across forces.

Lack of accurate estimates of time spent on DAC – Although an attempt was made to gather records of time spent on DAC from some pilot participants, response rates to this exercise were low. Therefore, estimates of time spent on the DAC process can be based only on responses to the questionnaires and these estimates are likely to be inaccurate¹⁰.

No follow-up survey on impact of DAC – The follow-up to the baseline survey to measure the impact of DAC on attitudes and behaviours towards DAC was not conducted due to low response rates to other surveys. Findings from the other DAC surveys also suggested that the assessments were unlikely to have led to these types of outcomes during the pilot period.

¹⁰ McLean and Hillier 2011

3

Findings

Evaluation findings are set out in the following sections. The sections have been structured as far as possible around the three statements against which the evaluation aimed to gather evidence (see section 1.3).

Sections 3.1 to 3.3 present findings relevant to the first evaluation statement and focus on views about the appropriateness and relevance of the DAC assessments (section 3.1), assessment results (3.2) and perceptions about the fairness of the assessments (3.3).

Section 3.4 addresses the second evaluation statement: force readiness for the introduction of the assessments and factors that may have influenced the effectiveness of the assessment implementation. Section 3.5 sets out findings on the impact of the assessments, which the third evaluation statement is concerned with. Finally, learning points from the pilot evaluation are presented in section 4.

Key tables and responses to survey questions are presented in the following sections of the report with additional tables in Appendix A.9.

3.1 Views about the DAC assessments

Part of the first statement that the evaluation set out to inform was whether the assessments were perceived to be ‘consistent, relevant and reflect the required level of competence for the target group’. Before exploring the findings on views about the assessments, it is important

to understand the context in which DAC was introduced in the pilot forces and also the pilot participants’ understanding of the purpose of the assessment process.

Views about the DAC assessments need to be looked at in the context of the challenges that the police service was going through at the time and the climate that this created among officers. Officers interviewed for the DAC pilot raised concerns around continued pay and promotion freezes in the service, uncertainty around job security and force budget cuts. Interview responses also suggested that pilot participants had concerns about the potential link between DAC and pay as set out in the original proposals in the Winsor¹¹ review, as well as about pay freezes and job cuts within the police service. These apprehensions may well have worked against pilot participants perceiving any potential benefits of DAC and possibly contributed to a negative reaction to the pilot.

As mentioned in the introduction, the data collection was split into two stages – the first stage was prior to the assessments taking place and the second stage was after the assessments had been completed.

¹¹ Winsor 2012 (<https://www.gov.uk/police-pay-winsor-review>)

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

There were low levels of engagement in the pilot at all stages from officers and supervisors, as reflected in the low take-up rate for pilot registration, poor response rates for both pre- and post-assessment surveys and limited assessment results returned from all forces. This affected the pilot participants' awareness of the assessments and the extent of their knowledge on DAC more broadly. This lack of engagement could also have had an impact on officers' and supervisors' views on the DAC assessments and could explain why views collected at the pre- and post-assessment stage had often not changed. Findings relating to how DAC was introduced in forces and engagement with the process provide further context to these concerns and are covered in section 3.4 of this report. The following sections set out some findings that provide an indication of the level of understanding among pilot participants about the assessments, before going on to consider their views of the assessments in section 3.1.2.

3.1.1 Understanding of the DAC process

Understanding of the purpose of the assessments

The interview findings provide an indication of some pilot participants' understanding or concerns about the purpose of the DAC assessments. Some interviewees perceived that the purpose of DAC was to identify underperforming PCs, and some others questioned why it needed to involve everyone, rather than just underperforming officers. The association with the Winsor review

and the link to pay remained an underlying issue throughout the pilot, and, for many, this led to negative perceptions of DAC from the outset.

'[...] morale is quite low because of all the changes in the pay conditions and pensions... this is another thing on top of that with the primary aim it's saving money'.

[DAC supervisor]

Understanding about the assessment criteria

The survey findings at the pre-assessment stage provide an indication of the level of understanding about the assessment criteria.

- Specifically among officers participating in the foundation assessment, over half of respondents (72 out of 124, 58%) stated that they were unclear at the pre-assessment stage in their understanding of 'how the police diploma units will be reaffirmed'.
- In the advanced assessment, half of respondents (27 out of 53, 51%) said they were unclear about 'the PPF personal qualities being assessed'. A quarter of respondents (13 out of 53, 25%) said they were clear about the '16 advanced threshold personal qualities'.
- In the reconfirmation assessment, over half of respondents (21 out of 35, 60%) were unclear in their understanding of 'how the police diploma units will be reaffirmed'.

Understanding about the three DAC assessments

A further issue was that some respondents, even at the post-assessment stage, did not know which of the DAC assessments they were being assessed against. The post-assessment survey findings suggest that one fifth of assesseees (30 out of 135, 22%) who responded to the survey did not know which assessment they were participating in. This limited understanding about the assessments may well have had an impact on views about the appropriateness of the level and content of the DAC assessments. The proceeding sections set out the evaluation findings on the pilot participants' views of the assessments which should be interpreted in the light of these findings about their understanding about the assessments.

3.1.2 Views about the level of the assessments

The majority of assesseees at both the pre- and post-assessment stage thought that the level of the assessment was 'about right'. At the pre-assessment stage, the level of assessment was thought to be 'about right' by 70 per cent of assesseees who responded to the survey (203 out of 288). After the assessment, 77 out of 135 (57%) assessee survey respondents were of this view. This was reflected across all assessment types. Most supervisors at both stages in the pilot also agreed that the level of competence the assessment was measuring was 'about right' (31 out of 54, 57%, at the post-assessment stage).

Table 4: Assessee's views of the appropriateness of the elements of DAC (pre-assessment perceptions survey)

To what extent do you feel each of the elements of the DAC assessment process are appropriate for your role?	Core learning requirements No. of question respondents (%)	PPF personal quality framework No. of question respondents (%)	Role-specific CPD No. of question respondents (%)	Reaffirming the Diploma in Policing units No. of question respondents (%)	16 advanced threshold personal qualities No. of question respondents (%)
	Foundation, reconfirmation and advanced			Foundation and reconfirmation	Advanced
Very appropriate or appropriate	7 (3%)	14 (6%)	14 (5%)	8 (4%)	6 (5%)
Neutral responses	135 (61%)	161 (64%)	163 (62%)	143 (63%)	83 (62%)
Inappropriate/very inappropriate	81 (36%)	78 (31%)	84 (32%)	76 (33%)	44 (33%)
Total (n=) ¹²	223	253	261	227	133

3.1.3 Appropriateness and relevance of assessments

Views on the assessment criteria and the appropriateness of each assessment were less positive compared to views on the level of assessment at both stages of the pilot.

Pre-assessment views

Responses at the pre-assessment stage were quite negative from assessee's on how appropriate they thought the DAC assessment elements were for their role. As shown in Table 4, only a small proportion of respondents answering each question thought that the assessment elements (eg, core learning requirements, PPF personal quality framework, CPD) were appropriate to their role. Many responses were neutral and approximately one third felt each of the elements were inappropriate. The large number of neutral responses to the statements at

the pre-assessment stage could have been due to participants not knowing enough about the assessments at that stage to form a view as to whether they were appropriate or not. It may also reflect the 36 per cent of all respondents (120 out of 337) who answered this question who did not know what assessment they were completing at this stage.

Survey findings suggest that assessee's who had been in the police service a long time and were taking the reconfirmation of competence assessment saw little value in demonstrating competencies they had already shown, especially against foundation level criteria. Although the specific areas of competence being assessed at the reconfirmation stage did not pose any problems in terms of their relevance, officers did express concern about the appropriateness of the DAC assessment itself.

'I don't really understand why I've now got to demonstrate further competency when I've already proven myself... Especially when there is thin resource so having to do this 'extra sort of stuff' feels burdensome and bureaucratic.'

[DAC assessee]

Supervisors were, however, generally more positive at the pre-assessment stage about the relevance of each aspect of the DAC assessment process. The majority of supervisors felt that most of the assessment elements were either appropriate or very appropriate for their officers. But supervisor views were split with regards to 'reaffirming the police

¹² All totals include respondents who did not know which assessment they were completing.

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

diploma units' (foundation and reconfirmation assessment) and '16 advanced threshold personal qualities' (advanced assessment), with similar proportions of supervisors considering these aspects to be appropriate or inappropriate for their officers.

Post-assessment views

Although we may have expected the post-assessment views to be more positive once participants had completed the assessments, similar concerns to those expressed at the pre-assessment stage were raised by the interviewees. Interview findings suggested that a key criticism was that there was a lack of clarity in all three assessments. In particular, there were concerns about some overlap between different criteria, a need for clarity on what the criteria units actually mean, how they can be evidenced and the level of detail required.

The DAC assessment was seen by some of the assesseees who were interviewed at the post-assessment stage as being very subjective and open to interpretation. The survey and interview responses both indicated that assesseees in the advanced and reconfirmation group thought some of the assessment elements were inappropriate for their role, while survey responses about the foundation assessment were more positive.

Assesseees' views (at the post-assessment stage) about the appropriateness of the DAC assessment are looked at in more detail in terms of which assessment they undertook in the next section.

Foundation assessment

Over half of assesseees who responded to the survey thought all the assessment elements at the foundation level were appropriate for assessing their level of competence (as shown in Table 5 but these findings should be interpreted with caution due to small numbers of respondents). Participants' views were more positive at the post-assessment stage, once the officers had been through the assessment process and were perhaps better equipped to judge whether or not the assessment elements were appropriate to their role. It should also be noted, however, that the question did not allow neutral responses at the post-assessment questionnaire.

Table 5: Foundation assesseees' views of the appropriateness of the elements of the foundation DAC assessment (post-assessment perceptions survey)

To what extent do you feel each of the elements of the DAC assessment process are appropriate for your role?	Core learning requirements	PPF personal quality framework	Role-specific CPD	Reaffirming the Diploma in Policing units	16 advanced threshold personal qualities
	No. of question respondents (%)	No. of question respondents (%)			
Very appropriate or appropriate	26 (58%)	26 (59%)	25 (56%)	22 (52%)	23 (51%)
Inappropriate or very inappropriate	14 (31%)	11 (25%)	16 (35%)	14 (33%)	19 (42%)
Don't know	5 (11%)	7 (16%)	4 (9%)	7 (16%)	3 (7%)
Total (n=) ¹³	45	44	45	43	45

¹³ The total includes responses from foundation assesseees only.

This finding was also reflected in the interviews, which found that for a PC undertaking a 'standard' day-to-day policing role, the foundation assessment was felt to generally reflect the nature of their role:

'I thought it was good. Everything that was in it was something that I still do in day-to-day policing. So I definitely felt it met the needs of my current occupation.'

[DAC assessee]

However, some assessee interviewed from the foundation group who felt like they had quite recently passed their probationary period, thought that the DAC duplicated their probation assessment and did not add any further value.

Advanced assessment

The small number of survey respondents at the post-assessment stage has led to difficulties in any more detailed analysis of the findings in relation to the views on the appropriateness of the advanced and reconfirmation assessment. A common theme in the interviews was that the advanced assessment was perceived to be too 'easy' for the level, too generalist, subjective, and having too many assessment criteria (meaning it would be lengthy to complete).

Reconfirmation assessment

Some assessee in the reconfirmation group were temporarily acting up into a higher role and did not feel that the DAC assessment took this into account. Views about the reconfirmation assessment were mixed in the interviews, in terms of how far it was perceived as appropriate for an officer's level given their length of service. Some interviewees felt that their length of service could disadvantage them in the assessments. For example:

'I think it's discriminating on age as well because it goes on about arresting... round the age of 53, I might get to 55, 56 how do they expect me to be tackling 18-year-olds?'

[DAC assessee]

3.1.4 Appropriateness of the assessments for PCs in specialist roles

A key issue which was raised in the pre- and post-assessment stage interviews and by some survey respondents was the applicability of the DAC assessment to those with specialist and split roles (eg, specific specialist roles mentioned included firearms and split roles included those where, in some forces, response officers book suspects in, whereas in others they are handed over to the custody officer).

Assessee interviewed who were in specialist roles indicated that their areas of expertise were niche and suggested that it was unfair that they were expected to answer 'generic' questions (while conceding it would be a difficult task to find questions that would be appropriate for officers of varying specialist roles).

Assessee also indicated that being able to fulfil the criteria would have to be at the expense of their current, specialist duties.

'And it's unrealistic for officers to be expected to be released from their current role...to be released to uniform for a month or a few weeks to fulfil the criteria. It's an unrealistic goal.'

[DAC assessee]

Particular concerns were raised at the pre-assessment stage about how the assessments would work in practice (and be fair) for those in specialist roles, such as firearms, which may not allow them to gather the necessary evidence to meet the assessment requirements.

'We work in very, very different ways. So you're definitely not comparing eggs with eggs.'

[DAC assessee]

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

Interview findings at the post-assessment stage suggested that in some instances, supervisors attempted to get round the issue of relevance by using hypothetical situations and assessing constables on their answer. While this may be a potential solution to completing the DAC assessment, there was difficulty reported in creating hypothetical situations. An example of a view from a supervisor interviewed was:

‘...it would have been probably very difficult to complete it. It would have all been professional conversations and I’m not so sure that that would be appropriate because they haven’t been able to demonstrate anything over the last two years...and you’re certainly going to get that with your covert officers who can’t go and do frontline duties for obvious reasons.’

[DAC supervisor]

3.2 Completion of the assessments and assessment results

Before exploring evaluation findings about the fairness and consistency of the assessments, this section presents findings on the assessment results. It is important to present findings on perceptions of fairness in the context of the assessment results as these perceptions are likely to be influenced by each officer’s own assessment outcome.

3.2.1 Completion of the assessment process

The post-assessment survey findings suggest that although 22 per cent of assessees who responded to the survey (30 out of 135) did not know which assessment they were participating in, most had gathered evidence against the assessment criteria. Where assessees did know (105 out of 135, 78%) which assessment they were participating in:

- the majority who answered the survey participated in the foundation assessment (58 out of 105, 55%)
- only 16 assessees (out of 105, 15%) were doing the reconfirmation assessment and
- 31 (out of 105, 30%) were doing the advanced assessment.

Most of the assessees who answered the post-assessment survey reported that they had completed the DAC assessment (99 out of 135, 73%), 26 PCs (19 per cent) did not complete it and 10 PCs (7%) did not know whether they had completed the assessment or not. A large proportion of assessees (across all assessment types) did, however, report that they had not been informed as to whether or not they met the standard required for the DAC assessment (51 out of 123, 41% who answered the question) – see Table A.9.8 in Appendix 9 for the breakdown. This lack of information about the assessment result is reflected in the assessment results data presented below and in some of the interview responses, for example:

‘And at the end of the pilot... we weren’t given any verbal feedback or communication from our line managers whatsoever.’

[DAC assessee]

3.2.2 Assessment results

Assessment result information was gathered from supervisors by the SPOCs in the seven pilot forces. This information, ie, whether or not each officer met the DAC criteria, has been provided for only 485 out of approximately 1,000¹⁴ DAC assessees across the pilot forces. For the officers without an assessment result, it is unknown whether they completed the assessment or whether the result had not been submitted. Post-assessment survey and interview findings suggest that where assessments were not completed, the main reasons were because of a lack of clarity about the process, lack of time to gather evidence and lack of relevance for specialist roles.

- For the officers in the seven pilot forces with an assessment result, 407 were assessed as meeting the DAC standard (out of 485, 84%) and 78 as not meeting the standard (out of 485, 16%) – see Table 6.
- Reasons given for not meeting the assessment standard included criteria not part of core role (for 33 officers), restricted duties, sickness or maternity leave (17) and insufficient time, eg, due to workload (13).
- Insufficient evidence submitted was the reason given for 12 officers not meeting the DAC standard.

¹⁴ This estimate of the number of assessees is based on figures provided by the forces and includes officers who participated in the assessment process but did not register as pilot participants on the College DAC registration database.

Table 6: Assessment results – totals and broken down by role and assessment type where information provided

Assessment result	All PCs with an assessment result (%)	All PCs with a result and matched with registration (biographical) details					
		All PCs with assessment result and matched with bio details (%)	PCs in specialist roles (%)	PCs in non-specialist roles (%)	PCs in foundation assessment group (%)	PCs in advanced assessment group (%)	PCs in reconfirmation competence assessment group (%)
DAC standard met	407 (84%)	182 (75%)	22 (41%)	160 (84%)	74 (76%)	53 (76%)	53 (71%)
DAC standard not met	78 (16%)	62 (25%)	32 (59%)	30 (16%)	23 (24%)	17 (24%)	22 (29%)
Total (n=)	485	244	54	190	97*	70	75

*For two officers it was not stated which assessment group they were in so figures broken down by assessment group do not add up to the total of 244.

For 244 of the officers with an assessment result biographical information was also provided when they registered with the College of Policing for the DAC pilot. Further analysis of these 244 matched cases shows that (see Table 6):

- Most met the DAC standard (75% met the standard and 25% did not).
- PCs in specialist roles were less likely to meet the DAC standard than non-specialists. More than half of the specialists (32 out of 54, 59%) did not meet the DAC standard. The criteria not being part of their core role was the most frequently given reason for specialists not meeting the DAC standard (24 out of 32, 75% of specialists who did not meet the DAC assessment criteria). The most commonly named specialist roles were firearms or armed response officers. It is difficult to discern from the data, however, which specialist roles had more or less difficulty meeting the DAC assessment criteria.

The PCs in specialist roles were predominantly in the advanced and reconfirmation assessment groups and all of the specialists in the foundation assessment group had more than five years of service¹⁵.

- The proportion of the 244 assesses who met the DAC standard was slightly lower among the reconfirmation group (71%) compared to those assessed against the foundation and advanced criteria (76%) – see Table 6.

In order to meet the DAC standard of competence, assesses had to meet all the required criteria units for the assessment they were undertaking. For the foundation and reconfirmation assessment there were 10 criteria units and for the advanced assessment there were 16 criteria units (see appendices A.1 to A.4 for details of the assessment criteria).

Across the three assessment types, 62 PCs did not meet the required DAC standard. For the foundation and reconfirmation assessment:

- Diploma Units 6 and 7 appeared to present most difficulty as they were the assessment criteria most frequently not met. Of the 45 assesses who did not meet the assessment standard, 32 (71%) did not meet criteria 7: 'Interview suspects in relation to priority and volume investigations' and 29 out of 45 (64%) did not meet criteria 6: 'Interview victims and witnesses in relation to priority and volume investigations and criteria'.

For the advanced assessment:

- Of the 16 advanced criteria units, criteria 16: 'Builds relationships with partner agencies (eg, local authorities, community leaders, or internal departments), bringing people together to tackle and resolve community issues' was the unit that most assesses (9 out of 17, 53%) did not meet.

¹⁵ The pilot foundation assessment was intended for officers approaching their fourth pay point. It is possible, however, that some officers with more years of service were allocated to the foundation group in the pilot or the officers may have reported that they were in the foundation group but were in fact in the reconfirmation of competence group.

3.3 Views about consistency and fairness of assessments

As noted in the introduction, it has not been possible to conduct an objective independent assessment of the consistency of assessments. Observations and visits conducted with internal verification did suggest that some of those involved in force internal verification processes felt that they had found a lack of consistency between assessors and wide variation in the nature of the supporting evidence used (see section 3.4.6). Evaluation findings are, however, primarily based on perceptions of the supervisors and assessees as set out below.

There were some concerns raised at both the pre- and post-assessment stage by assessees about the fairness of assessment results. Specific concerns around officers in specialist roles were raised at both stages and by some supervisors. Although in relation to assessees at the pre-assessment stage, their concerns were mostly speculative and did not relate specifically to themselves.

The evaluation planned to conduct key demographic analysis on assessees' views about how fair and transparent they thought their supervisor was in conducting their DAC assessment. Due to the very small number of assessees who identified as being from a black or minority ethnic group, the evaluation was unable to conduct this analysis. Analysis by gender is also limited by the small number of female officers in the sample.

3.3.1 Perceptions about fairness and consistency of assessments

Pre-assessment views

At the pre-assessment stage, 45 per cent of survey respondents gave a neutral response (127 out of 285) to questions about their confidence as to whether the DAC assessment will be fair. A similar proportion (122 out of 285, 43%), however, also suggested they were not confident about the fairness of the assessment. The responses from assessees at the pre-assessment stage could possibly reflect some respondents' more limited understanding of DAC at this early stage of the process as noted in section 3.1 above.

The interview findings suggested that a key concern at the pre-assessment stage was about ensuring consistency in order that the assessments were carried out fairly. A common view from SPOCs across forces was that standardisation was important and necessary, but the extent to which this had been actively planned for at the pre-assessment stage in the pilot varied. Most supervisors interviewed, however, were confident that their DAC assessments would be fair.

Post-assessment views

As noted above, only a small number of assessees (99) stated that they had completed the assessment process in the survey and their supervisor had informed them of their assessment result (ie, whether they had met the standard or not). The small number makes it difficult to draw any strong conclusions about perceptions of fairness of the assessments at the post-assessment stage of the pilot.

The majority of the small number of survey respondents with an assessment result, were satisfied that their assessment had been fair (63 out of 68, 93% of respondents). Most of the small number of assessees who reported an assessment result (and answered the question) were satisfied that the result reflected their level of competence (39 out of 53, 74% of respondents¹⁶). It is not possible to match all these cases with assessment result data, but it is likely many of these PCs will have met the DAC criteria based on the assessment result data presented in section 3.2.2 above.

At both stages in the pilot, most supervisors felt that they were able to conduct DAC assessments in a fair way. Most of the small number (43 out of 59, 73%) of supervisors who completed both the survey and the assessment process felt they had conducted the assessments in a fair way. Where supervisors were not sure about the fairness and consistency of their own assessing, reasons given for this included lack of clarity about the standard and type of evidence required, a lack of time, and difficulties relating to specialist roles.

Supervisors and assessees who took part in the post-assessment interviews were mixed in their views about whether their assessments were fair. A lack of clarity in the DAC assessment process was again given as a reason for potential unfairness. Another concern raised was the potential to 'cherry pick' the experience to fit the DAC criteria, ie, base the assessment on just one occurrence that was possibly not representative.

¹⁶ Each question has a different response rate and the total number of responses to each question is reported.

3.3.2 Concerns about the relationship between supervisor and assessee

Both pre- and post-assessment survey responses suggest that PCs switch supervisors frequently. In the post-assessment survey 57 out of 124 (46%) PC respondents had a change of supervisor during the pilot year. The lack of continuity with supervisors could possibly have implications for the assessment, as the supervisor may be less familiar with the officer's work.

Concerns about the impartiality and objectivity of the assessor were raised by assessees in interviews at both the pre- and post-assessment stages. Reasons suggested for a potential lack of objectivity included how well the supervisor knows the assessee, as there was concern raised about assessments being contingent on the relationship with one specific person, and the potential to be penalised if an officer does not get on with their supervisor. This was felt to be especially unfair if the assessment related to pay, and it was felt it could

potentially undermine working relationships and highlighted the need for a standardisation process across forces. These issues are explored further in section 3.4.

3.3.3 Satisfaction with support from supervisor and opportunities relating to DAC

The evaluation also explored participants' satisfaction with support and their opportunities to gather evidence for the assessments.

At the pre-assessment stage, a mixture of activities had been undertaken by assessees as part of the DAC process (see Table A.9.3 in Appendix A.9). The responses from the perceptions survey with assessees (out of 251 responses in total) found that the most common tasks they had completed included:

- one-to-one meetings with supervisors or line managers (41%)
- recording of evidence for their DAC assessment (41%)

- agreeing with supervisors/line managers what actions were necessary for the assessments (33%).

Only seven respondents (3%), however, stated that they had a timetable of what needs to be done for their DAC assessment.

After the assessments were completed, interviews with supervisors suggested that the level of support they had provided to assessees varied and tended to depend on their own degree of buy-in to the DAC assessments.

The satisfaction levels also varied among assessees after their assessment in relation to supervisor support, and the opportunities and time available to prepare for the assessments (see Table 7). Across each of the areas looked at, around a fifth of assessees (across all assessment types) had not been provided with any support or opportunities.

Table 7: Assessee's satisfaction with support and opportunities provided for their DAC assessment (post-assessment perceptions survey)

All assessment types					
How satisfied are you with ...?	Support from supervisor	Time available	Opportunities to develop skills and behaviours	Opportunities to demonstrate skills and competence	Opportunities to record evidence
Very satisfied or satisfied	58 (47%)	35 (29%)	32 (26%)	41 (34%)	39 (33%)
Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied	40 (33%)	60 (49%)	56 (46%)	52 (43%)	53 (44%)
Support or opportunities not provided	25 (20%)	27 (22%)	33 (27%)	28 (23%)	28 (23%)
Total (n=)	123	122	121	121	120

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

- For some types of support (opportunities to record evidence and time available), satisfaction levels were lower among assessees in the foundation assessment compared to those in the advanced and reconfirmation assessment.
- A common theme from the assessee interviews was that there needed to be some support available for them throughout the assessment process. While assessees did not all necessarily need the same amount of support, it was felt a minimum should be agreed so that they understand what they are required to do.

‘But there is no guidance whatsoever. I mean you don’t have meetings about it. You got told you were doing it; here’s the end date; make sure you have got your examples.’

[DAC assessee]

In terms of gathering evidence to demonstrate they met the competence, survey respondents at the post-assessment stage taking the foundation assessment found it easier to gather evidence (two-thirds of assessees, 37 out of 54, 69% found it easy or very easy) compared to those in the advanced or reconfirmation group (less than half of assessees in these two groups, 18 out of 42, 43%, found it easy or very easy).

3.4 Introducing DAC to forces

The second evaluation statement to be evidenced was concerned with what needs to be in place to ensure the DAC assessments are implemented effectively in forces. Overall, the pre- and post-assessment survey responses showed that there was mixed receptivity and readiness for DAC both between and within forces. The following section covers key factors that appear to influence receptivity and the likely successful introduction of the assessments.

3.4.1 Buy-in from forces

There were mixed feelings about how DAC was introduced and some confusion over whether or not the pilot was compulsory – this affected the initial buy-in in some forces and continued to affect pilot participants’ views as well as their level of engagement in the pilot.

As noted in section 3.1, there appeared to be a lack of understanding among assessees at the pre-assessment stage in relation to the purpose of DAC and certain elements of the DAC process. These mixed views about the assessments at the pre-assessment stage contributed to making implementation challenging¹⁷.

A lack of engagement from supervisors and assessees was highlighted in the survey response rate which was low in the pre-assessment survey and dropped even more at the final post-assessment stage.

Furthermore, at the post-assessment stage, over one in five of the assessees who responded to the survey still did not know which assessment they were doing.

- The post-assessment interviews found that the way in which the DAC was communicated, including follow-up material and explanations provided on the aims of the assessments, seemed to vary depending on the level of buy-in from those involved in the pilot.
- Where there was a high level of buy-in from the SPOC¹⁸ or other senior police leaders within the force, communications seemed to work better; where there was less buy-in, responses to the surveys and interviews suggested a poorer understanding of the DAC process and less overall engagement. For example:

‘The chief inspector over there has been very, very engaged, so consequently that’s cascaded down, all of the inspectors and sergeants have been engaged, all of the assessment forms are going back.’

[DAC SPOC]

¹⁷ Research has found that if an assessment lacks job relevance, is over complex or increases pressure on time it could result in a barrier to successful implementation of employee interventions within organisations (McGovern and Ferlie 2007 and Lings and Gray 2002).

¹⁸ SPOCs are pilot force single points of contact who were responsible for managing the DAC pilot within the force.

It was clear from the post-assessment interviews that buy-in from leaders within forces for the DAC pilot was dependent on:

- whether they thought the DAC would go live in the future (ie, not wishing to waste scarce resources on a project that would never be implemented)
- overall commitment to PDR and professional development and the alignment of DAC with the force PDR processes
- the time force SPOCs had available to implement the pilot in addition to their regular role
- a desire to see how the process worked ‘naturally’ without lots of support (with a view that limited resources would be an issue if DAC was rolled out)
- involvement in other pilot projects, with some suggestion that some forces could be suffering from ‘pilot fatigue’.

3.4.2 How DAC fits with existing processes and structures

Similar findings came out of both the pre- and post-assessment stage interviews which suggested that:

- where there was no formalised PDR structure, DAC was seen as timely and participants in these forces were more positive about the principle of DAC
- in forces where PDRs were in place, it was felt that DAC clashed with current structures and plans already in place

- a lack of clarity about how the DAC process and PDR interacted and fit together going forwards was evident. Some respondents felt they are similar, others less so. Some concerns were also raised about potential time burden if there was duplication or inefficiencies. For example:

‘I think it needs to be one or the other and not both...PDR is more flexible because, for example, if I wanted to do armed response...I would put that in my personal development portfolio, I’d look at the competencies for that role.’

[DAC assessee, post-assessment interview]

- participants felt that, ideally, the DAC assessment would be integrated into the PDR system and not add any additional time burden. As most PDR systems are electronic, an electronic system for DAC would make it more user-friendly and would be welcomed by officers.

The baseline impact survey conducted with PCs prior to the start of the assessment process suggested there was variation in the extent to which competence assessments were already conducted with PCs. In response to the question, ‘Has your supervisor made an assessment of your policing skills and competencies in the last year?’, 117 out of 258 (45%) PCs eligible for the foundation assessment responded ‘yes’.

3.4.3 Communications about DAC

The type of communication used was perceived to be crucial at both the pre- and post-assessment stage in engaging participants in the pilot and shaping their views on the DAC assessments.

Similar themes around the use of communication emerged from both stages of the pilot (see Table A.9.2 in Appendix A.9):

- The majority of assessees received information by email, but satisfaction was low with this form of communication.
- Satisfaction levels were higher with assessees in relation to briefings or one-to-one meetings, but in both stages many fewer respondents had received information about DAC in this way.
- These themes were reflected by some assessees interviewed who were disappointed at the lack of support they felt they received. For example:

‘No one gave me any briefs, no one spoke to me, there was absolutely no face-to-face or verbal communication whatsoever. So I felt quite let down by it, if I’m honest.’

[DAC assessee at post-assessment stage]

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

Supervisors responding to the pre-assessment survey also mentioned that there had been a lack of information or contact and confusion as to what was expected of them. Evidence from interviews with supervisors at the pre-assessment stage highlighted that communication strategies were mixed, as were the levels of satisfaction with what had been communicated.

In the post-assessment interviews, pilot participants made suggestions on how to improve communication which included providing guidance about completing the assessments in a number of different formats – including downloadable documents, web tutorials and YouTube-style videos.

3.4.4 Assessor training

At the pre-assessment stage, over a third of supervisors (57 out of 147, 39%) responding to the survey said they had received training specifically on how to complete the assessments. At the post-assessment stage, the proportion who reported they had received training rose to over two-thirds (45 out of 62, 73%) – but caution must be taken as the total survey response rate fell. Some supervisors reported that they had attended one or two workshops, which they had found very useful and which they felt provided clear, although not in-depth, guidance.

A common theme that emerged from both the pre- and post-assessment interviews with supervisors was the desire (and in some cases expectation) for more formal training, especially for the assessments following the pilot phase, in order to increase confidence:

‘I feel as though I’m ready to assess material but the proof of the pudding will be in the tasting I suppose.’

[DAC supervisor at pre-assessment]

This possibly reflects the concern among some supervisors about the adequacy of their experience or training when assessments relate to pay decisions. When asked at the post-assessment stage if they would feel confident conducting the DAC assessment if it was linked to pay, approximately half responded (29 out of 57, 51%) that they would not be confident about this.

It was widely felt among supervisors who were interviewed, that the receipt of a formal assessment qualification would have been a considerable incentive to participate in the pilot. They also felt it would be an incentive for taking part in the DAC if it was rolled out nationally. Some supervisors who had received assessor training earlier in their career, felt that specific DAC training was not necessary.

Examples of views from two supervisors who were interviewed were:

‘I’ve got no specific qualifications in assessing; it does feel a little bit uncomfortable to be assessing somebody, because it is very subjective.’

‘I think initially the idea was that we would receive A1 Assessor Training and we didn’t get that...it was more like a briefing about what the DAC was...It was from our training department...And then we did have a training session but it was a couple of hours of going [through an] example [of one] incident, which could cover quite a lot of the actual areas of competency..’

3.4.5 Guidance for assesseees

A minority of assesseees (35 out of 135, 26%) who answered the post-assessment survey said they had accessed information or guidance about the DAC assessments on the College website. The recording sheet appeared to be the most widely used information from the College website (27 assesseees said they had used this) and the majority of them (18 out of 27, 67%) found it helpful. This view was also reflected in the interviews. Supervisors and assesseees, however, universally said the information was difficult to find on the College website and was not presented in an easily accessible form.

Assesseees were less likely to have used the other documents available on the College website, including the candidate guidance handbooks and advanced threshold personal qualities.

The review of assessment evidence workshop found evidence to suggest that guidance documents had not been followed or understood by officers and supervisors, as some assessments were not completed in the way the pilot had envisaged.

The guidance on completing the evidence recording sheet may not have provided all the information assesses may have needed in order for them to complete the sheet as expected. The very small number of examples of completed assessments which were reviewed as part of the evaluation, revealed wide variations in the length and detail of examples used to meet the competence criteria. In terms of how assesses completed the evidence recording sheet, the review found that the examples PCs used to meet the competence criteria were task-orientated and descriptive in nature – they lacked reflection on their actions. In a number of assessments, PCs used dramatic examples which were clearly impactful on the individual, but did not hit the competence criteria. The examples reviewed suggested that PCs were able to meet the competencies but they lacked the ability to communicate and present how they had demonstrated the competence in their role. The review found that when officers used a couple of evidence-rich examples, they were able to meet all the competence criteria. For example, one PC provided an example of their response to a call to attend two shoplifters detained at a store. This example covered conducting a search, taking a statement, gathering evidence, arresting the suspects and conducting an interview. The assessee used the example to provide evidence against seven of the ten assessment units and five of the six personal qualities.

A further indication of the need for more guidance for PCs on how to gather evidence in relation to CPD was provided through responses to the baseline survey conducted in four forces prior to the assessment process. At this stage, 46 per cent of PCs agreed with a statement ‘I am not sure what sort of evidence I should be gathering to demonstrate the professional development I have done.’ (118 out of 254 PC respondents eligible for the foundation assessment).

3.4.6 Internal verification processes

The police forces participating in the DAC pilot developed their own approaches to verification and standardisation. A number of visits were conducted to pilot forces to observe their internal verification process. The observation visits found that two of the police forces inspected a small number of assessment record sheets in their entirety, and one used a more formal system of verification in which a sample of evidence was checked and verified per candidate. This process included checking supporting evidence – such as looking for reference case notes or statements on record management systems (such as NICHE/CAD serial numbers) to verify that they agreed with the assessor’s decision-making process. Some of those involved in force internal verification processes, reported to the evaluation team that they had found a lack of consistency between assessors and wide variation in the nature of the supporting evidence used.

Another force introduced a standardisation process within the assessor training by using trial forms, which had space for assessee to add more information on the type of evidence they were referencing and further details which would allow supervisors easier access to evidence. The general conclusion of this process was that it was difficult to assess to the same level because of the variation in different job roles, specialisms and structures across different areas within the force.

The consensus among pilot force SPOCs was that standardisation through verification was a significant concern, not just across ranks or across the force, but nationally if the assessments are to be linked with pay. Without a standardisation process in place, it was expected that there would be significant challenges raised by officers who felt that they were being penalised by the new system.

The review of assessment evidence workshop (DAC project team members review of a small sample of DAC assessments from two pilot forces) findings reflected those found in the internal verification visits – there was a wide variation in the nature and length of supporting evidence used, as well as inconsistency between assessors.

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

The review considered the role of internal verification (IV) and felt that there was a lack of clarity in forces as to what the role of IV was. The review stated that the role of IV should be about managing the assessment process, developing and upskilling assessors, and standardisation – ensuring there is consistency in levels of competence. As discussed in section 3.4.3, the way this is communicated to forces is pivotal in equipping them with the guidance they need to develop a suitable IV process for their force.

3.4.7 Time available for gathering evidence

A common theme from pre-assessment survey respondents was that they did not have the time either during work or in their personal time to devote to DAC.

The majority of supervisor respondents at the pre-assessment stage also did not think that there was sufficient time available to prepare for the DAC assessments. There was also concern among assessees about the impact that time spent on DAC would have on their job performance and work-life balance. Due to the limitations of the pilot, we are unable to know what the implication will be at national roll-out (see Table A.9.10 in Appendix A.9).

3.4.8 Change of supervisor

A concern that was raised previously is the impact that a change of supervisor could have on assessees. Findings from the pre- and post-assessment surveys, as well as the baseline impact survey, showed that between 40

and 60 per cent of respondents had had a change of supervisor either in the last year or since the DAC assessment had started. The baseline survey suggested that 141 out of 259 (54%) PC respondents had changed supervisor in the past year although most of these PCs had not changed role themselves (212 out of 259, 82%). Some officers had expressed concern about their supervisor's ability to assess them if they had not worked together for a long period of time, which could have affected their perception of the fairness of the assessment. Section 3.3.2 highlighted some concerns pilot participants raised in the interviews regarding relationships between the supervisor and the assessee and potential impacts on assessment fairness.

3.5 Impact of DAC

The third evaluation statement the evaluation aimed to explore related to the impact of the assessments, particularly in relation to any benefits in terms of changes in attitudes and behaviours relating to CPD within police forces. This section sets out evaluation findings on the impact of DAC – the potential benefits as well as resource implications.

Overall, respondents to both the interviews and survey at the post-assessment stage expressed concerns about the resource implications of the implementation and undertaking of the DAC pilot, while the perceived positive impacts it brought appeared to be limited.

3.5.1 Resource implications for forces

Respondents to both the survey and interviews at the post-assessment stage suggested that the introduction of the DAC assessments would require dedicated resources for administering assessor training and providing face-to-face briefings on the assessments.

- For the force SPOCs, as well as the time spent on sending out communications, arranging and delivering briefing sessions and managing and monitoring the whole DAC process; verification and standardisation exercises were identified as being particularly resource intensive.
- Those interviewed frequently suggested that DAC would be heavily resource-intensive, both for the assessee in terms of collecting evidence and the supervisor in supporting and conducting the assessment.
- Post-assessment survey respondents were asked to provide an estimate of the amount of time they had spent on DAC. Previous research¹⁹ suggests these estimates are unlikely to be accurate and should, therefore, be interpreted with caution. PCs who had completed the assessment and responded to the survey (104 PCs) gave quite wide-ranging responses in relation to the time they had spent on gathering and writing up evidence for DAC. Responses were fairly evenly divided between those that estimated this took up

¹⁹ McLean and Hillier 2011 (http://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Documents/An_observational_study_of_response_and_neighbourhood_officers.pdf)

between one and three hours (31 PCs), between four and seven hours (29 PCs) and over seven hours of their time in total (30 PCs) during the pilot period²⁰. The interview findings also suggested a wide range in the amount of time officers perceived they spent on DAC, with some interviewees saying they were completing the DAC in a few hours, others suggesting they had spent three to four working days on it.

- Most assesseses (37 out of 53, 70%) who answered the question said they did not complete any of their DAC assessment activities in their personal time.
- The amount of time supervisors suggested they devoted to briefing assesseses, discussing the DAC, managing the process and in some cases acting as verifiers and providing a degree of standardisation, also varied. Over half the supervisors who responded to the survey did not feel they had enough time to complete the assessment to a standard they would have liked (33 out of 59, 56%), 23 (39%) supervisors thought they had enough time and three (5%) supervisors did not know.
- There was also a view that as the DAC pilot was undertaken with more limited input within forces than would be required for national roll-out (for example, short or single briefing sessions, limited or no assessor training, incomplete assessments and limited or no verification process in place), the true resource implications could be much higher on roll-out.

3.5.2 Positive and negative impacts

Very few of the PC survey respondents (fewer than 15 out of 122, 12%) agreed that the DAC process provided any of the following benefits (when asked to respond to an agree/disagree statement): more support from their supervisor, more one-to-one meetings or more professional development. Over 90 of the 122 (74%) disagreed that any of these benefits were provided by DAC. Similarly, only a few of the supervisors (7 out of 58, 12% of supervisors responding to the question) reported that they provided more support to the officers participating in the DAC pilot with their professional development than they would have done otherwise.

The context within which DAC was introduced, concerns about the potential link between DAC and pay, as well as concerns about pay freezes and job cuts within the police service may well have worked against pilot participants perceiving any potential benefits of DAC. The lack of engagement in and support for the participants going through the process will also have limited the realisation of some of these potential benefits. The evaluation findings did, however, also suggest there was widespread concern about the value of the DAC process and potential negative impacts.

The main potential negative impact identified through the survey was additional workload (102 out of 122, 84%) and over half of the PCs (64 out of 122, 52%) agreed with the statement 'the process made me feel anxious'. While fewer PCs (30, 25%) felt their work-life balance had suffered as a result of DAC, some (50 out of 122, 41%) felt their job had suffered. Some supervisors also reported that their job performance suffered as a result of the activity they had to do for DAC (22 out of 58, 38% of supervisors who responded to the question) and some indicated their work-life balance suffered (20 out of 58, 34%). Estimates of the amount of time spent on DAC were reported to be very wide-ranging with some officers spending significantly more time on the assessment process than others.

²⁰ Estimates provided by survey respondents at the pre-assessment stage are provided in Table A.9.6.

4

Learning points that can be drawn from the DAC pilot evaluation

Concerns raised by interviewees highlighted that the DAC pilot was introduced against a backdrop of low morale, limited or frozen pay rises and promotion, and perceptions of further job cuts across some of the police forces. This meant that officers participating in the pilot were more likely to be critical of the process, especially if they did not see it as being fit for purpose.

There are a number of areas of learning that can be taken from the DAC pilot. Some are related to the manner in which the DAC was initially designed and introduced into forces; others are related to the design of the DAC itself.

In terms of the way the DAC pilot was designed and introduced, the following learning points apply:

- A need for very clear communications about the role of the DAC assessment and what the pilot is aiming to achieve.
- A clear understanding of the processes that police forces already have in place for PDRs, etc. and some thought given as to whether the DAC duplicates existing systems and/or whether it could be integrated into existing processes in order to reduce duplication.
- Clarity over whether the completion of the DAC assessment was voluntary or mandatory. Although the DAC assessment was voluntary, this message was misconstrued in some instances.
- Greater availability of supervisor and assessee briefing.
- Greater availability of supervisor training.
- The need for a formal, recognised approach to standardising DAC assessments.
- The potential to reward supervisors with a formal assessor qualification.

The learning points that can be drawn from the evaluation which apply more generally to running a pilot within police forces are:

- avoid overburdening participants, and be clear from the outset what is involved
- provide clear guidance on the requirements of the pilot for all involved, eg, whether or not participation is compulsory
- clarity about resource requirements for introducing the pilot, and amount of support the force needs to provide to pilot participants
- be aware of organisational changes within forces that may affect implementation of the pilot.

In terms of the DAC assessment design, enhancements that could be implemented are:

- Reduced number of relevant criteria.
- Clear definitions of the criteria, the type and amount of evidence required (removing any ambiguities).
- Guidance documents which clearly explain how assessees should complete the recording sheet.
- Create a '10 top tips for completing the assessment' document.
- Develop examples of evidence-rich incidents which systematically show how the example demonstrates the competence criteria.
- Guidance for supervisors should include what they should cover in their first meeting with their assessee as well as how to conduct a competence-based assessment.
- Recognition of specialist roles and roles that are split.
- Consideration as to how to apply DAC to roles that are covert or sensitive.
- Recommendations as to how much time is required for completion.
- Easily accessible guidance.
- Guidance that is simple, clear, and written in plain English.

Table 8 overleaf sets out the key lessons from the evaluation of the DAC pilot and other supporting evidence from previous research drawn from rapid evidence assessments, for example, on PDRs, competence- and work-based assessments, and training and behaviour change²¹. The table also sets out the actions that had been agreed so far by the DAC programme board specifically for the national roll-out of ARC²² as at January 2016. As noted in section 1.4 above, findings from the evaluation were reported to the DAC programme board at the earliest points possible. Responding to these learning points is ongoing and many of these lessons are also relevant for other College of Policing programmes, for example, the broader College Professional Development Programme and the Leadership Review²³. The evaluation findings will be able to be used to continue to inform not only the implementation of ARC but also these wider College objectives and programmes aimed at supporting the development of police officers and staff.

²¹ (i) What works in training, behaviour change and implementing guidance? (Wheller and Morris, 2010) http://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Documents/What_Works_in_Training_and_Behaviour_change_REA.pdf, (ii) What works in leadership development? A rapid evidence assessment (Kodz and Campbell, 2010), (iii) Rapid evidence assessment of performance and development review (PDR) systems: Summary report, (NPIA, 2011, published on POLKA), (iv) Rapid evidence assessment on work-based assessment (Institute for Employment Studies for NPIA (2011, published on POLKA), (v) McDowell, A. et al (2015) Identifying Effective Processes for Assessing Competence and Managing Underperformance (University of Surrey for College of Policing, unpublished).

²² DAC was renamed as ARC (Assessment and Recognition of Competence) for the national roll-out of assessments.

²³ College of Policing 2015 Leadership Review <http://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Development/Promotion/the-leadership-review/Pages/The-Leadership-Review.aspx>

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

Table 8: Lessons from the DAC evaluation, supporting previous research evidence and actions agreed to address these lessons

Lessons from the evaluation of DAC pilot	Supporting research evidence from previous College rapid evidence assessments (on similar interventions)	Actions agreed to date by the DAC programme board for roll-out of ARC as at January 2016
<p>Buy-in and clarity about the value and purpose of DAC among police leaders, implementation leads and all those involved in the assessment process within forces.</p>	<p>Employees are likely to be more positive about PDR systems where the structure and purpose of the process has been well communicated and employees also have active input into their own individual PDR assessments²⁴.</p> <p>Evidence also suggests that engagement and buy-in may be associated with perceptions about the fairness of the assessment process, strong leadership and role models championing any systems introduced²⁵.</p> <p>Some evidence suggests that perceptions of PDR processes may be more negative when the PDR is based on national frameworks or introduced to comply with external requirements²⁶.</p> <p>Research studies have found that many employees have negative reactions to PDR systems perceived to be ‘pointless rituals’²⁷.</p>	<p>Communication strategy drafted and implementation under way.</p> <p>Communications plan is to first establish SPOCs who can cascade information throughout their force; provide forward notification for assessors; and ensure that all potential assesseees receive clear information by late spring/early summer.</p>
<p>Communication and guidance to prepare officers for assessments. Relying on communications through email is insufficient and more innovative methods should be explored such as YouTube-style videos, web tutorials and online forms. Guidance should cover how to present evidence for competence assessments.</p>	<p>Evidence from eight systematic reviews suggested that multi-faceted approaches are more likely to be effective at securing behavioural change among employees than the adoption of any one single approach. Active approaches (such as educational sessions and peer-to-peer discussion) are more likely to be associated with employee behavioural change than passively disseminating new guidelines²⁸.</p> <p>Some evidence, including research in policing organisations, suggests that training for both appraisers and employees on how to complete the PDR process may result in higher levels of satisfaction with and acceptance of the process²⁹.</p>	<p>Communication strategy drafted and implementation under way.</p> <p>Video development to be explored.</p> <p>College developing guidance on collection and presentation of evidence for competence assessments.</p>

continued...

²⁴ Cawley et al 1998, Narcisse and Harcourt 2008, Kavanagh et al 2007, Mamatoglu 2008 and Kelly et al 2008.

²⁵ College of Policing 2015 (unpublished) Defining and assessing competence project – key findings and implications of three research projects.

²⁶ McGivern and Ferlie 2007 and Bryman et al 1994.

²⁷ Pretorius and Ngwenya 2008, Catano et al 2007, McGivern and Ferlie 2007.

²⁸ Oxman et al 1995, Menon et al 2009, Grimshaw et al 2004, Bero et al 1998, Grimshaw et al 2001, van der Wees et al 2008, Medves et al 2009 and Francke, et al 2008.

²⁹ Catano et al 2007, Lilley and Hinduja 2007 and Narcisse and Harcourt 2008.

Lessons from the evaluation of DAC pilot	Supporting research evidence from previous College rapid evidence assessments (on similar interventions)	Actions agreed to date by the DAC programme board for roll-out of ARC as at January 2016
<p>Trained and confident assessors – assessor training and receipt of a formal assessor qualification could have provided an incentive to participate in the DAC pilot.</p>	<p>Trained and confident assessors and training to facilitate consistency of assessment between assessors has been identified as important in research on competence assessments, PDRs and work-based assessments. There is potential for individual values of supervisors or assessors to influence assessments and this potential bias needs to be minimised. Conflict avoidance can be an additional issue. Also appraiser–appraisee agreement is higher when appraiser self-efficacy is high, ie, the appraiser has greater belief in their own assessment abilities³⁰.</p>	<p>College developing online learning package for assessors (in partnership with Sussex Police).</p> <p>College commissioning the development of assessor ‘train the trainer’ workshops for delivery to forces.</p> <p>The National Police Promotions Framework step 4 qualification includes an ‘assessment in the workplace’ unit that will ensure newly promoted sergeants have met the required standard.</p>
<p>Integration with existing force processes – DAC should complement and not duplicate existing PDR processes.</p>	<p>Studies suggest that higher-performing organisations integrate PDR with a complementary set of human resource management practices such as investment in training and development, recruitment and programmes involving employees in management practices³¹.</p>	<p>It is recommended that PDR dates are moved to align with ARC assessments so that they become a single event, although flexibility will be needed to allow forces time to implement this.</p>
<p>Assessment criteria – the assessments could be improved by reducing the number of criteria and providing clear definitions of the criteria, the type and amount of evidence required and removing any ambiguities. There were particular concerns about the appropriateness of some elements of the advanced and reconfirmation assessment. The foundation assessment was generally felt by officers to reflect the nature of their role but some pilot participants thought it was too similar to the probation diploma.</p>	<p>Employees prefer PDR systems that are simpler and less time-consuming to complete. One robust evaluation found positive effects in terms of performance and employee relationships from a very simple system comprising peer observation and brief feedback³².</p> <p>Research studies have found that many employees have strongly negative reactions to PDR systems perceived to be excessively bureaucratic, time-consuming and ‘pointless rituals’³³.</p>	<p>College developing guidance on collection and presentation of evidence.</p> <p>Only foundation assessments to be rolled out in in September 2016.</p> <p>Advanced threshold assessments (for all ranks) and reconfirmation assessments are ‘parked’ for the time being and will be reconsidered alongside wider workforce and pay reforms with a view to later implementation.</p>

continued...

³⁰ College of Policing 2015 (unpublished) Defining and assessing competence project – key findings and implications of three research projects.

³¹ Oxman et al 1995, Menon et al 2009, Grimshaw et al 2004, Bero et al 1998, Grimshaw et al 2001, van der Wees et al 2008, Medves et al 2009 and Francke et al 2008.

³² Wang 2007.

³³ Pretorius and Ngwenya 2008, Catano et al 2007, McGivern and Ferlie 2007.

Defining and Assessing Competence pilot: final report of the evaluation findings

Lessons from the evaluation of DAC pilot	Supporting research evidence from previous College rapid evidence assessments (on similar interventions)	Actions agreed to date by the DAC programme board for roll-out of ARC as at January 2016
<p>Specialist roles – the difficulties reported in meeting the DAC assessment criteria reported by those in specialist or split roles need to be considered.</p>	<p>The perception that the competency domains or measures included as part of PDR are not relevant to employees' jobs is likely to increase dissatisfaction with the process³⁴. Similarly research on work-based assessments suggests that if assessments are not tailored to an individual employee's development needs or work schedule, they are more likely to be seen as something 'done to them', less likely to take responsibility for their assessments or not realise the progress they have made³⁵.</p>	<p>This will be partially mitigated by the assessment only being at pay point 4 on the PC pay scale, which is the foundation assessment level. Additionally, there will be the opportunity for professional discussions to be used in extenuating circumstances as a 'last resort' for officers in specialist/split roles.</p>
<p>A standardisation process was seen as important to ensure consistency within and between forces. Evaluation participants felt that standardisation of assessments should be built in to the DAC process and that the College of Policing had a role in supporting this at the national level.</p>	<p>Multiple raters and facilitation of agreement between raters was identified as important in the evidence review conducted to inform the development of the DAC assessment³⁶.</p>	<p>Mechanisms will be put in place to monitor consistency post-launch and improvements to the model will continue to be made.</p>
<p>Resource requirements – participants perceived that implementing DAC in its current format had considerable resource implications for both the College and forces, eg, for integrating/aligning it with PDR processes in forces, providing briefing about DAC, training for assessors and introducing standardisation and verification processes.</p>	<p>PDR systems – employees prefer PDR systems that are simpler and less time-consuming to complete³⁷. Also see findings relating to training and guidance and standardisation.</p>	<p>Implementation plan developed which will use communication events and the creation of guidance materials and surgery-style workshops to highlight and discuss individual force challenges.</p>
<p>Ongoing monitoring and review – a key limitation of the evaluation has been a lack of an independent review of consistency of assessments and insufficient provision of data to conduct analysis by key demographics such as gender and race.</p>	<p>Group differences, for example variation by gender and ethnicity, can be found in performance ratings and these need to be monitored and reviewed³⁸.</p>	<p>Recommendation made to the Professional Development Programme board for ongoing monitoring and review of DAC implementation in forces and gathering of data on assessment results.</p>

³⁴ Narcisse and Harcourt 2008.

³⁵ Miller et al 2005.

³⁶ College of Policing 2015 (unpublished) Defining and assessing competence project – key findings and implications of three research projects.

³⁷ Wang 2007.

³⁸ College of Policing 2015 (unpublished) Defining and assessing competence project – key findings and implications of three research projects.

A.1

Police Professional Framework

Required personal qualities for the rank of police constable

The table below outlines the required personal qualities for the rank of police constable which are represented within the Policing Professional Framework as personal qualities at practitioner level.

Area	Personal quality
Decision making	Gathers, verifies and assesses all appropriate and available information to gain an accurate understanding of situations.
	Considers a range of possible options before making clear, timely, justifiable decisions.
	Reviews decisions in the light of new information and changing circumstances.
	Balances risks, costs and benefits, thinking about the wider impact of decisions.
	Exercises discretion and applies professional judgement, ensuring actions and decisions are proportionate and in the public interest.
Openness to change	Positive about change, adapting rapidly to different ways of working and putting effort into making them work.
	Flexible and open to alternative approaches to solving problems.
	Finds better, more cost-effective ways to do things, making suggestions for change and putting forward ideas for improvement.
	Takes an innovative and creative approach to solving problems.
Professionalism	Acts with integrity.
	Takes ownership for resolving problems.
	Acts on own initiative to address issues. Upholds professional standards
	Asks for and acts on feedback.
	Remains calm and professional under pressure.

continued...

Appendix A.1

Area	Personal quality
Service delivery	Understands the organisation's objectives and priorities and how own work fits into these.
	Plans and organises tasks effectively, taking a structured and methodical approach to achieving outcomes.
	Manages multiple tasks effectively by thinking things through in advance, prioritising and managing time well.
	Focuses on the outcomes to be achieved, working quickly and accurately and seeking guidance when appropriate.
Serving the public	Demonstrates a real belief in public service, focusing on what matters to the public and will best serve their interests.
	Understands the expectations, changing needs and concerns of different communities and strives to address them.
	Builds public confidence by talking with people in local communities to explore their viewpoints and break down barriers between them and the police.
	Understands the impact and benefits of policing for different communities and identifies the best way to deliver services to them.
	Works in partnership with other agencies to deliver the best possible overall service to the public.
Working with others	Works cooperatively with others to get things done, willingly giving help and support to colleagues.
	Is approachable, developing positive working relationships.
	Explains things well, focusing on the key points and talking to people using language they understand.
	Listens carefully and asks questions to clarify understanding, expressing own views positively and constructively.
	Persuades people by stressing the benefits of a particular approach, keeps them informed of progress and manages their expectations.
	Is courteous, polite and considerate, showing empathy and compassion.
	Deals with people as individuals and addresses their specific needs and concerns.

A.2

Police constable foundation threshold

(Diploma in Policing units)

The following are the current 10 Diploma in Policing units. These will be the units that are referenced within the pilot.

- Provide initial support to victims and witnesses
- Gather and submit information to support law enforcement objectives
- Provide an initial response to incidents
- Arrest, detain or report individuals
- Conduct priority and volume investigations
- Interview victims and witnesses in relation to priority and volume investigations
- Interview suspects in relation to priority and volume investigations
- Searching people in a policing context
- Search vehicles, premises and open spaces

A.3

Police constable advanced threshold criteria

Standard of work and behaviour is beyond that associated with a competent police constable.

1. Works with minimal supervision and can be trusted and relied upon to get work completed without being prompted by supervisor.
2. Takes initiative to generate own workload and does not wait to be asked.
3. Has developed breadth and depth of understanding of law, knowledge, evidence-based policing and understanding of complete role.
4. Takes an active interest in changes in law and evidenced-based policing, consistently identifying gaps in knowledge and rectifying this.
5. Willingness to make decisions independently, escalating when appropriate.
6. Reasoned decision making based on evidence of what actually works in delivering outcomes, consideration of the National Decision Model, and thinking ahead.
7. When making pressurised decisions does not focus on any potential negative impact or repercussions on oneself.
8. Trusted to take control, take the lead, and can be relied upon to take over when required from supervision.
9. Confidently and competently challenges and expresses opinions with peers and supervisory officers using constructive language.
10. Confidently and effectively communicates with colleagues, members of the public or external agencies on what needs to happen and the reason why.
11. Actively develops colleagues in terms of developmental or performance needs.
12. Is highly thought of and respected by colleagues for their knowledge, skills and experience. Considered as a role model who colleagues seek advice from.
13. Retains knowledge (organisational, law, or evidence-based policing) in order to share with colleagues (including knowledge transfer that others benefit from).
14. Consistently copes with the demands of peaks in workload, balancing workload efficiently, without having an impact on the quality of work.
15. Shows commitment to professional development which is demonstrated through frequent self-initiated learning, further education or skill enhancement.
16. Builds relationships with partner agencies (eg, local authorities, community leaders, or internal departments), bringing people together to tackle and resolve community issues.

Appendix A.4

A.4

Assessment Event – Recording Sheet

Candidate Name _____

Registration Number _____

Date _____

Line Manager Name _____

Registration Number _____

Short Description of Event					Where the relevant evidence is stored				
This assessment covers the following									
Units									
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Personal Qualities									
1	2	3	4	5	6				
Core Learning									
Evidence of CPD Activity									

A.5

Pilot participants

The following tables present details of the numbers of officers who registered with the College of Policing as a DAC pilot participant and provided details of their role and biographical information. It should be noted that not all officers who participated in the pilot registered on this system.

Table A.5.1 Registered pilot participants broken down by force

Police force	No. of PCs	No. of Assessors/supervisors
A	150	49
B	172	93
C	288	141
D	104	45
E	128	38
F	118	46
G	2	2
H	106	45
Total (n=)	1068*	459**

Table A.5.2 Registered pilot participants broken down by gender

Gender	No. of PCs	No. of Assessors/supervisors
Female	309	79
Male	706	353
Not given	53	27
Total (n=)	1068*	459**

Table A.5.3 Registered pilot participants broken down by black and minority ethnic group/white participants

Race	No. of PCs	No. of Assessors/supervisors
Black or minority ethnic group	45	9
White	827	353
Not given	196	97
Total (n=)	1068*	459**

*174 of the PCs were allocated to a control group and did not participate in the DAC assessment process

**59 of the assessors were also allocated to a control group and did not participate in the DAC assessment process

A.6

Advisory panel for the evaluation of the Defining and Assessing Competence (DAC) pilot

An evaluation advisory panel was established to provide technical expertise and input to the design and implementation of the DAC evaluation. The six panel members comprised academic experts, researchers and police practitioners, independent of the College.

The members were identified based on their expertise in some or all of the following key areas: diversity, assessments, policing, evaluation, occupational psychology and police human resource management. Two panel meetings were held, one during the development of the evaluation

specification and the second after the first phase of fieldwork had begun. Panel members were invited to comment on the evaluation specification and research methods. Two of the evaluation advisory panel members also conducted a peer review the final evaluation report.

A.7

Evaluation specification

Statement 1	
Statement	There is consistent evidence that the assessment model implemented in the pilot forces is / is not perceived to be fair, consistent, relevant and reflect the required level of competence for the target group. This perception is supported / not supported by evidence from independent assessors. Where there are variations in the evidence there are / are not reasonable explanations for the differences.
Indicator	<p>Validity of the assessment</p> <p>Perceptions about relevance and required level of competence tested (these indicators will supplement the research and consultation evidence used to inform the development of the assessment criteria).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates perceived/did not perceive the areas of competence assessment to be relevant and reflect competence in their rank. • Supervisors considered/did not consider the areas of competence assessment to be relevant and reflect competence in the rank of police constable at that point in their career. • HR/training and development professionals in the participating forces considered/did not consider the areas of competence assessment to be relevant and reflect competence in the rank of police constable at that point in their career. <p>Face validity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates considered/did not consider the statement of competence made by their supervisor to be an accurate reflection of their competence. • Candidates felt that the assessor applied/did not apply a consistent standard across all elements of their own assessment. • Validity indicators were consistent/not consistent across all pilot forces, groups of participants and time. <p>Fairness – outcome of assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examination of individual assessment evidence by independent assessors indicated that the assessor’s judgement was/was not based on all information available to them • Examination of individual assessment evidence by independent assessors indicated that there was/was not sufficient information/material for the supervisor to conduct assessment of that individual. • Examination of assessment evidence by independent assessors indicated that the statement of competence made by the supervisors reflected/did not reflect the evidence collated in the assessment model. • Fairness indicators were consistent/not consistent across all pilot forces, groups of participants and time.

Indicator	<p>Consistency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent scoring of candidates' evidence by external independent assessors indicated that there was/there was not consistency in the outcome of the assessment among the supervisor and the independent assessors. • Examination of assessment evidence by independent assessors indicated that the supervisor applied/did not apply the same standard across candidates. • Examination of assessment evidence by independent assessors indicated that separate supervisors applied/did not apply the same standard to individual candidates. • The above indicators were consistent/not consistent across all pilot forces, groups of participants and time.
	<p>Perceptions about fairness – process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates were satisfied/not satisfied with the transparency of the competence assessment process. • Candidates were satisfied/not satisfied with the guidance they received prior and during the period of assessment. • Candidates were satisfied/not satisfied with the supervisory support that they received prior and during the period of assessment. • Candidates were satisfied/not satisfied with the opportunities (eg, assignments) they were offered to collect evidence and demonstrate competence. • Candidates were satisfied not satisfied with the time they were given to collate evidence. • Supervisors were satisfied/not satisfied with the guidance, training and support they received prior and during the period of assessment. • Supervisors were satisfied/not satisfied with the time that was available to them to support candidates. • Supervisors were satisfied/not satisfied with the time that was available to them to assess evidence. • Supervisors were satisfied/not satisfied with the availability of opportunities (eg, assignments) they were able to offer to candidates in order to collect evidence and demonstrate competence.
	<p>Fairness – work context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates were satisfied/not satisfied that they were able to complete the competence assessment process without their job performance suffering. • Candidates were satisfied/not satisfied that they were able to complete the competence assessment process without their work–life balance being affected. • Supervisors were satisfied/not satisfied that they were able to complete the competence assessment process without their own job performance suffering. • Supervisors were satisfied/not satisfied that they were able to complete the competence assessment process without their own work–life balance being affected. • Supervisors were satisfied/not satisfied that candidates were able to complete the competence assessment process without their job performance suffering. • Supervisors were satisfied/not satisfied that candidates were able to complete the competence assessment process without their work–life balance being affected.

continued...

Appendix A.7

Data requirements/ methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of assessment results conducted by independent assessors. • Review of assessment evidence provided as part of assessment (random sample or focusing on individuals with unexpected or disputed results). • Surveys of and in-depth interviews with assessees and assessors.
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakdowns of questions relating to fairness by groups within the sample, for example, by gender and black and minority ethnic groups may not be possible due to small numbers in the sample. For this reason, potential adverse impacts on these groups may need to rely on qualitative in-depth research. • Assessee's perceptions about fairness, relevance and level of the competence assessment may be influenced by the outcome of the test. For this reason evaluation data relating to these indicators will be collected before the outcome is known.

Statement 2

Statement	<p>To ensure an effectively implemented, consistent and fair competence assessment process that minimises impact on the business (eg, in terms of resource costs), the model needs to be implemented with the following requirements in place: ...X, Y and Z (to be determined by the evaluation).</p>
Indicators	<p>What do assessors, assessees and training and development professionals perceive as the implementation requirements, how do these work in practice and what are areas for improvement? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • communication about the purpose of the test • guidance and learning for assessors particularly in order to ensure they make reliable and valid assessments and avoid bias • timeframe for the process • additional workload required for assessment process • reassessment of the diploma modules • mechanisms for identifying, accessing and obtaining opportunities to collect evidence and demonstrate competence • use of performance appraisal processes • consistency with other HR processes • quality assurance processes • appeal processes • gathering of monitoring data. <p>Assessors/supervisors, HR training and development professionals and police leaders agree/ do not agree that the resource costs of the test are manageable (eg, relative to similar activities and the potential benefits):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set-up costs • time spent on the additional professional development activity • time spent on the assessment process

Indicators	<p>The estimated resource costs relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparation • training • quality assurance • assessment • CPD activity required for the assessment. <p>Perceptions about business implications of the test and adverse impacts on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential impact on progression and retention of officers from underrepresented groups • potential appeals, grievances, tribunal cases, litigation to manage • open discussion of development needs • numbers of appeals, grievances, tribunal cases, litigation to manage.
Data requirements/methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaire surveys and in-depth interviews/focus groups with assessees, assessors, HR professionals and police leaders in all pilot forces. • Estimates of time and other resources spent on activities relating to the test.
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of data available on costs may vary between the pilot forces so caveats may need to be placed around the analysis of this data. • The one-year pilot period is not long enough to collect and analyse actual data on numbers of appeals, grievances, tribunals and litigation cases. For this reason, data on this could continue to be collected beyond the one year pilot. • Implementation failure: it is possible that a force does not implement the test as intended and, for this reason, feedback from early evaluation findings and support should be given to forces as part of the pilot process to help to ensure the assessment is implemented as well as possible.

Appendix A.7

Statement 3	
Statement	Within the pilot period, in X participating pilot force, the evidence suggests that undergoing a competence assessment had no / a positive / a negative impact on PCs' perceptions about their own professionalism and skills and the support they have received from their supervisor for their professional development, on their attitudes and behaviours relating to professional development and on supervisors perceptions of assessees' professionalism and skills.
Indicators	<p>Perceptions: evidence of no/a positive/a negative impact on:</p> <p>Assessees':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perceived enhancement of own professionalism and skills in policing • perceived maintenance of own professionalism and skills in policing • perceived value of professional development • commitment to taking up continuous professional development • personal responsibility for own professional development • perceived support provided by supervisor for professional development • perceived ability of supervisor to identify and manage development needs. <p>Supervisors':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perceived enhancement in assessees' professionalism and skills in policing <p>Behaviours relating to professional development:</p> <p>Among assessees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • indicators of CPD activity (eg, time spent on CPD) • recording of CPD (eg, use of CPD logs)
Data requirements/ methods	<p>June–July 2015 Method: Quasi-experimental design, data collection before and after the intervention for a group of eligible officers going through the assessment process and a control group of eligible officers who are not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participating forces: one or two forces with large cohorts of officers going through the competence assessment process each implementing the test in a specific context, eg, existing performance appraisal processes. • Sample size: A cohort of approximately 300 eligible officers is likely to be available in one of the pilot forces. The outcome evaluation could take place in this force only with the 300 officers allocated to the intervention or control group. <p>Design requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quasi-experimental design would require collection of data before and after the assessment process. Cross over of supervisors/assessors between the intervention and control group should be avoided to ensure separation of the two groups, ie, supervisors who are line managers of PCs in the control group should not also be line managers of any PCs in the intervention group. • Data collected: survey of assessees, survey of assessors/supervisors, analysis of records of professional development activity or CPD logs of eligible cohort of PCs.
Limitations	It is possible that the sample in the pilot force with the largest number of eligible officers will not be sufficient to detect statistically significant results. A possible mitigation would be to include officers with more than

A.8

Research methods

The table below presents details of each of the evaluation methods.

Table A.8.1 DAC research methods timeline

Research method	Participants	Evaluation statement(s) covered	Timescale
Pilot registration	1,068 PCs registered (174 of these in control group and not taking part in the DAC assessments). 459 supervisors registered (59 of these in control group and not taking part in the DAC assessments).		December 2015 to October 2016
Baseline survey (impact evaluation)	320 out of 1,454 PCs responded (in control and intervention group).	Statement 3	March 2015
Pre-assessment perceptions survey	359 DAC assessees responded (compared with 894 registered assessees). 158 supervisors responded (compared with 400 registered supervisors).	Statements 1 and 2	June–July 2015
Pre-assessment interviews	47 interviews conducted with six pilot forces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 assessees • 7 HR/L&D • 15 supervisors. 	Statements 1 and 2	June 2015
Post-assessment perceptions survey	135 DAC assessees responded (compared with 894 registered assessees). 62 supervisors responded (compared with 400 registered supervisors).	Statements 1 and 2 (and statement 3 based on perceptions)	October–December 2015
Post-assessment interviews	43 interviews conducted with seven pilot forces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 assessees • 8 HR/L&D • 16 supervisors 	Statements 1 and 2	October–November 2015
Review of assessment result data	485 assessment results collected from seven pilot forces.	Statement 1	October–November 2015

continued...

Appendix A.8

Research method	Participants	Evaluation statement(s) covered	Timescale
Internal verification (IV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IV meeting with three pilot forces • Written feedback from one pilot force. 	Statement 1	September–October 2015
DAC SPOC consultation event	SPOCs and HR representatives from five pilot forces attended.	Statement 1 and 2	3 December 2015
Exploratory review of assessment evidence	Seven assessment recording sheets reviewed by DAC team members.	Statement 1	25 January 2016

Online survey on perceptions of the assessments

Individual officers' views are likely to be influenced by the outcome of their own assessment and for this reason evaluation data relating to these indicators were collected both before and after their assessment result was known.

For the pre-assessment survey, The College of Policing sent a link to the survey with a covering email to force SPOCs in order for the SPOC to distribute the information to DAC assesseses and their supervisors in their force. The survey went live and initial communications were sent out on 1 June 2015. In order to encourage responses, the communications included a statement approved by the Police Federation as follows:

'The Police Federation of England and Wales has worked with the College in determining what aspects of the assessments will be evaluated during the pilot study, and supports the aims of this pilot.'

Reminders were sent out on a weekly basis to force SPOCs. It was originally intended that the survey would close on 30 June prior to the start of the DAC assessment stage on 1 July. Due to low response rates, however, the survey was kept open until Monday, 20 July to encourage further responses. Any assesseses who reported that they had completed their assessment in their response were excluded from the pre-assessment survey analysis. A final reminder was sent out directly from the College of Policing to the force email address lists of assesseses and supervisors on 16 July 2015. Advice was taken from the College Marketing and Communications team on the wording of the prompting emails.

The College of Policing sent the post-assessment survey web link by email directly to all assesseses and supervisors taking part in the DAC pilot using the force email address lists. The survey went live and the survey link along with an email invitation was sent on 16 October 2015. The survey was originally planned to remain open for a six-week period, until 27 November 2015. Email reminders were sent to all assesseses and supervisors every two weeks for the six-week period. Due to low response rates, however, the survey was kept open until 21

December 2015. Force SPOCs were also approached to encourage DAC participants to complete the survey.

The topics covered in the surveys and interviews were informed by the evaluation statements and indicators and covered:

- communications and guidance about the assessments
- gathering evidence for the assessments and the assessment process
- appropriateness, relevance and fairness of the assessments
- impact of the assessment process
- time spent on the assessments.

The perception surveys were distributed to force participants using the forces' lists of pilot participants.

The baseline survey

The topics covered in the baseline were informed by the third evaluation statement relating to the potential impact of DAC and included:

- CPD undertaken over the last year
- assessment of competence conducted in the last year
- the value of CPD
- support provided for professional development within the force and by the supervisor.

The baseline survey went live on 26 February 2015 prior to the start of the assessments to PCs in four pilot forces. The survey was distributed to pilot participants via force SPOCs. Some respondents in some of the forces had difficulty accessing the survey. Although these technical difficulties were rectified, they may have affected response rates. The supporting statement from the Police Federation was again included in the communications about the survey and the survey was kept open for over two months to encourage response.

The PCs were randomised in order to divide them into two equal-sized groups: a control group who did not participate in DAC and a group who did go through the assessment process. It was intended that this survey would be repeated a year later after the assessment process was complete to measure any impact of

the DAC process on behaviour and attitudes towards CPD and to make comparisons between the control and assessment groups of officers. Due to low response rates to other surveys and a lack of evidence relating to these types of impacts, however, the second stage of the survey was not completed. The findings of the baseline survey do, however, provide an insight into the starting point within forces in relation to support for CPD and competence assessments.

Interviews

The in-depth interviews covered similar topic areas as the survey on perceptions of the assessments. Qualitative data collection methods are expected to further explore the meaning and importance that participants assign to their statements in their own words and identify aspects of perceptions that had not

been covered in the questionnaires. Interviews were conducted in the seven pilot forces at the pre- and post-assessment stage with PCs, supervisors and HR/L&D professionals involved in implementing DAC into forces.

- At the pre-assessment stage, 47 interviews were conducted during March 2015.
- At the post-assessment stage, 43 interviews were carried out during October and November 2015.

The sample for both pre- and post-assessment interviews were drawn from the seven pilot forces. Table A.8.2 shows the breakdown by force and role of the interviewees.

Table A.8.2 Pre- and post-assessment stage interview breakdown

Police force	No. of assessee interviews		No. of HR/L&D interviews		No. of supervisor Interviews	
	Pre-assessment	Post-assessment	Pre-assessment	Post-assessment	Pre-assessment	Post-assessment
Force A	6	3	2	2	3	2
Force B	0	4	1	1	1	0
Force C	6	3	1	1	4	4
Force D	3	3	1	1	2	3
Force E	0	0	0	1	0	2
Force F	5	3	1	1	3	3
Force H	5	3	1	1	2	2
Total (n=)	25	19	7	8	15	16

Appendix A.8

Limitations of the evaluation methods

Overall, there was a low level of engagement with the DAC pilot in forces which appeared to contribute to low levels of responses to surveys and provision of data for the evaluation.

Pilot data

Analysis of survey and pilot data based on ethnicity, gender or any other protected characteristic is limited due to the small sample sizes and limited biographical details that pilot participants provided at the registration stage. Furthermore, information on the assessment result was not provided for a high number of pilot participants, which has limited the conclusions that can be drawn from the data.

Survey responses

There were low response rates to both the surveys on perceptions of the DAC assessments. Furthermore, some of the respondents did not answer all the survey questions. The number of survey respondents (n=) is detailed in the tables under the findings section for selected questions. In addition, analysis of all questionnaire data by DAC assessment type was limited by the amount of assessees who did not know which assessment they were participating in (ie, whether they were in the foundation, reconfirmation or advanced group) or their survey response could not be matched with registration data. For the post-assessment survey, some of the questionnaire respondents did not complete the DAC assessment and many were not informed about the result of their assessment, ie, whether they had met the DAC standard, which presents difficulties in relation to gathering views about the fairness of the process.

In-depth interviews

There was an uneven split in participants across the pilot forces, which was a limitation of the interview sample. This was especially apparent at the pre-assessment interviews, where only six pilot forces took part in interviews.

Independent review of assessment evidence

No assessment has been made in the pilot of the consistency of assessment decisions between supervisors and independent assessors across forces. The original proposal was to run an independent review of assessment evidence with an external panel comprising up to three independent assessors, who ideally were qualified assessors with internal verifier experience. This proposal was modified during the course of the pilot and agreed with the programme board, as a number of issues came to light which suggested there were practical difficulties in undertaking the original approach. The key problems for this approach were:

- Access to DAC evidence: in most cases it was not possible to make an assessment decision based on DAC recording sheets alone. This written evidence refers to confidential information held on internal force systems to which external assessors would not be given access.
- Sample size: only a small sample of DAC recording sheets was made available to the College that could be used for independent review purposes. This was insufficient for the purposes of the proposed review.

Estimates of time spent on DAC

Data gathered on time spent on DAC has been limited to that provided in response to questions in the survey. An original proposal for recording time spent on a monthly basis was not possible due to a very low response rate to this time recording.

Impact survey

An impact evaluation was designed to inform the third evaluation statement: the impact of the assessment process on PCs' perceptions and behaviours relating to professionalism and skills and support from their supervisor for their professional development. Although a baseline survey was conducted, a follow-up survey to measure changes was not conducted due to low responses to the other surveys and responses to the other questionnaires suggested DAC was unlikely to have led to these types of outcomes.

A.9

Findings

Please note, all tables in this appendix have a total (n=) column, which is the total number of respondents who answered that question.

Some tables report the percentage as well as the number of respondents. The percentage total columns may not add up to 100 per cent – this is due to rounding up the percentage points.

1. Pre-assessment survey findings

Table A.9.1 Assessee's views on fairness and assessment process (pre-assessment survey)

Statements	No. of strongly agree/agree responses	No. of neutral responses	No. of strongly disagree/disagree responses	Total (n=)
I am confident the DAC assessment will be fair	36	127	122	285
I am concerned the DAC assessment will not be conducted fairly	113	122	48	283
The DAC assessment process is very similar to existing performance appraisal/PDR processes in my force	96	110	80	286
The DAC assessment process is very different to existing performance appraisal/PDR processes in my force	75	124	85	284
The DAC assessment has made no difference to the level of support I receive from my supervisor	158	103	22	283

Appendix A.9

Table A.9.2 Information or guidance survey respondent assesseees have seen or received about the DAC pilot so far and satisfaction level (pre-assessment survey)

Information or guidance	All survey respondents		Satisfaction among respondents who had received the information	
	No. of respondents who received information	% of respondents who received information	No. satisfied/very satisfied	% satisfied/very satisfied
Emails	271	80%	86	32%
Info on force intranet	58	17%	0	0%
One to one meetings	87	26%	65	75%
DAC briefings with other DAC officers	50	15%	28	56%
Info from force DAC lead/HR	70	21%	31	44%
Communications from senior leaders	23	7%	11	48%
Info on College website	39	11%	15	38%
College guidance documents	59	17%	24	41%
Other guidance materials	15	4%	6	40%
None	23	7%	n/a	n/a
Other	11	3%	n/a	n/a
Total (n=)	340		266	

Table A.9.3 Activities undertaken for DAC assessments to date: assesseees (pre-assessment survey)

Statements	No. of assessee respondents who agree with the statement	% of assessee respondents who agree with the statement
I have had one to one meetings with my supervisor/line manager when we have discussed the DAC arrangements	104	41
I have agreed what I need to do for the DAC assessments with my supervisor/line manager	84	33
I have planned activities in order to gather evidence for the DAC assessment	20	8
I have a timetable of what needs to be done for my DAC assessment	7	3
My supervisor has helped me identify areas of competence I need to develop for the DAC assessment	26	10
My supervisor has helped me secure development and training opportunities in order for me to meet the DAC requirements	13	5
I have undertaken some training or development activities to develop work related skills/competence for the DAC assessments	21	8
I have started to record evidence for the DAC assessments	102	41
My supervisor has helped me record evidence for the DAC assessments	16	6
Total (n=)	251	

Appendix A.9

Table A.9.4 Previous experience, training, or qualifications of supervisors in conducting assessments (pre-assessment survey)

Previous experience, training or qualifications	No. of supervisor respondents	% of supervisor respondents
Experience of conducting PDRs/appraisals	125	55%
Experience of conducting other police assessments	42	19%
Attending training for police assessments	24	11%
Assessor qualification	15	7%
None	20	9%
Other	1	0%
Total (n=)	227	101%

Supervisors were asked to estimate how much time they had spent on DAC-related activities since the beginning of January 2015. Estimates of time should be treated with caution due to variations in activities undertaken to date at the time of the survey (June 2015) and difficulties in gathering accurate estimates of time spent through a survey. On average, supervisors thought they had spent just under nine hours (8.9 hours) on DAC-related activities since January 2015 (see Table A.9.5 for a breakdown of the estimated times).

Table A.9.5 Estimates provided by supervisors on total time they spent on DAC-related activities between January 2015 and the pre-assessment survey

Estimated time spent	No. of supervisor respondents	% of supervisor respondents
Under 5 hours	44	40%
5–10 hours	39	35%
11–20 hours	20	18%
Over 20 hours	7	6%
Total (n=)	110	99%

Assessee respondents were also asked to provide an estimate of the time they had spent on specific activities for the assessment.

Table A.9.6 Estimates provided by assesseees on total time they spent on DAC-related activities between January 2015 and the pre-assessment survey

Estimated time spent	No. of assessee respondents	% of assessee respondents
Under 4 hours	141	56%
4–6 hours	42	17%
7–10 hours	31	13%
11–20 hours	17	7%
Over 20 hours	17	7%
Total (n=)	248	100%

Table A.9.7 Pre-assessment survey: assessee responses to open-ended question in survey:

‘If there is anything else you would like to add in relation to any of the questions in this questionnaire or how the DAC process could be improved, please provide details below.’

Open-ended answer themes	No. of assessee responses	% of assessee responses
Lack of communication in relation to DAC	74	46%
DAC time-consuming/bureaucratic process	40	25%
Concerns about the structure of DAC	15	9%
Concerns about duplication with PDR process	13	8%
Concerns about specialist roles and DAC	12	8%
Other	6	4%
Total (n=)	160	100%

Appendix A.9

Post-assessment survey findings

Table A.9.8 Assessee's completion of the assessment process and assessment result (post assessment survey)

Did your supervisor inform you whether you met the standard?	No. of respondents
Yes	53
No	51
I didn't complete the DAC assessment	19
Total (n=)	123

Table A.9.9 Assessee's satisfaction that their assessment was fair (post assessment survey)

To what extent were you satisfied that your supervisor conducted your assessment in a fair/transparent way?*	No. of respondents (All assessment types)	
	Fair	Transparent
Very satisfied	26	25
Satisfied	37	32
Dissatisfied	1	2
Very Dissatisfied	4	5
Total (n=)	68	64

*(Excludes those respondents who stated that they did not complete the DAC assessment)

Table A.9.9 Assesseees' satisfaction that their assessment was fair (post assessment survey)

To what extent do you agree with the statements?		
Statements:	No. of respondents strongly agree/agree	Total (n=)
DAC is a valuable process	19	122
More 121 meetings with supervisor as a result of DAC	14	121
More support from supervisor as a result of DAC	5	122
Undertaken more professional development as a result of DAC	4	121
DAC process made me feel anxious	64	120
DAC duplicates existing PDR processes	83	122
Work-life balance suffered as a result of DAC	30	120
Job performance suffered as a result of DAC	50	122
Additional work as a result of DAC	102	122
Not enough time to complete DAC to a standard	75	122

References

Bero, L. A. et al (1998) Getting research findings into practice: an overview of systematic reviews of interventions to promote the implementation of research findings, *British Medical Journal*, 317(7156), pp 465–8.

Bryman, A., Haslam, C., and Webb, A. (1994) ‘Performance appraisal in UK universities: a case of procedural compliance?’ *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol 19 (3), pp 175–187.

Catano, V. M., Darr, W., and Campbell, C. A. (2007) Performance appraisal of behavior-based competencies: a reliable and valid procedure, *Personnel Psychology*, 60(1), pp 201–230.

Cawley, B., Keeping L., Levy, P. (1998) Participation in the Performance Appraisal Process and Employee Reactions: A Meta-Analytic Review of Field Investigations, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 83, No. 4, pp 615–633.

College of Policing (2015) Leadership Review <http://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Development/Promotion/the-leadership-review/Pages/The-Leadership-Review.aspx>

College of Policing (2015) (unpublished) Defining and assessing competence project – key findings and implications of three research projects.

Equality Act 2010 (c.15). London: The Stationery Office. (<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>)

Francke, A. L. et al (2008) Factors influencing the implementation of clinical guidelines for health care professionals: A systematic meta-review, *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 8:38.

Grimshaw, J. M. et al (2001) Changing provider behavior: An overview of systematic reviews of interventions, *Med Care* 39, Supplement 2, pp 112–45.

Grimshaw J., Eccles M. and Tetroe J. (2004) Implementing clinical guidelines: Current evidence and future implications, *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 24(1), pp 31–7.

Institute for Employment Studies for NPIA (2011) Rapid evidence assessment on work-based assessment (available on POLKA)

Kavanagh, P., Benson, J. and Brown, M. (2007) Understanding performance appraisal fairness, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 45(2), pp 132–50.

- Kelly, K. O. et al (2008)** Teacher appraisal and its outcomes in Singapore primary schools, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(1), pp 39–54.
- Kodz, J. and Campbell, I. (2011)** What works in leadership development? A rapid evidence assessment, College of Policing.
- Lilley, D. and Hinduja, S. (2007)** Police officer performance appraisal and overall satisfaction. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(2), pp 137–50.
- Lings, P. and Gray, D. P. (2002)** Professional development for general practitioners through fellowship by assessment, *Medical Education*, 36(4), pp 360–365.
- McLean, F. and Hillier, J. (2011)** An observational study of response and neighbourhood officers, National Policing Improvement Agency. http://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Documents/An_observational_study_of_response_and_neighbourhood_officers.pdf
- Mamatoglu, N. (2008)** Effects on organizational context (culture and climate) from implementing a 360-degree feedback system: The case of Arcelik, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(4), pp 426–49.
- McDowell, A. et al (2015)** Identifying Effective Processes for Assessing Competence and Managing Underperformance (University of Surrey for College of Policing, unpublished).
- McGivern, G. and Ferlie, E. (2007)** Playing tick-box games: Interrelating defences in professional appraisal, *Human Relations*, 60(9), pp 1361–85.
- Medves, J. et al (2009)** Practice Guideline Dissemination and Implementation Strategies for Healthcare Teams and Team-Based Practice: A Systematic Review, Joanna Briggs Institute Library of Systematic Reviews, JBL000197, 7(12).
- Menon, A. et al (2009)** Strategies for rehabilitation professionals to move evidence-based knowledge into practice: a systematic review, *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 41(13), pp 1024–32.
- Miller, D. L. (2007)** Linking learning methods to outcomes in public health leadership development, *Leadership in Health Services*, 20(2), pp 97–123.
- Miller, L. et al (2005)** Policies and strategies for workforce development: encouraging a customised approach, *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 10(3), pp 287–304.
- Narcisse, S. and Harcourt, M. (2008)** Employee fairness perceptions of performance appraisal: A Saint Lucian case study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(6), pp 1152–69.
- NPIA (2011)** Rapid evidence assessment of performance and development review (PDR) systems: Summary report (available on POLKA).

References

Oxman, A. D. et al (1995) No magic bullets: a systematic review of 102 trials of interventions to improve professional practice, *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 153, pp 1423–31.

Pretorius, S. G. and V. C. Ngwenya (2008) Teachers' perceptions of and attitudes towards performance appraisal in Zimbabwean schools, *Africa Education Review*, 5(1), pp 144–64.

Van der Wees, P. J. et al (2008) Multifaceted strategies may increase implementation of physiotherapy clinical guidelines: a systematic review, *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy*, 54(4), pp 233–41.

Wang, W. (2007) Evaluation of 2+2 alternative teacher performance appraisal program in Shanxi, People's Republic of China, *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 23(7), 1012–23.

Winsor, T. (2012) Independent Review of Police Officer and Staff Remuneration and Conditions, London: The Stationery Office. <https://www.gov.uk/police-pay-winsor-review>.

Protecting the public Supporting the fight against crime

As the professional body for policing, the College of Policing sets high professional standards to help forces cut crime and protect the public. We are here to give everyone in policing the tools, skills and knowledge they need to succeed. We will provide practical and common-sense approaches based on evidence of what works.

college.police.uk