



Keeping People Safe

MINUTES OF MEETING

NAME OF COMMITTEE: (SPEB)

DATE: 28th April 2022

TIME: 14.45 – 15.30

LOCATION: Dial in Conference

CHAIRPERSONS: [REDACTED]

s.F40

s.F40(2)

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(A)

s.F40(3)(A)(a)

MEMBERS:

NIPSA	[REDACTED]	
Police Federation		
HR Strategic Lead Internal Resourcing		
Internal Promotion		
Superintendent's Association		
Head of Employment		
Diversity		
Finance		
Head of Police College		
Chief Moderator		

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Note Taker	[REDACTED]
------------	------------

Apologies

[REDACTED]

s.F40

s.F40(2)

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(A)

s.F40(3)(A) 000001

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

1.0	Introduction, apologies noted.
2.0	Review of Previous Minutes: Approved
3.0	<p>Inspector Promotion Exam and numbers to Stage 2 Assessment</p> <p>■ I have checked with Workforce Planning and it is projected that there will be 47 Inspector vacancies. Therefore, the proposal is to take through the top 100 applicants through to interview from the exam. This information must be published before the exam. We currently have 358 candidates preparing to sit the Inspectors exam in a few weeks' time. Is this the agreement of the group that 100 is enough to take through to interview?</p> <p>■ This makes sense to me that we take double of 47 so rounding it to 100 seems to be a reasonable number to take through to interview. Although, we need to look at possibly delaying the next Inspectors process due to lack of vacancies and budget issues. This would be frustrating for those who have decided to skip this upcoming Inspector process, or who have decided to drop out as they will be expecting another Inspector process next year.</p> <p>■ This all depends on what the budget is like for next year. If the budget and organisational requirement is there, we will run another Inspector Process. If it's not, then we will have to look at delaying it. However, it's only recently that we have started running yearly processes for these generic posts but, it all comes down to the budget and organisational requirement.</p> <p>■ We should try to ensure that the current list is exhausted before we have a new list for Inspectors.</p> <p>■ The main issue we are having with exhausting the current Inspector list is that we have to carry out the Chief Inspector allocations first. It is possible that we may have a slight overlap in having 2 Inspector lists, the current and new one. We should however, be very close to exhausting the current list before the new one has been created.</p>

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

	<p>████ All content with this.</p>	<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>
4.0	<p>Sergeant Promotion Process Considerations</p> <p>████ The current situation with the Sergeant Process is that last year we had over 1700 applicants. With the current forecast for Sergeant vacancies, we would only be able to take circa 80 applicants from this large number through to the interview from the exam, promoting only 40. Therefore, we propose we delay the process, launching it in January 2023, with the exam being held in April 2023. This is to increase the number of vacancies available.</p> <p>████ To run a completion to get 70/80 individuals for interview wouldn't make sense and would be a waste of resources. Delaying it is the most feasible thing to do moving forward as there is still over 100 on the current Sergeant list.</p> <p>████ By the launch of the Sergeants process in January 2023, we will have a much clearer view on the budget and vacancies meaning we aren't letting people's expectations down. This will also give us more time to work on offering appointments to those on the current list.</p> <p>████ It is agreed that the launch of the Sergeants process will be delayed until January 2023 then, thank you.</p> <p>████ It is important that we provide the organisation with regular updates, stating our current situation in terms of processes so people aren't left wondering.</p>	
5.0	<p>SPEB Communications</p> <p>████ We will send out a communication to all Inspectors with regards to the numbers we are taking through to interview, and around the Sergeant's promotion process new provisional timelines</p>	<p>s.F40 s.F40(2) s.F40(2)(a) s.F40(2)(b) s.F40(3)(A) s.F40(3)(A)(a)</p>

6.0 AOB

It has come to my attention that we have different rules for different processes with regards to interview scoring. Internal Promotions have a rule in place whereby, candidates are able to drop one point below an average of 3 in their interviews. For example a process which would usually require 21, Promotions allow a score of 20 to go through, as long as there is no score of 1. This is not consistent with either Selection, or External Recruitment, who both require an average of 3 across the board. I believe that a level playing field should be made.

This was discussed and changed about a year ago by SPEB. It was decided that due to Internal Promotions being a generic and internal process for both Police officers and staff, that they would allow candidates the benefit of dropping one point in one competency or value but for promotion only. This has never been proposed or discussed for internal selection or external recruitment for which the rule of an average of 3 is consistently applied, with no dropping of one point.

I don't believe this is particularly fair as I believe we need to be consistent throughout all our processes.

Internal Selection for police staff can also be a gateway to promotions so it's resulting in different rules for different processes.

I think the rationale currently set out makes sense, giving those seeking promotion the benefit of dropping one point in a competency.

I also believe we may need to drop the rule whereby, if a candidate receives a score of 1, they have automatically failed. This is currently being reviewed as very few, if any, other forces use this rule, so we can add to this benchmarking.

I would prefer if we had a consistent approach across all processes in the organisation, regarding Promotions having one score lower than the rest. Maintaining consistency is the most important thing when it comes to these processes.

s.F40

s.F40(2)

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(A)

s.F40(3)(A)(a)

There is also inconsistency with how Police Officers cannot be promoted through selection in the same way Police Staff can.

This all needs to be reviewed, but I agree with that there should be consistency. This all needs to be fully reviewed.

This can be brought forward through the Review of Selection and Promotion.

We are still having the same issues with panels on boards. We need people to be told that they have to do it as it's an organisational requirement and that they must commit for the entire process.

I completely agree, there needs to be a commitment from people to assess on a panel as it is a requirement from the organisation.

We would be very appreciative of a direction being put forward which requires people to sit on panels. At this moment in time, it is my team's responsibility to ask and this is problematic.

In this circumstance, people may need to be told to sit on a panel and that they must commit for the entire process.

We will get this feedback sent out and take a look at the suggestions from regarding the scoring system across the organisation, and the issue raised by with regards to the panels.

s.F40

s.F40(2)

s.F40(2)(a)

s.F40(2)(b)

s.F40(3)(A)

s.F40(3)(A)(a)