## **MPA Race and Faith Inquiry** Robin FIELD-SMITH-HM Inspector of Constabulary 31 March 09 **Chair: Cindy Butts Panel Members: Margaret Blankson** Document has been proofread and names have been inserted where they are practically certain. Where names have not been inserted there is some doubt about who is speaking. Yep. You're aware that we're (inaudible) Whoops, I'd better put my mic. on. We're going to talk to you for roughly about forty five minutes or so RF Yep We are actually taping the session (inaudible) ..and will ensure that you get copies of the transcript, so that you're happy with it. RF Yep We'll ask you questions in turn, but we may juggle about a bit

 $\mathsf{RF}$ 

Yeah

..and at the end we'll give n—you an opportunity to say anything that you haven't had the opportunity to, to say. We hope that you'll feel comfortable enough to be as honest and open as you'd like to be. Can, can I start by asking you, you've been in this game, as it were, for some time now. Could, could you tell us your assessment of where the Met is at in terms of performance around these issues, the issues that concern this Inquiry?

RF The – what shall I say? The evidential base I would use is probably split into two parts. First is what I would call the reality, the substance, which is based upon the quantifiable data that we've got and I don't think from an Inspectorate point of view we have got anything more recent gene—to sort of in wholistic terms, than probably 2006 when we did the last baseline assessment. And the second area obviously that we base our, our view on is what I would call perceptions because perceptions are people's reality. And so, even though the facts may not be as people see them, the fact that people see those as where things are

Sure

RF ..actually we need to you know, regard as being really important. Now in terms of the hard facts, apart actually to be fair, from the data on recruitment, retention and progression which has been an annual reporting exercise in response to the 1999 targets, the latest, more general evidence we had I say was in our baseline assessment 2006. And I think the Metropolitan Police have actually come a very long way, particularly in terms of recruitment, if you think where they were ten years ago, where they are now, they've done really well and the introduction of PCSOs and the work force mix changes has actually helped that and PCSOs particularly have helped produce the work force component which is far more representative of the community to be policed. And we've also had a clear improvement in retention in the early stages, which is a function obviously of the training program, over this, in this decade and there has been what shall I say? There has been progression upwards through the ranks and grades and of course, when you get police staff who are an im-- very important element of the work force, the benefit from police staff point of view is that you can recruit in at any level. That doesn't apply to PCSOs, of course, because PCSOs are basically a flat structure but if you look at the police staff other than PCSOs, because you can recruit in at any level, you have an opportunity to take positive action in a way you can't do with police officers, because you have a single entry system.

Right.

And one of the things that we have to remember about police officers is that it takes time in a single entry system to grow people through the organisation. I think – so in terms of recruitment and retention generally, I think the Metropolitan Police has come a long way. The areas which still need attention – first is lateral progression and the specialist areas and in fact probably the lessons that we learned from the gender agenda probably apply here, as well. You know, what, what we learnt about getting women in, into the organisation generally and then promoting them generally but (inaudible) what about the specialist areas and what about lateral progression.

RF I think (inaudible) there are lessons to be learnt there, to be applied in terms of race and faith. And the other area is in I was going to say, is in retention, particularly in the specialist arena and it works on both, it both, it works both ways. There is a tendency when you get somebody good from particularly a minority to keep them there, because you've got them and this is fantastic.

RF Now that actually is what I would call the, the other side of retention. You're actually keeping them somewhere too long, almost in some form of tokenism so I think it's important that we see retention the balanced way, inside the organisation as well as the issue of retaining people

Right

RF ... inside the organisation so that you don't lose them altogether. A--and the other area, I'd say is the issue of progression, particularly within the specialisms and the final area which still needs attention is the issue of section, because stories that are out there very often last longer than the reality and so it is really important that where there are successes and improvements, those are communicated and the facts are continually reinforced,

Mm

RF ...to overcome the, the stories that have sort of become almost – you know, the you know, the, the reality because they've been told so many times that they must be true. So that's a sort of starting point for you.

No, that's, that's, extremely useful. Can, can you then, given what you've just said, can you then give us a flavour of how the inspection process works and how it might be able to assist in the assessment of the areas that you talked about earlier, as being the problems and how that might – that process might assist us as an Authority, to -- not to sow the seed and that but also how that could improve the performance of the Met?

RF Right. I'm certain that I'm not starting from a completely blank sheet of paper here because you, I know you've talked a lot with (inaudible)

No, of course not least, least I know, Denis O'Connor yesterday.

RF Clearly the inspection process is based upon an identification of an area to be inspected and why do we inspect that area in the first place? Now it, it's either because we have decided that's an area which merits inspection because it is critical to performance or because we have had an area of risk or deficiency identified to us through our

Sure

RF ..ongoing overall monitoring performance, or because it's a – inspection's been commissioned from us, and obviously the work force inspection 2010, 2011 is an example where the Home Secretary has commissioned the Inspectorate to conduct an inspection of the work force. We can only inspect against something that can be tested and therefore we've got to have data which is principally quantitive (sic) to base our inspection around. So for example, we can look at something like the progress against the 1999 targets, which obviously (inaudible) large (inaudible) that, that that (inaudible) '99 target (inaudible) they reported on, or we can look at any other piece of data which is available to us bec-either because it's something which is a national, nationally reported or it's something that's given to us. I mean you as a police authority could say to us HMIC, here's some data that we've got. We've got questions around it or we're, you know, we, we've got concerns about it you know, can you come and inspect? Because there's whole, whole range of ways that we come to inspect. We've then got to decide what - I was going to say, what we're actually looking at, because we have got to be interested in what all the inputs which are the majority of the quantitive (sic) data, are actually contributing to the key outcomes, which is going to be about high quality, high performance policing which is going to gain and maintain public confidence and security. 'Cause that's basically what it's all about. 'Cause it's no good having tremendous inputs if it's not actually achieving the right outcomes.

	Okay.
	Okay. Can I just (inaudible) hand over to Margaret?
МВ	Yes. Hi. So it's simply one of the things you said. Given what you've just said about what you can inspect and it's based on having good, accurate data. How is, how do we then address one of the other issues you've talked about which is an area that the inspections is, inspections are identified as still being potentially a problem area, the whole issue of perceptions, 'cause you can't measure such perceptions. How do you deal with a perceptual issue?
RF	Well, you can
	Okay?
RF	because perception is a sense, is measured by things like community and staff surveys. So if you've got a – well, I mean, an, an, an, a, perhaps a good example is how did we arrive at a position where crime's going down but so is public confidence in policing? So we've got hard data that, you know, crime is going down and detections are going up but public confidence as measured through opinion surveys, community surveys, whatever, is actually going down.
RF	And we only know it's going down because we have got a measure of what people thought last year. And then we've gone and put the same methodology and then we've got the measure this year
	Yeah, yeah, of course
RF	and (inaudible)
	Yeah

RF	Now although you're asking people their view,
	Yeah
RF	and therefore it's a perception, that's still valid.
	Yeah, of course it's (inaudible), yep
RF	All right? And therefore we look at staff surveys and community surveys as part of our evidence base.
	Yeah, no, that (inaudible) In terms of some of the internal perceptions, that are held by, in some BME groups and, and faith groups around their progression opportunities within the Met, how's that dealt with through the HMIC pro—inspection process in terms of sticking to the issue of measuring perceptions?
RF	By if you're looking at the internal perceptions,
	Yeah
RF	Well obviously we, we look at staff survey data and look to see whether we've got enough differentiated data in there 'cause it's no good having a staff survey that looks at the whole work face, we've actually got to say, Have you, you know, have you actually looked at the particular (inaudible) incident. But then we'd also, through focus groups and one to one interviews, will be asking people both about their experiences and their views and we triangulate that and what I mean by that is, we don't just ask two people, if you like a team member and their supervisor, we've actually (inaudible) to see whether team members all agreed or disagreed and whether the supervisors agreed or disagreed and whether also ther higher up the chain.

RF

Now that is actually quantitat-- quantitative.

RF Because a triangulation – I know it's a triangle but actually it's actually more complicated function we call triangulation, it, it's getting as many of the – what shall I say, the, the views and opinions which are relevant

(inaudible)

nactually tested out, to see whether for example there is a complete mismatch between what people are thinking on the front line and what people are thinking at the strategic level, or whether there's a mismatch between this group of people here, which might even be between two shifts, for examplea, a, and it's, it's testing that out all the time.

(inaudible) thank you. Just want to talk a bit about the actual inspection process and some of the issues that have risen to the top in relation to race and faith and diversity. What are they? What are the sort of key issues, through the inspection process around those areas, that have consistently risen in relation to the MPA? MPS, sorry.

MPS. Gosh. I mean, because – because the Met has been subject to so much pay inspection and I came in during – was going to say, winning the race 3 in 2000, so I mean I've sort of seen quite a lot over, well, say nearly nine years – there is first the issue of understanding. Have we basically got a work force that understands the what (inaudible) what is meant by equality and diversity, know do people understand the difference between Positive Action and positive discrimination.

RF Basic understanding. Secondly, we've got whether we've actually got people not only educated for the basic knowledge, but actually trained then to apply it. Because although people may have the knowledge, they may not be confident or competent to apply that knowledge, particularly when they're in positions of responsibility.

RF And the first line supervisor is the absolutely key level, whether it's police officers or police staff. Third issue is, do people understand the difference and the overlap

people Right RF ..also understand that every individual is a make-up of all the strands of diversity? Mm. Do you think that's understood? RF No. I don't. Particularly where you get the difference between the visible and the non visible. Ju—just to just pick up, we've had great difficulty in how that discussion I think (inaudible) Inquiry and in the focus groups, even from some (inaudible) some of the staff associations to get that sort of sense of clarity so I'd welcome your thoughts and what you've picked up from that during the inspection process, where you think the problems are, what you think the lack of clarity is and, and what potentially you might (inaudible) to do. RF I think we've got to do more generally to get people to recognise what they are. RFI mean, I, I, I have had to – what shall I say? I've had to challenge myself to be standing up when I hold the equality and diversity portfolio for HMIC, to say, Look, I'm a white male heterosexual, ancient Christian, basically able, able person, you know what I mean? So I, remember what I am, you know what I mean? RF I mean, it's remembering what I am and then, when I'm interacting with other people, to actually have that in mind and I don't think that that comes easily, particularly in a transactional environment which policing all too often is, when you are working on what you can see and what you can hear. Now race is -- been seen very much historically as the difference between black and white. But it's quite interesting, where you now see what's happening with the, you know, the migration particularly from in, within Europe that we've

between race and faith particularly, because it isn't a neat division and in fact do

now got issues of race which are not visible in the way they have been historically seen.

When you get to faith, you are dealing with something which you can't generally see. It's about people's belief, but again there's a lot of culture that goes with it. You know, we live in a (inaudible) say, a predominantly Christian country. Christian not just in terms of what people's belief is but the cultures and ethics and traditions that go around it. Now a lot of that you can't see, it's actually it's implied or it's assumed an--, and I think that we've got to do an awful lot more to help our people inside the policing work force to understand what they are and the issues that flow from that, to help them then engage better with the community to be policed.

RF And I, I can't do better than quote Peter Bottomley, 2001 Black Police Association Conference, "The time will come when we treat the public properly only when we treat our own people properly".

Do you think that is, that whole piece is understood by the-- I'm not specifically the, but the broader Management Board, is that concept, is that understood?

RF I think they are experienced and intellectually bright enough to understand the concept. The challenge is how you then take that out in tangible – what shall I say, delivery terms through an organisation as big as the Met.

So

RF I don't minimise that at all.

No. So let's assume, which I, I will share your assumption. I expect leadership and the Management Board to understand that concept. Why, then, do you think it's perhaps not understood or there's not more — (inaudible) is representation in that, lower down in the organisation? 'Cause the concept's quite, I mean, to be quite honest, quite straightforward in terms of understanding it, and it, and it is a key part of the Met's Diversity Approach, must be. Why hasn't that filtered down? Why hasn't it, do you think, been filtered down?

RF I think there's a range of reasons. The Met's a very big organisation and I know (inaudible) having inspected in the Met people will say in the outer boroughs, you know, the Yard might as well be n the Moon, because you know, they're out there, you know-- and okay, you might say that if you're a Londoner generally.

You know, if you live out in one of the outer boroughs you know, you don't have much feeling for what's going on in Westminster and, and, you know, at Kensington and Chelsea. That's just the nature of, of having millions and millions of people and a large organisation. Secondly, I think that there's -- how anybody who sits at the top of an organisation gets the message that they intend to send, received by everybody else in the organisation 'cause there're all sorts of things that get in the way of it. Thirdly, particularly when you're changing cultures and attitudes, it takes longer than actually changing the more tangible. And how do you re-educate people who have grown up over ten, twenty years in an organisation, particularly in the middle. Now the (inaudible) CRE used the expression, you know, the permafrost in the centre of policing in their, in their 2005

RF (inaudible) Investigation. Now that was a bit unkind, but I think what they're getting at is the fact you know, you've got people coming in new to the organisation, I think you can shape the way you want them today and tomorrow, and you've got people who are right at the top, who, you know, you know, if you like earned the right to be there, but you've got all the, the rest of the organisation, who have grown up from being in there, young and keen and everything else but they've, they've, they've been shaped by their experience. And the challenge is how you turn round the – what's I going to say, the supertanker in the middle.

Mm. You're saying it's size, communication and time; is there something about priority? And then something about

RF Well,

(inaudible) leadership on that

JF ...of course it's priority and there is another thing because again, policing is essentially reactionary, but it's keeping your – keeping faith with the long term intent while still coping with all the things that – what shall I say – can, can blow you off course, along the way. You

know, I mean, if, you know, we've only got to have something happens this week and clearly we've all got to deal with that. But not forget, we're still – got this long term intent.

CB Mm. Okay. Well, w—m—Margaret added on leadership and clarity

RF Yeah.

CB Can you say something about leadership? And can I also ask you to say something about structure. One of the things we've been viewing today and we've, you know heard it from (inaudible)

Yep

CB ...was the, the idea that there should be no Diversity Directorate, concept of champions should go because that means that you've got champions, then everyone else feels that they're off the hook. And can, can you talk to us about how you think, wh—what you think the best structure to deal with the issues that the Met are facing ought to be? Have they got it right, should it change, if so how?

RF Right. Leadership is at every level. So it is really important that the work that has been put in train, which I commend, from the Leadership Academy, is reinforced because that's aiming to get to every level of the Service. And that's not easy, I mean I, (inaudible) if I give you a little anecdote, I was up at Hendon about a year ago probably because I had wanted to see the Leadership Academy work, not just get the big briefing on it but actually to go and engage with people and I had a, an Inspector and he said, This is great. The experience I'm having off the job, and I'm now on the second module, but I've got to go back to borough and I'm, you know, I'm one of the early people, so that it's trying to put enough effort in to reach the tipping point so it's a change in the culture but it's got to happen at every level. You know, when I was talking about getting in to the middle of the organisation, so that leadership has got to be exercised at strategic level by the Board and by the Borough Commanders and all the other OCU Commanders in the Met but you've also got to have it being exercised by everybody else, you know, first line, second line supervision. The structure in dealing with these issues of race and faith, it's everybody's business and so there is a, there is a real risk if you have a Directorate which has got a name around it, so everybody thinks Oh, they're dealing with it. Nothing to do with me. So I do believe that as far as possible, you should have equality, diversity, race, faith and everything else actually

mainstreamed everywhere. You do need to have champions and, but you no good to have just one champion on the main Board. You need champions at every level and I co—commend to you looking at what's happened in Wiltshire police in Swindon BCU where the BCU Commander has now got champions at middle management who have been selected and help-- you know, move forward the process. You also need some expertise. You do actually need people who could help advise, again, at each level and in each — what shall I call it — in each of the dare I say it, silos, about the issues. But they must not be seen as the only person to deal with this issue of equality and diversity.

Mm hm. Okay.

RF Does that help? (inaudible) that, that ...

Yes, yeah; that's very helpful. I'm just thinking about your point about champions.

Ju-- just going back. Can I, you talked about cult—you started to use, or refer to the culture of the organisation. Can you talk a bit about the culture of the organisation in relation to the inspection process? The rat catchers and

RF Yes. On the one hand, the police service is more receptive of inspection than just about any other part of the public sector and that's for two reasons. Generally you know that we're, you know, HMIC's been around since 1856 (inaudible)police are used to being inspected and secondly, the Met has probably even as 25 per cent plus of the, you know, the police service of England and Wales, has probably been inspected more than most.

RF But generally people are used to it, not always – what shall I say – understanding it but they're definitely used to it. The other side of it, however is that inspection is sometimes seen as Oh, well, we can get through that inspection, tick in the box then we can forget about that then we can get on with sort of normal life, or at worst, inspection is used internally as a – almost as a threat to get people

How, how does the Met deal with inspection, then? What's their approach?

Mm

RF The, the, the – at the senior level, I think they do, as long as they can see the value that's going to accrue from it and as long as we've done our bit as inspectors to make certain that we have deconflicted, you know, reduced the the burden to maximise the outcome. I'm not certain -- and I've had personal experience, that it is understood further down you know, in the, in the bulk of the work force. And sometimes I think (inaudible) How down is down? RF Well Borough Commander level? RFNo, probably we're talking about sort of the bulk of the work force, down you know, at delivery --first and second line supervision level, Okay RF Either 'cause they've not experienced it before, because they're too new to the organisation Okay RF ..or because it's just something that is sort of done to them and it's not explained. I mean, again, my experience and it's not peculiar to the Met but again, because of the size of the organisation (inaudible)

Do – do you think they welcome it?

RF	see what I mean,
	Yes, (inaudible)
RF	it's get—making certain people understand why, why this has been, why, why they're experiencing this.
	Yes. I'm going to go forward and (inaudible) come back for a second. Just taking that principle about (inaudible) inspection process. The new inspection process that will include the MPA in, in, in, terms of being inspected, what do you think the impact of that (inaudible) inspection on, on, on the MPA, on the police authorities will have? Or you hoping it will have?
RF	Well, two things. It must improve police authorities' performance. Because that's what inspection
	Mm
RF	is basically about. I hope it will actually get police authorities to look to their own performance, before they're actually inspected. Because the, the rigour aand the, the tools that are sort of being developed around it will enable police authorities to self assess and peer review before they're touched by inspection.
	Yes
RF	And think about
	Mm

RF ...the specifics of governance and scrutiny within in any area. Let's say you're obviously you're looking particularly at race and faith, equality and diversity. But actually really getting police authorities to say, What should we be doing? And what shouldn't we be doing?

RF The difference between Executive and Non Executive.

(inaudible)

I, I just want to pick up a couple of things,

Yes

..just going backwards. I, I want you to give us your views on multipoint entry, 'cause it's a re-occurring (sic) theme and issue that we've discussed through the Inquiry, so would you be supportive of multiple entry?

RF I would be supportive, in the first instance, of a – I was going to say measured, well researched look at the – what shall I say? – the concept of multipoint entry. And I'd say it's got to be done that way, because if it's approached – what shall I say, carelessly or precipitately it will immediately raise barriers, people would dig trenches and all the rest of it. I don't think that single entry is something for which there is no alternative but in looking at the multiple point entry concept, got to look at what are the business benefits, what are the opportunities but also what are the risks, so I, I'd be in favour of a really well constructed and very well informed and research based piece of work.

Okay. Okay. So, wha—what in your view are the key sort of risks, then, associated with multipoint entry?

RF It, it is all too easy to solve one problem in the short term and to build up a problem in the long term. The Portuguese national police introduced double point entry, but they hadn't done a proper impact assessment and what they then discovered that 75 per cent of their intake at the senior level were women, who were going to have charge over predominantly male Constables. And they hadn't worked out the cultural challenge and all the rest that went with it. So though, though they solved a quantitative problem and a expertise

	it. So I think there is a risk unless you have done, if you have done a proper, comprehensive,
	Sure. Okay
RF	you know, research and plan
	Yes.
RF	I think the other risk is that you could lose an element of your expertise and experience because you're not growing people up
	Right
RF	through the system.
	Okay
RF	And you could in some way actually get in the way of those who deserve to be grown from the bottom, all the way through the organisation. 'Cause they suddenly discover that other people are coming in and blocking their way.
	And is there any example that shows how it could work?
RF enough	It is very difficult to find, in an organisation such as the police, something which is similar; I mean the, the one that's usually trotted out is the Armed Forces
	Yes

RF	because they have a
	Of course. Yes.
RF	double entry system
	Yeah
RF	But although, you know, with my own military background, I've, I, I think that's got a lot to commend it; again you think you need to understand the differences, as well as the similarities. There are other police forces in the world that have multiple entry and I could give you Pakistan, which I know a bit about 'cause I've been out there to see it and they have three entries; Constable, Inspector and Superintendent. The Constables are regarded as very much blue collar, not paid a living wage, just do what you're told; the Inspectors probably act at the level we would expect Constables to act in the Metropolitan Police and elsewhere and the Superintendents come in as, frankly, a bit of a privileged sort of senior management and how you get homon—homogeneity out of that approach
	Right
RF	is really difficult.
	So we won't be looking there, then.
	(inaudible)!
	And, and can I just test out something else that we've been talking about and that is the Thirty Plus scheme.
RF	Yep

I get the impression – and it's just a personal opinion that Thirty Plus you know, tends to kind of regurg—the organisation regurgitates itself, it doesn't get the opportunity to build and to, to renew its culture and the people; it could potentially act as a block to other individuals gaining useful sort of skills and experiences, allows the organisation not to succession plan, these are things that we've been picking up, as I say, across the, along the way. What, what's your view on Thirty Plus? Is it

RF	The, the police have not been good historically at work force and succession planning.
	(Inaudible)
RF	And the Thirty Plus scheme in part was introduced as a response to the – what shall I say – what they had – the penalties of not having good work force and succession planning.
RF	However, on a case by case basis we need to have a Thirty Plus opportunity because there will be individuals who have skills and experience which at that point when they come to the thirty year point, the organisation would be silly to lose, (inaudible) a few years.
	Sure, sure.
RF	But it's got to be on a case by case basis.
	Yes.
RF	It should not be seen as an easy answer to, Oh dear, we forgot to recruit people you know, ten years ago, to, to, to, to fill up. You know what I mean? So there is a place for a well differentiated Thirty Plus scheme but only if it is complemented by really good work force and succession planning.

Okay. Just touching then on that – work force development and succession planning. Do, d—do you think the Met is still poor at that? Do you think it's better? What, I mean, how do you assess its---?

Rf It's co-well actually it's come a, (inaudible) Rf ..a long way and I think the, the Met in its approach to Work Force Planning is well ahead of most of the rest of the, the police service in England and Wales. RF Where, again the police need to do more, is in looking far enough ahead in time. The whole police service should be looking ten years ahead and looking at the technological, sociological, economic issues, as far as we can detect them and doing that all the time. RF And then thinking about, you know, wh—what we need to recruit, who we need to recruit, what the impact's going to be internally, you know, the change of the workforce mix to cope with whatever we've got to cope with. RF And, and refreshing that, year on year. Mm. Okay. Can I just do, one, one, one last question. Really just to talk a bit about the national training and Positive Action programs. What do you think is working, currently working well in the Met and where do you think perhaps the Met aren't at its best?

The Met responded well to diversity matters and I would s—mention diversity matters, 'cause that was the, you know, the major thematic on, on diversity training which I conducted and it's not from pride on my part but I mean I, I still think that it's worth going back to that 2003 publication. The, I think the Met has tried hard around getting the business case out, because we needed to move on from the Give everybody two days'

training and we've solved it, which was, you know, the one size fits all which clearly is not right, because we've not got everybody (inaudible) the same and neither have we got everybody starting with the same level of knowledge and, and experience. The, the problem I think is twofold. First is, I come back to the size, but it's how you get a consistency of approach across the whole organisation, both in terms of the geographical spread and in terms of the specialist spread and the second thing is that 80 per cent of learning goes on in the work place, not off the job, which is why the real importance is ensuring that you have got as a absolutely essential complement to off the job input, on the job good supervision and a really good PDR process.

	and a really good PDR process.
	(inaudible)
RR	Because if you get all the – off the job stuff really high quality, but you're not then helping to embed and take people on, through what's happening in the work place
	Yuh
RF	then, that initial bit is not totally wasted, but is not going to be optimised.
	And what's your, you view on how good the Met are at the PDR process?
RF	They're about as good as any other police force on PDR, but there are two problems always: one
	(inaudible) That's not encouraging!
RF	No, no, there's two problems. One is – it is not a form, it is not an IT system, it is the daily

RF ...interaction between team leaders and their teams at every level and secondly, we have got to have supervisors who are competent and confident both to challenge and to pull through.

(inaudible) just for my benefit. You say not as good, they're about the same as the others. How good are the others, then, so I can work out how good the Met are?

RF No, again, the Service has come a long way and we've now got, I'm glad to say, PDR recognised nationally and (inaudible) as far as the Met concerned, corporately, you know as something which is a high priority, because it's actually what drives performance.

(inaudible) perhaps I'm, I'm not clear. Are they good, fair, or are they an A, B, C or D (inaudible) with A, B and (inaudible)

RF They're – what shall I say? Generally, they meet the standard but unfortunately there are pockets where they don't meet the standard and we actually need to be taking it above the standard that (inaudible) around the Service at the moment because the standards around the Service is not going to sustain policing for the long term.

Perhaps (inaudible) clarify that. I, I, I don't have a, I don't have a bar to mark it against 'cause I'm not clear, I'm not completely clear about what the standard is, but I (inaudible) if you can just help me. If you were writing a report on the Met and you had, you've, you've you've, done an Inspection Report and you had to allocate a, a grade, now, in, in — could you alloget, get a grade being A and B to where the Met are and then I, give me an idea of where the other services are?

RF I'm very reluctant just to pluck

I'm not going to hold you to it

number 2. It is standard that is to be measured against is Home Office Circular 14 of 2003 which lays out what PDR should look like. And we have got a Met-wide process and we've got everybody recognising that PDR needs to happen and that's actually a not inconsiderable achievement.

	I'm going to ask you to humour me, then
RF	Right
	(inaudible). I haven't read the circular and I'm going to, if I ask for it it, it may take two days for me to get it.
RF	No, (inaudible)
	I just want to go away, while I'm not going to hold you, you know, it's not, I'm not going to hold you to it or pin you against the wall. Just give me an idea, so in some way in my mind I can understand. Look, they're about, they're a sor—sort of a C and A is excellent. They're sort of a D, they're (inaudible). So if you just give me an A, B, C, that's all I need an answer to, to and then I think I don't have any further questions.
RF	I would say B, but could do better.
	Okay, that's fine. Thank you.
RF	You're really demanding!
	I was being polite!
	Don't want to keep you in after school.
RF	No. (laughter)

	would they be?
RF	That you only have three recommendations.
	Okay.
RF	Or four. But I mean, keep it (inaudible)
	And that's because
RF	Very simple
	the Met are tired of change, is that right?
RF	Well, no, no; it's, you know - it's about concentrating people's mind
	Right
RF	on a few things which if they get right will make the difference, rather than having too many.
	Okay.
RF	Right? So I, I'd be really pleased if it was, you know. I mean you have now lots of conclusions but actually you just want these few things

Is, is there, can you give us a sense of if, if-- once we produce our report, if I were to ask you for two or three things that would make you jump for joy by way of recommendations, what

	Okay	
RF	attended to.	
	Mm hm	
	Supervision, particularly first line supervision, is absolutely key. For having confident and competent supervisors who will challenge poor performance and will pull through real potential.	
	Okay	
	Secondly you need a monitoring system that not just gets the data but asks the question: So what? And then there's an action plan to do something about it, and thirdly, that you find a way of engaging with and helping to move on, that middle section of the work force.	
END OF SIDE A		
RF	their Service.	
	Right.	
RF	Because they've been around long enough	
	Right	
RF	to be – what shall I say? – bringing with them things as used to be done.	

RF Engaging with them to For what purpose?  $\mathsf{RF}$ ..to help them to – what shall I say? – to adopt the cultures and practices that we need for you know, the second decade of the twenty-first century, rather than what they've leant and experienced, br-- bringing in from the last decade of the twentieth century. Okay. CB Okay. I, I understand exactly what you're saying. Margaret, do you any, have any further questions? No, (inaudible) MB СВ Okay. Is there anything to which you've sort of prepared a wonderful answer that we need to hear? RF I didn't prepare any wonderful answers, Okay JF ...I, I, I wondered whether you were going to ask me about Duty Calls. We were going to, RF All I would say

I still don't understand. En—Engaging with them for...?

We were going to ask you about the status of that report and why it was, why it wasn't published. We were also going to ask you, what relevance does that have to the Metropolitan Police Service?

RF Right. It was a conscious decision not to have the Met as one of the forces inspected.

Yes.

RF And that was deliberate because the Met has been, had a lot of inspection and we were trying to, know, within the decision only to have six Forces it was trying to get a balance and if we don't, if we'd had the Met in there it would have unbalanced

Yeah, go on

RF ...because of the size of it. I think the, the partic—well, the area particularly relevant to this Review is the, the chapter on recruitment, retention and progression, which has gone out to all Forces and police authorities and it is — I think it is worth reading. It wasn't published because there was a, a view within the Inspectorate that we didn't have enough hard, evidential basis. I have a real, I've had a real difficulty in being an HMI, particularly in the area of HR and, and diversity. A lot of stuff is around perceptions and not just reality 'cause we're dealing with people. But I respected the fact that we were needing to, to if you like have a standard which we worked by; I'm glad that we've now got to the point where we have at least a closing commentary on our Web site, which the whole public can read and this has gone out to all police forces and authorities. Now the only people who can't see the whole thing in detail is the rest of the public, but it is not a classified document so, you know, I mean there are ways which this will get, if, you know, if the, the public are interested enough then they can ask to see it. I mean I'm not counselling that

..and, and is it possible for us to have a copy of the full report?

RF (inaudible) the Metropolitan Police Authority's got a copy somewhere, so I mean it's, you know, I think, but I can send you a copy

	Right
RF	It's not
	No, that'd be useful
RF	(inaudible) right?
	Yeah, that would be great
RF	But I did send it out. After we'd had discussions with the HRC last year sent it out, under the Chief Inspector's letter to all Forces and Police Authorities.
	Okay
RF	So it's around somewhere within the MPA.
	That's great
	Great, brilliant. Brilliant
RF	But I, Cindy, I will send you a copy of the four chapters
	(inaudible) that would be fantastic. Okay. Well, thanks ever so much.
	Thank you.

I'll make sure that staff get you a copy of your transcript for you to approve. If there's anything else you think of that you would like to say to us, then send it by all means to Siobhan. Okay? Thank you very much.

RF Thank you very much; thank you for according me the opportunity. (inaudible) I look forward to seeing the final results.