



## FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST



**Request Number:** F-2018-00341

**Keyword:** Human Resources

**Subject:** PSNI Inspector 2017

### Request and Answer:

Your request for information has now been considered. In respect of Section 1(1)(a) of the Act I can confirm that the Police Service of Northern Ireland does the information to which your request relates and this is being provided to you. We further consider the information you seek in your request is exempt by virtue of Sections 31, 38 and 40 of FOIA and have detailed our rationale as to why this exemption applies. We have also provided you with links to guidance issued by the Information Commissioner's Office which we have followed in responding to your request.

### Request

In relation to PSNI Inspector process 2017 all records written or otherwise in relation to quality assurance of the process and any material in relation to any issues raised by any party in relation to validity, fairness or any other query regarding the process and results.

### Answer

Please find the information requested which is provided at the end of this correspondence in a redacted format for the reasons as outlined below:

Section 17(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires the Police Service of Northern Ireland, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) to provide you the applicant with a notice which:

- (a) states that fact,
- (b) specifies the exemption in question and
- (c) states (if not otherwise apparent) why the exemption applies.

The exemption/s, as well as the factors the Department considered when deciding where the public interest lies, are listed below:

Section 31 (1)(a) the prevention or detection of crime (b) the apprehension or prosecution of offenders – Law Enforcement

Section 38 (1) (a) endanger the physical or mental health of any individual, or (b) endanger the safety of any individual

## Section 40(2)(a)(b) by virtue of Section 40(3)(a)(i) – Personal Information

The full text of exemptions can be found at [www.legislation.gov.uk](http://www.legislation.gov.uk) and further guidance on how they operate can be located on the Information Commissioners Office website [www.ico.org.uk](http://www.ico.org.uk).

Section 40, Personal Information, is an absolute exemption which means there is no requirement on the Public Authority to consider whether there is a public interest in disclosure. This is so because personal data is governed by other law (The Data Protection Act 1998). A disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act is a release of information to the world in general and not just to the individual applicant.

The information redacted by PSNI relates to persons who we consider could be identified from that information. The information within the documents constitutes the ‘personal data’ of those individuals. We have therefore considered whether the disclosure of this personal data is subject to the exemption at section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (by virtue of S40 (3) (a) (i)). If the disclosure of the personal data would contravene any of the eight data protection principles contained within the Data Protection Act 1998, the exemption at section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 will apply. Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 by virtue of section 40(3)(a)(i) states:-

“(2) Any information to which a request for information relates is also exempt information if

- a) it constitutes personal data which do not fall within subsection (1), and
- b) either the first or the second condition below is satisfied.

(3) The first condition is –

a) in a case where the information falls within any of paragraphs (a) to (d) of the definition of “data” in section 1(1) of the Data Protection Act 1998, that the disclosure of the information to a member of the public otherwise than under this Act would contravene – i. any of the data protection principles ...”

The eight principles within the Data Protection Act, are principles of good information handling standards which PSNI must comply with in relation to how it handles personal information, including deciding whether to disclose it or not. In particular, the first principle requires personal data to be processed ‘fairly and lawfully’. In considering whether it is ‘fair’ to individuals to release this information about them, PSNI considered the likely expectations of those individuals and the nature of the information involved. It is unlikely that it would be within the expectations of these individuals that their identification information would be put into the public domain. Therefore disclosure would be in contravention of the first Data Protection Principle as it would be ‘unfair’ to those individuals to release it and PSNI has removed that information.

Section 31 is a qualified and prejudice-based exemption. This means that the legislators have determined that it is necessary to evidence the harm in release and to conduct a public interest test.

Section 38 is a prejudiced based, qualified exemption, which means that it is the Public Authority's responsibility to evidence the Harm which releasing the information may cause. PSNI must also consider the balance of the public interest in releasing the information against the public interest in withholding it.

A summary of the Harm and Public Interest Test considerations for Sections 31 and 38 is provided below.

### **Harm**

Due to the information being requested which falls under this exemption if disclosed would or would likely prejudice Police functions and the information would be useful to terrorist / criminals to commit crime and therefore endangering individuals. Releasing these details would allow criminals, and

anyone intent on hampering police law enforcement duties, thus impacting on the prevention and detection of crime. Disclosure of any event locations used by PSNI could put individuals at risk and impact on their safety if this information was released into the public domain.

## **Public Interest Test**

### **Factors Favouring Release – Section 31**

Release of this information contains detail which could inform how public money is spent and provide an insight into PSNI's use of law enforcement. This enhanced knowledge would assist in providing transparency in the way PSNI carry out their day-to-day delivery of operational law enforcement. The public have a right to expect transparency and accountability in relation to the use of Public Funds.

### **Factors Favouring Retention – Section 31**

Disclosure of this information could compromise law enforcement tactics and within the document are details, which if any persons were involved in crime would be able to use to assist them to avoid detection. Disclosure of details about email addresses and phone numbers could compromise the PSNI's law enforcement abilities by bombarding the addresses with emails and keeping the telephone lines engaged. This could also increase cyber-attacks.

This would therefore hinder the detection of crime and further knowledge that such information could be obtained in this way would encourage further crime, therefore hindering the prevention of crime. To release information which reveals police operational methodology and in combination with any other information they have gathered to try and prejudice law enforcement.

### **Factors Favouring Release - Section 38**

Release of venues / locations which PSNI use for work purposes outside Police establishments would lead to a better informed public and would show transparency and accountability on the part of PSNI.

### **Factors Favouring Retention - Section 38**

Release of venues / locations that PSNI use outside the Police establishments would compromise the health and safety of individuals involved and could lead to attacks on any personal attending these locations and in addition innocent bystanders as in the past these attacks have been known to be indiscriminate in nature.

## **Decision**

The Police Service is charged with enforcing the law, preventing and detecting crime and protecting the communities we serve. Whilst there is a public interest in the transparency of the law enforcement role of the Police Service and providing assurance that the PSNI is appropriately and effectively dealing with crime, there is a strong public interest in safeguarding the integrity of the police service. The PSNI has a duty to fulfil its law enforcement role and whilst there is a public interest in the transparency of policing activities and the appropriateness of how public funds are allocated, in Policing, the delivery of effective law enforcement is a priority. To release commercial locations which PSNI use for events etc.; would not be in the public interest. Both criminal and terrorist elements could use this information to plot activities which could be harmful to both the police and innocent bystanders as attacks in the past have been indiscriminate. PSNI must ensure that law enforcement responsibilities are not adversely affected by the release of direct dial numbers and e-mail addresses, although the information may be of public interest PSNI has a duty of care to the community it serves.

The release of information under the Freedom of Information Act is a release into the public domain and not just to the individual requesting the information. Once information is disclosed by FOI there is no control or limits as to who or how the information is shared with other individuals, therefore a release under FOI is considered a disclosure to the world in general. While there is a strong public interest in releasing the information requested the PSNI must ensure that law enforcement is not

adversely affected.

The Service is currently under SEVERE threat from terrorists and disclosure of this level of information has the potential to assist those criminal elements seeking to carry out attacks against police officers. The Police Service will not disclose information that will put officers' lives at risk as the safety of individuals is of paramount importance and by releasing operational policing details into the public domain has the potential to assist criminal elements to launch attacks at police officers

For the above reasons I believe that the exemptions quoted are engaged and the information provided should be in a redacted format.

If you have any queries regarding your request or the decision please do not hesitate to contact me on 028 9070 0164. When contacting the Freedom of Information Team, please quote the reference number listed at the beginning of this letter.

If you are dissatisfied in any way with the handling of your request, you have the right to request a review. You should do this as soon as possible or in any case within two months of the date of issue of this letter. In the event that you require a review to be undertaken, you can do so by writing to the Head of Freedom of Information, PSNI Headquarters, 65 Knock Road, Belfast, BT5 6LE or by emailing [foi@psni.pnn.police.uk](mailto:foi@psni.pnn.police.uk).

If following an internal review, carried out by an independent decision maker, you were to remain dissatisfied in any way with the handling of the request you may make a complaint, under Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act, to the Information Commissioner's Office and ask that they investigate whether the PSNI has complied with the terms of the Freedom of Information Act. You can write to the Information Commissioner at Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF. In most circumstances the Information Commissioner will not investigate a complaint unless an internal review procedure has been carried out, however the Commissioner has the option to investigate the matter at his discretion.

Please be advised that PSNI replies under Freedom of Information may be released into the public domain via our website @ [www.psnj.police.uk](http://www.psnj.police.uk)

Personal details in respect of your request have, where applicable, been removed to protect confidentiality.

## PSNI 2017 Inspector Promotion Process

**Moderator Team:** Chief Superintendent [REDACTED] (Chief Moderator), Superintendent [REDACTED] Detective Superintendent [REDACTED] and Superintendent [REDACTED]

s.F40  
s.F40(2)(a)  
s.F40(2)(b)  
s.F40(3)(ai)

### Moderator Report

The promotion process took place in [REDACTED] Castlereagh between Monday 11 September and Friday 22 September 2017. There were four panels each day, consisting generally of two Police officers and one member of Police Staff. The Panels were chaired by a Superintendent supported by a Chief Inspector and Deputy Principal Officer. Moderators were present at some point every day and additional observers included members of PSNI HR department, and College of Policing, [REDACTED] an independent observer. Only one was present in an interview at any time.

s.F38  
s.F38(1)(a)  
s.F38(1)(b)

There was a good mix of genders across the panels and at moderating roles. Furthermore members of panels at times rotated to ensure that a consistent level of assessing was maintained and also allowed for the sharing of good practice.

On Tuesday 19 September one of the panel chairs, Supt [REDACTED] was unable to attend due to a family emergency which developed on the 18 September. Discussion was had with the HOHR [REDACTED] and a decision was agree to supplement the panel with Supt [REDACTED]. Supt [REDACTED] had been heavily involved in moderating the Sergeant and Inspector process and had also attended the assessor training. While this would have precluded her returning to her moderating role, it was not an issue as she had already been scheduled to be on annual leave from 20/9/17 until the 22/9/17 and the moderating schedule had already taken account of that absence.

s.F40  
s.F40(2)(a)  
s.F40(2)(b)  
s.F40(3)(ai)

### Location and Logistics

The interview rooms in [REDACTED] were away from the main part of the hotel in a private wing where no-one else had occasion to be. The access to the area was controlled by a member of HR and the area was quiet. The timetable was made out to accommodate up to four candidates a day which appeared to be achievable although some of the assessors did complain about the amount of time they had to write up the candidates' notes, however the amount of time available focused their minds to achieve the task in hand

s.F38  
s.F38(1)(a)  
s.F38(1)(b)

**Administration** - No issues identified

### Panel

Each moderator observed at least one interview for each panel. Each panel followed the script, asked a mixture of past and future focused questions. The questions were agreed and disseminated to each panel at the beginning of each day along with the presentation

topic. The presentation topic of Leading People was followed by an extended period of questioning following which 6 further questions were asked across the competency areas. Observations indicated that prompts were used appropriately and the same amount of time was afforded to each candidate for questions. At the end of the interview, each panel member independently assessed the candidate and scored them prior to discussing the performance with the rest of the panel. Each assessor was asked to talk through their assessment and score before overall discussion and an appropriate score was awarded after this. There was constructive debate in some cases where there was a difference in scoring and agreement was reached, on the basis of the evidence provided, as to what the final score should be in a professional manner. There tended not to be a huge deviation between scores of assessors.

### **Verification of evidence**

A process had already been agreed in respect of how the panels dealt with any occasions where evidence needed to be verified. The incidents were highlighted to the Chief Moderator who reviewed the case with the panel to identify the key issues for concern. Due to the range of Supt from across different branches and departments the majority of verification checks were able to be progressed by the moderating and assessing teams.

### **Overall**

Each panel observed strictly maintained the process of individually writing up the candidate's performance before discussing with other panel members. In all panels there was open and necessary challenge across panel members as required. Overall the process was run fairly, professionally and panels provided candidates with every opportunity to perform effectively through putting them at ease from the start and encouraging them through appropriate prompts.

**PSNI INSPECTORS' PROMOTION PROCESS 2017**

Report of the Independent Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Adviser

Dr [REDACTED]

April 2017

s.F40

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(ai)

---

## Introduction

This report presents an independent view, from an equality and diversity perspective, on the delivery of the 2017 PSNI Inspectors' Promotion Process. The comments in the report are based on my observations of an Exercise Consultation meeting at Lisnasharragh on the 16<sup>th</sup> June 2017 and my observations of the assessment of candidates at [REDACTED] on the 12<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> of September 2017.

s.F38  
s.F38(1)(a)  
s.F38(1)(b)

## 1 Exercise Consultation Meeting

- 1.1 The purpose of the meeting, which was led and facilitated by Occupational Psychologists from the College of Policing, was to review a number of potential presentation topics and interview questions (including prompts), which had been developed by the College, and identify those that would be most appropriate for inclusion in the 2017 Inspectors' Promotion process. Those attending the meeting were also asked to identify how a good candidate might respond to the questions being asked.
- 1.2 The review panel comprised three female and three male officers, with input from two senior officers, one male and the other female, who were performing the role of Moderators for the Inspector process. When evaluating the appropriateness of questions, the panel members were given the challenging task of ensuring that the presentation topics and the questions relating to each of the Personal Behaviours were appropriately worded, relevant to the rank, of equal difficulty/complexity and fair to candidates from different backgrounds, including specialisms. As one would expect, the panel engaged in robust discussions about the content, wording, fairness and level of difficulty of the draft questions and provided a number of constructive suggestions as to how some of the presentation topics and draft questions could be re-worked. The fairness of questions, particularly in relation to officers from different work backgrounds featured prominently in the panel discussions.

At the end of the consultation the Psychologists from the College committed to redrafting the assessment material to reflect the outcome of the panel discussion.

## 2 Presentation and Interviews

- 2.1 I observed four candidates being assessed at [REDACTED] Hotel on the 12<sup>th</sup> September and four on the 21<sup>st</sup> September. On each of my site visits I observed the assessments being made by four different panels. Five of the candidates I observed were male and three were female. In

s.F38  
s.F38(1)(a)  
s.F38(1)(b)

---

seven of the eight panels that I observed two of the assessors were male and one was female. The remaining panel comprised two female and one male assessor. Four of the panel chairs were female and four were male. The equitable gender balance among panel chairs, particularly at this level of seniority, is a positive element of the assessment process and is to be commended.

- 2.2 The assessment site within the hotel was relatively self-contained, with all the assessment rooms being co-located in a wing on the 2nd floor at the rear of the hotel. The assessment rooms were spacious hotel bedrooms from which the bed had been removed and a large desk added to seat the interview panel. Candidates were seated across the desk from the panel and were given the choice of standing or remaining seated during their presentations. A clip-board was located sufficiently close to the desk to enable candidates to give their presentations without having to project their voices. The rooms had a comfortable temperature, and the lighting, while adequate for candidates, was somewhat subdued and caused some problems for assessors later in the day when they had to complete their reports on candidates.
- 2.3 To help candidates manage their time a digital clock, operated by a member of the panel, was placed on the desk in their direct line of sight. A similar clock was placed on the desk facing the panel. The digital clocks were used to time each discrete element of the process, including the individual interview questions. The rigorous timing of all elements of the process reflects best practice and helped ensure that candidates were provided with equal opportunity to demonstrate the behaviours being assessed.
- 2.4 My observations of the presentations and interviews can be summarised as follows.
- All of the Panel Chairs, in line with good practice, adhered to a standardised script when briefing candidates about how their interview would be conducted. While the Chairs' introductory remarks were largely scripted they were not overly formal and were delivered in a manner that helped put candidates at ease.
  - The use of digital clocks with audible alarms that sounded when the set time had elapsed ensured that all candidates received the same time to deliver their presentations and respond to questions from the panel. Candidates who finished their presentation before 10 minutes had elapsed were invited to make use of the remaining time. In line with good practice, there was only one hand-over between panel members when questioning candidates about their presentations. In large part, the questions asked by panel members were aimed at clarifying what was being said and finding what, if anything, lay behind the competency descriptors given by candidates, with particular emphasis placed on 'how' candidates would demonstrate the behaviours they described. While some

---

candidates experienced difficulty in answering the questions posed by the panel, on no occasion was a candidate unbalanced and left exposed by the line of questioning being pursued.

- The panel members were exceptionally diligent in attempting to record the content of the presentations and as a consequence rarely lifted their heads to make eye contact with candidates. On occasions, candidates paced their delivery to help the panel keep up with what they were saying. To make the presentation feel more authentic, at least from the candidates' perspective, it might be best in future competitions for one member of each panel to maintain good eye contact with the candidate and simply record the salient points of the presentation and leave it to the other two panel members to take detailed notes.
- Prior to each interview question being asked, the relevant panel member clearly identified the Personal Behaviour being assessed and stated whether the question was future focused or based on past behaviour.
- On both days that I attended the assessment site the Personal Behaviour areas were covered in the same order by all of panels with only one hand-over between panel members. On a small number of occasions the Panel chair sought clarification on a candidate's answer to a question asked by another panel member.
- While all candidates received the same questions in the same order on each of the days, the questions were different between the days.
- All of the panels were conscientious in their use of digital clocks to ensure that candidates were given the same time to answer questions.
- The style of questioning was supportive of candidates. It was commonplace for interviewers to restate the question to help candidate's get back on track and to show humility when, despite repeated prompts the candidate did not appear to understand the question being asked. Question probes were used, where appropriate, to help provide candidates with the opportunity to evidence the behaviours being assessed.
- There was a high degree of consistency between panels and across candidates in the manner in which the interviews were conducted. There was no discernible difference in the level of focus displayed by the panels on the two occasions I visited the assessment site (12<sup>th</sup> September and the 21<sup>st</sup> September).
- All of the observed panels were exceptionally disciplined in independently classifying and evaluating the evidence they had recorded prior to engaging in discussion to achieve an agreed rating for each candidate. In line with good practice, no comments or remarks were made about a candidate's performance until the classification and evaluation of evidence had been completed.

- 
- The panel discussions to achieve a consensus rating on each of the personal behaviours were appropriately robust and when there was disagreement on the grade awarded, discussion focused on the evidence that had been recorded. On a number of occasions the Panel Chair played an important role in reminding panel members that the candidate did not actually answer the question being asked and that the 'level' of the answer needed to be interpreted with regard to the rank being assessed. The role of the Chair in achieving a fair and valid assessment was more crucial in this promotion process than in other PSNI promotion processes I have observed.
  - During three of the interviews I was aware of some background noise outside the hotel ( eg people talking, machinery being operated, cars driving past), however on no occasion did I feel that the noise was sufficient to distract candidates during their presentation or interview.

### **3 Administration**

- 3.1 The assessment process ran smoothly on both of the days I attended the site. This reflects the detailed administrative planning that underpinned the assessment, the level of competence and experience of the administrative team and the self-contained nature of the assessment site.

### **4. Conclusion**

- 4.1 All of the interviews I observed were undertaken with a high degree of diligence and professional rigour. There was a high degree of consistency in the treatment of candidates across all of the panels observed. Panel members were conscientious in independently classifying and evaluating the evidence they recorded prior to engaging in discussion to agree grades. All of the discussions focused entirely on the evidence recorded and were interpreted in relation to the question that had been asked. In conclusion all of the candidates I observed were treated fairly, considerately and were provided with equality of opportunity to demonstrate the Personal Behaviours being assessed.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 September 2017 13:01  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE [PSNI ONLY]; FW: OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]: Appeal - Inspector Promotion Process

**Importance:** High

This e-mail has been marked OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE [PSNI ONLY]. This email contains sensitive information. Do not disclose or disseminate outside of the PSNI without firstly seeking permission from the originator.

s.F40

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(ai)

Superintendent Walls

Please see email chain below which includes an appeal by [REDACTED] in relation to the interview stage of the Inspector promotion process, and the outcome of the Stage 1 Appeal from [REDACTED]

I would be grateful if you would consider this appeal at Stage 2 and advise [REDACTED] (in my absence) of the outcome within 7 days of the date of this correspondence.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
*Internal Resourcing*  
*HR Department*  
*Lisnasharragh*  
*Ext.* [REDACTED]

s.F31

s.F31(1)(a)

s.F31(1)(b)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 September 2017 12:54  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]: Appeal - Inspector Promotion Process  
**Importance:** High

s.F40

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(ai)

This e-mail has been marked OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]

[REDACTED]

Guide Dogs were at the hotel week commencing 18<sup>th</sup> September and we unfortunately had no control over this.

The candidate did not advise us of this at the time nor did he alert one of the candidate co-ordinators who went into his preparation room at least twice during the preparation time.

I can confirm that the officer did not alert the candidate co-ordinator when she entered his room. I can also advise that there was another officer in the adjoining office completing their preparation who has not raised any issues.

I have asked the candidate co-ordinator if she remembers the day and if she heard any dog barking and she has no recollection of same.

The officer did not report this to the candidate co-ordinator or myself at any stage and he would have had the opportunity to do so during and after the preparation period and before and after the interview.

Therefore the officer's appeal [REDACTED]

s.F40

[REDACTED]

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(ai)

[REDACTED]

Internal Selection & Promotions Manager

s.F31

HR Service Centre

s.F31(1)(a)

Lisnasharragh

s.F31(1)(b)

Ext [REDACTED]

s.F40

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 21 September 2017 14:21

**To:** zPolicePromotions

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]: RE: Stage 3 Inspectors Process Invite to Presentation/Interview - Amendment to room numbers

**Importance:** High

s.F40

This e-mail has been marked OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

Good Afternoon [REDACTED]

s.F40(3)(ai)

I'm not sure if it is you that deals with complaints about the process but if it isn't could you direct me to the right person?

I had my board on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> September arriving at 1015hrs. The complaint I have is that when I was trying to prep for my presentation there was a dog right outside the window for the full 30 minutes barking and howling.

It might not sound significant but it was impossible to concentrate under extreme pressure with that continual racket. It completely threw me and not only severely impacted on my presentation preparation but on my interview as well.

Because I had so little time to prep the presentation I was not in a position to get up and inform the invigilators at the time so was completely helpless to do anything about it. I am aware that there were signs regarding background noise because it was a working hotel but having a barking howling dog right outside the window is certainly not acceptable background noise.

As you can appreciate these boards are extremely stressful and I feel that I was unable to come anywhere near close to my potential because of the impact of it. As a result I am extremely frustrated as such a situation should not occur and feel that I have to bring the matter to your attention.

Many Thanks

[REDACTED]

s.F40

[REDACTED]

s.F40(2)(a)

Candidate Number [REDACTED]

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(ai)

**From** [REDACTED] **On Behalf Of** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 September 2017 14:19  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]: Stage 3 Inspectors Process Invite to Presentation/Interview - Amendment to room numbers

s.F31  
s.F31(1)(a)  
s.F31(1)(b)  
s.F40  
s.F40(2)(a)  
s.F40(2)(b)  
s.F40(3)(ai)

This e-mail has been marked OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]

Colleagues

Please note the following amendment to the initial invite to presentation/interview you received:

**PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU ARRIVE 15 MINUTES PRIOR TO YOUR PREPARATION FOR PRESENTATION TIME. YOU SHOULD MAKE YOUR WAY TO THE FIRST FLOOR AND FOLLOW THE SIGNAGE FOR ROOMS 213 to 223. THE PSNI CANDIDATE CO-ORDINATOR WILL MEET YOU THERE AND BRING YOU TO THE WAITING AREA.**

Please note that there will be signage from reception within the hotel directing you to the waiting area.

Any additional queries should be addressed to **zInternalSelection&Promotions**.

You are reminded that should you be unable to attend you should email **zInternalSelection&Promotions** immediately.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Internal Resourcing  
HR Service Centre  
Lisnasharragh  
Ext 4 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]@psni.pnn.police.uk

s.F31  
s.F31(1)(a)  
s.F31(1)(b)  
s.F40  
s.F40(2)(a)  
s.F40(2)(b)  
s.F40(3)(ai)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 September 2017 13:04  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]: Inspectors Promotion Board - Appeal

s.F31  
s.F31(1)(a)  
s.F31(1)(b)  
s.F40  
s.F40(2)(a)  
s.F40(2)(b)  
s.F40(3)(ai)

To whom it may concern,

I wish to make a formal appeal in relation to the Inspectors promotion board that I sat on

The basis of my complaint is that I believe my performance was adversely affected due to a genuine mistake that was made by the chair of the panel in the very first question of the interview process following my presentation.

The presentation title which I received was in relation to the PSNI workforce being set to change dramatically and there were two questions that I had to answer in my presentation.

1. As an Inspector how will you build resilience in your team to ensure they keep pace with the changes that happen.
2. What steps will I take to make sure the team remain informed and engaged.

I spent 30 minutes preparing my answer and then delivered this in a ten minute presentation to what I thought was a high standard, believing I had covered both elements of the question in a comprehensive manner.

I sat down expecting ten minutes questioning on my presentation and the first follow up question I received was

"As an Inspector how will you build resilience in your team to ensure they keep pace with the changes that happen?"

This was a verbatim restatement of the first part of the presentation question and immediately unsettled and confused me as I believed I had just answered that question in detail in my presentation. The impact of this was that I immediately doubted myself and believed that the panel thought that I had completely failed to answer this element of the presentation. While I understand that the panel were entitled to probe and explore the

contents of my presentation the fact that this was a verbatim restatement of the question was an obvious assertion that I had failed to answer the question posed in the presentation topic.

The consequence of this was that my confidence was dented and this adversely affected my performance throughout the remainder of the interview process. In effect the panel chair gave me the impression that I had already failed an essential part of the presentation and interview exercise before I could deliver my answers to the interview questions. This thought pervaded my mind throughout the remainder of the interview and prevented me from properly focusing on the questions being asked. In particular, my performance in forward looking questions was impacted because my forward looking approach in the presentation appeared to be inadequate to the panel. I left the interview knowing that I had underperformed as a direct result of this adverse occurrence.

It was only after the interview that I began to regain my belief that I had, in fact, given a good presentation that answered both questions. I have concluded that the panel chair made a mistake in asking the presentation question again, believing it was a probe, and that she did not intend to re-state the presentation question to me. However, this mistake did unfairly affect my performance.

I respectfully request that the panel be asked to confirm that this happened as I have described and that they take into account the adverse effect this had on my performance during the remainder of the interview in awarding my overall exercise score.

I wish to make it clear that I do not believe there was any malicious intent on the part of my panel chair. I accept it was an honest mistake, however it was a mistake that unfairly and negatively impacted my performance.

Respectfully submitted

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Candidate number :** [REDACTED]

s.F40  
s.F40(2)(a)  
s.F40(2)(b)  
s.F40(3)(ai)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 September 2017 14:21  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]: RE: Stage 3 Inspectors Process Invite to Presentation/Interview - Amendment to room numbers  
**Importance:** High

s.F40  
s.F40(2)(a)  
s.F40(2)(b)  
s.F40(3)(ai)

This e-mail has been marked OFFICIAL [PSNI ONLY]

Good Afternoon [REDACTED]

I'm not sure if it is you that deals with complaints about the process but if it isn't could you direct me to the right person?

I had my board on [REDACTED]. The complaint I have is that when I was trying to prep for my presentation there was a dog right outside the window for the full 30 minutes barking and howling.

It might not sound significant but it was impossible to concentrate under extreme pressure with that continual racket. It completely threw me and not only severely impacted on my presentation preparation but on my interview as well.

Because I had so little time to prep the presentation I was not in a position to get up and inform the invigilators at the time so was completely helpless to do anything about it. I am aware that there were signs regarding background noise because it was a working hotel but having a barking howling dog right outside the window is certainly not acceptable background noise.

As you can appreciate these boards are extremely stressful and I feel that I was unable to come anywhere near close to my potential because of the impact of it. As a result I am extremely frustrated as such a situation should not occur and feel that I have to bring the matter to your attention.

Many Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Candidate Number

[REDACTED]

s.F40

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(ai)

## MODERATOR ROLE

Please see below the Moderator duties:

- Act as ambassador for the PSNI and the promotion process
- Advise over writing of presentation and interview exercise
- Ensure exercises used in the promotion process are valid
- Ensure the exercises used in the promotion process are appropriate and meaningful, testing and topical
- Endorse the interview exercise as suitable for delivery
- Attend key stages of the delivery of the promotion process on a sampling basis whilst they are in progress to demonstrate visibility to candidates and add an independent element for quality and consistency of delivery whilst representing the interests of the PSNI
- Adhere to appropriate confidentiality agreements and code of conduct

Code of Conduct:

- Must demonstrate no interests which conflict with the role of moderator – e.g. required to confirm no involvement in training candidates for the forthcoming promotion process
- Content of promotion process materials must not be discussed with anyone outside of the moderator group and College of Policing
- Inform College of Policing as soon as you are aware of a conflict of interest that may be perceived as a result of your knowledge of any promotion process candidate, e.g. close friend or relative
- If working on a PC or laptop ensure confidentiality of materials and correct disposal