

Leadership assessment research: Phase one final report

April 2017

**RESEARCH
WITH
PLYMOUTH
UNIVERSITY**

HMICFRS Leadership assessment research: Phase one final report

Executive summary

Introduction

In order to develop its approach to assessing leadership within the police forces it inspects, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) commissioned the University of Plymouth (www.plymouth.ac.uk) to explore how such assessment is done in policing institutions in the US, Australia and Scandinavia as well as comparable institutions in the UK (the Ministry of Defence (MOD), Ofsted, Care Quality Commission (CQC), and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP)). This report presents the emerging findings from Phase One of the study, which involved a review of the literature and interviews to address two key questions:

- **How do other UK based organisations assess leadership?** Organisations of interest include Ofsted, CQC, MoD, and HMIP; and
- **How do other police authorities inspect leadership?** Authorities of interest include Canada, United States, Australia and Scandinavia.

The research approach

A rapid review of academic and grey literature was undertaken, which included 65 documents (20 academic articles, 28 reports, 17 other such as books, theses and working papers). Additionally, semi-structured interviews were held with representatives from **Ofsted**, the **Kings Fund**, **CQC**, **Her Majesty's Prison Dartmoor**, the **College of Policing**, **HMICFRS** and an expert on the **MOD from Cranfield University**. To include international perspective, representatives from the **US Justice Department** and **Victoria, Australia Police Authority** were also interviewed.

Key findings

Overall, approaches to assessing leadership at an institutional level were fairly consistent, in that similar methods (interviews, focus groups, surveys, analysis of key documents) were used and similar lines of inquiry (to what extent are there clear governance procedures in place, to what extent is there a clear vision and

statement of strategy?) followed. Key features of both the ‘content’ and ‘process’ aspects of the inspection approaches were identified and summarised.

Content of inspections

Although there was a good deal of similarity between the ‘content’ of assessment inquiries, there were differences in the underpinning assumptions in relation to two key questions:

- **What is the purpose of the leadership being assessed?**


Approaches ranged from those that assume leadership to be about **enabling** the sound running of the force, or those that assume leadership to be about **transforming** relationships and proactively intervening in a **changing** environment. ‘Enabling’ leadership includes activities such as motivating followers, communicating objectives, creating a shared sense of identity and other activities which facilitate the effective running of the organisation. ‘Transforming’ leadership aims to move the organisation beyond its current boundaries by responding to changes in the external environment in innovative or creative ways.

- **Where is that leadership assumed to be located?**

Leadership is inspected at both the **individual** and the **collective** levels. The collective level of leadership was often inspected in relation to the organisation’s **culture**. When leadership is assumed to be located at the individual level, those in hierarchically superior positions are often rated by inspectors (or sometimes by followers) to assess their leadership capabilities. Inspecting leadership at the collective level often involves an assessment of the governance structures, overall performance ratings on key indicators as well as judgements concerning the organisation’s culture.

These dimensions are represented in Figure A.

Figure A: Underpinning assumptions



In Figure A, organisations involved in the study are placed in the quadrant which most aligns with the approach being taken. It is important to stress that categorising organisations in this way is not clear-cut, and elements of all four dimensions are often apparent in an organisation’s approach. In other words, focusing on ‘enabling’ and ‘transformational’ elements of leading need not be exclusive, and an assessment approach could encompass both. However, the dimensions suggest different **content** parameters along which the assessment process can be organised, and has the potential of alerting HMICFRS to aspects of assessment that they might otherwise overlook.

The inspection process and methods

Similar types of processes were used by the organisations considered in this research. The most frequently used processes include:

- Three to four day on-site inspections undertaken by teams of assessors. These inspections would require up to five to six days of preparation, and involve the assessment of strategic plans, performance management indicators and other governance documents. During the inspections the following activities would take place:
 - Interviews with senior management teams;
 - Focus groups with cross-sectional organisational representation;

- Attending Board meetings; and
- Meetings with stakeholders outside of the organisation (such as commissioning bodies, patients, community members).

This type of process was used by CQC and Ofsted.

- Remotely conducted surveys of senior management teams and their staff. This would include the completion of questionnaires aimed at assessing either individual leaders (such as the Leadership Profile questionnaire) or the organisational culture overall (such as the Organisational Culture Assessment questionnaire). Sometimes these surveys would be followed up by interviews or focus group activities.

This type of inspection was carried out by police forces in the US (Austin, Texas, Princeton).

The process by which inspections are carried out also differs in other ways:

- The extent to which inspections are carried out at a national, or more localised level;
- Whether or not the inspection is voluntary or mandatory - in the US, the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) inspection process is voluntary and has only received a 3% uptake (potentially because of the high costs police forces are required to absorb);
- Frequency of inspection:
 - Ofsted carries out targeted inspections (although, in the case of school inspections, this has been criticised);
 - CQC is currently carrying out a comprehensive inspection across all NHS Trusts in terms of the 'well – led' aspect but this is newly instituted and other inspection elements are more targeted.
- The use of self-report information or not;
- The inclusion of quantitative or qualitative data, or both. The research indicated a balance between these methods, with a tendency for police forces in the US to utilise quantitative tools and those UK Government organisations studied to utilise more qualitative methods; and
- Who carries out the inspection (external or internal people) and the extent to which inspection teams involve 'specialist' inspectors.

Key considerations in designing a process for assessing leadership

A range of different aspects of assessing leadership at an institutional level also emerged from the interview data; these should be considered when designing HMICFRS's leadership assessment process:

- Organisational members situated in different hierarchical roles can have very different views of how leadership operates in the same organisation. In particular, the views of senior management can vary from that of their followers. These variations can lead to difficulties for inspecting teams trying to make sense of conflicting perspectives in order to arrive at an overall judgement. For HMICFRS, this means that it will be important to create mechanisms for sharing and making sense of varying views in order to reach judgments.
- It is often desirable for organisations to know how leadership will be evaluated in advance. For instance, CQC has found it valuable for Trusts being inspected to prepare self-report material concerning how governance and performance management issues are conducted prior to their inspection. Similarly, HMICFRS could include pre-work for organisations to undertake prior to the inspection process and provide clear guidance about the scope of the leadership assessment.
- Data from interviews conducted with representatives of the Kings Fund and Victoria Police Force in Australia emphasised the way in which the mode and focus of the assessment process will itself perpetuate a particular 'model' of leadership. A key question to consider in designing the assessment process concerns how that process supports a particular form of leadership, and whether HMICFRS intends to promote that form of leadership through the inspection process.
- It is also interesting to note that both Ofsted and CQC (who, it could be argued represent the most well-developed leadership assessment processes we have reviewed) are in the process of changing the content of their leadership assessment. Both are beginning to include more outward-facing, community-related dimensions to their inquiries, and the CQC is also including exploration of facets of leadership pertaining to IT security and systems, proactive attention to longer-term financial sustainability, as well as the assessment of systems that foster continual learning. HMICFRS may want to consider the extent to which they wish to

incorporate these aspects of leadership into their own assessment process.

- Very little, if any, evaluative work appears to have been undertaken to assess the effectiveness of leadership assessment within the organisations reviewed here. This is consistent with the leadership development field more generally, where there has been little evaluation of the effectiveness of leadership development interventions.

Phase two

After a meeting between the research team from University of Plymouth and HMICFRS on 13th April 2017, it was decided that Phase Two of the research would focus on comparing methods of inspection, rather than the content areas of inspection.

To enable different methods to be compared, HMICFRS will facilitate the research team's access to two police forces in England. Three different data collection methods will be tested within each of these forces in May and June 2017. The methods to be tested include:

- A broad sample of organisational members being invited to complete an online quantitative survey instrument;
- A more limited sample of organisational members being invited to complete an online qualitative survey instrument; and
- A 'reality-testing' intervention which will include holding focus groups with partner organisations external to the particular police force to evoke their perceptions of leadership within the force.

The qualitative and quantitative survey data will be analysed to identify if and how the method of data collection has shaped the responses given. The research team will then visit each of the two participating police forces to conduct the third method, 'reality-testing'. This will involve focus groups with external stakeholders to explore perceptions of each police force's leadership. The focus group data will be compared with that collected through the surveys to identify any differences in internal and external perceptions of leadership. The findings from this comparative analysis will then be discussed in a workshop with staff

from each police force. The workshop will also test the degree to which the findings align with their own experiences and perceptions of leadership.

The findings from Phase Two will then be summarised in a report for HMICFRS and the findings presented at a meeting of the Inspection Development Group.

Contents

Executive summary	i
1 Introduction	1
1.1 The research approach	1
1.2 Report structure	3
2 HMICFRS’s approach to assessing leadership	4
2.1 Background	4
2.2 HMICFRS’s approach to assessing leadership	5
3 Key findings	9
3.1 Introduction	9
3.2 The inspection approach of UK organisations	9
3.3 The inspection approach of other police authorities	17
3.4 Performance measurement in policing: Issues and challenges	20
4 Conclusions	24
4.1 Introduction	24
4.2 Summary of results	24
4.3 Next steps: Phase two	29
5 Bibliography	32
Appendices	35
Appendix A – Leadership Questions in Assessment Instruments	35

1. Introduction

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) is responsible for evaluating the performance of police forces in England and Wales. Each force is inspected annually across a number of pillars: effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy through the Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy (PEEL) Programme. Although leadership has been incorporated within the PEEL Programme of inspections as a fourth pillar since 2015, a lack of evidence on effective approaches to leadership inspections has proved challenging. This has limited the ability to analyse, and therefore grade, the data collected. To develop HMICFRS's understanding of what constitutes an effective approach, the University of Plymouth was commissioned to research leadership assessment methodologies. The findings from this research are to be used by HMICFRS to inform their future approaches to the assessment of leadership.

The research involves two phases: in the first, a literature review of leadership assessment and interviews with other organisations who have assessed leadership was conducted; the findings from this phase will then be used to develop a new approach to leadership inspection, the feasibility and effectiveness of which will be tested by undertaking three comparative methods of assessment within two participating police forces in Phase Two. This report presents the findings from the first phase and the agreed design for the second phase of the study.

1.1. The research approach

To identify and review the available evidence on leadership assessment, a rapid review methodology was adopted which involved searching for and examining both academic and grey¹ literature. The review was informed by two key research questions:

- 1. How do other UK based organisations assess leadership?**
- 2. How do police authorities in other countries (Canada, United States, Australia and Scandinavia in particular) inspect leadership?**

¹ Grey literature is any document that is produced by government, academics, business or other organisation but not controlled by a commercial publisher.

These questions were used to develop key search words that were then applied in searches of both academic databases (Science Direct, EBSCO Business Source Complete and ProQuest) and Google. There was a particular focus on UK organisations that were known to conduct regular inspections, including: Ofsted, the Care Quality Commission (CQC), the Ministry of Defence (MOD), and the prison service. The European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) was also considered. A total of 65 relevant documents were identified and reviewed.

Semi-structured interviews were also being conducted with representatives from organisations which conduct assessments of leadership, are assessed on leadership or have particular expertise of assessment approaches. A total of 10 interviews have been conducted with nine different organisations. Table One below lists the organisations represented by the interviewees.

Table One: List of Organisations Interviewed

Organisation Name
Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS)
The College of Policing
Ofsted
Her Majesty’s Prison Dartmoor
Former Victoria Police Commissioner (Australia)
The King’s Fund
Care Quality Commission (CQC)
School of Defence and Security, Cranfield University (MOD expert)
US Justice Department

The interviews have typically been of 45 minutes duration and conducted via telephone or SKYPE (with the exception of one face-to-face interview). The purpose of the interviews was to explore approaches to the

assessment of leadership in more depth. The following topics were explored:

- The approach to inspections and assessments (e.g. frequency, specific focus or themes);
- How results are reported;
- How leadership is assessed and why (including how the approach has been developed); and
- How the effectiveness of the assessment process is measured.

The findings from the first phase of the research are being used to inform the approach of its second phase, in which different methods of leadership assessment will be tested. The findings presented in a draft version of this report and the approach to Phase Two were discussed during a meeting with HMICFRS in April 2017. It was agreed in this meeting that Phase Two will compare the benefits of three different methods: a qualitatively based survey, a quantitatively based survey, and focus groups with partner organisations external to the participating police force

1.2. Report structure

The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- Section Two: an overview of HMICFRS's current approach to the assessment of leadership, and its development, is presented;
- Section Three: the key findings on the approach of UK organisations and other police authorities to leadership assessment are summarised; and
- Section Four: the options for Phase Two are articulated, along with the final design for Phase Two as agreed between HMICFRS and the University of Plymouth research team in April 2017.


2. HMICFRS's approach to assessing leadership

2.1. Background

Police services now operate in an environment where performance is closely monitored to ensure that communities receive a level of service that represents and provides value for money. The reform and modernisation of the police service over the last three decades has taken place alongside other public service reforms. There has been a move away from traditional public administration to new public management (NPM) and a focus on service delivery. NPM is informed by business management principles and the private sector's efficiency, effectiveness and value for money ethos (Hood, 1991).

Police services are required to understand and effectively operate in a complex, social, political and organisational environment (Casey and Mitchell, 2007). Leadership is widely considered fundamental to high performance in these environments (Dobby et al., 2004; Boedker et al., 2001). As such, the need for police leadership is greater than ever (Meaklim and Sims, 2011). In the UK, clear police leadership on crime was set out as one of the top ten policing approaches the public said they wanted to see in the Casey Review in 2008. Leadership has also become a prominent theme in the literature on citizen focused policing (Lloyd and Foster, 2012), community engagement (Skogan et al, 2000; Cordner, 1998; and Myhill, 2012) and for police organisational management more generally (see Pearson-Goff and Herrington, 2013). However, perhaps a limitation of this literature is the lack of *objective* measures of leadership practice and development. Instead, much of the research focuses on the perceptions of leadership practice from the perspective of police and stakeholders. In an attempt to reverse this trend, the College of Policing have promoted guiding principles of leadership to incorporate all aspects of police organisational leadership as benchmarks (or indicators). These principles, shown in Figure One, have provided a level of *objectivity* to base questioning across all aspects of inspections.

Figure One: College of Policing’s Guiding Principles for Organisational Leadership



Source: College of Policing (2017) Guiding Principles of Organisational Leadership, p7.

2.2. HMICFRS’s approach to assessing leadership

HMICFRS currently measures performance through the PEEL Programme, which involves a bi-annual inspection of each of the 43 police forces in England and Wales. These inspections are conducted by a team of inspectors who collect and review data from websites, documents and site visits. At the site, inspectors conduct interviews and hold focus groups

with a variety of individuals within the force being inspected. As one HMICFRS interviewee described, the cycle of inspection visits are supplemented with 'reality testing' where an unannounced visit enables HMICFRS to observe policing first hand. Inspectors assess and give a graded judgment based on the pre-determined grading criteria for each of the dimensions measured. A police force can be graded as either: outstanding, good, requires improvement or inadequate.

Leadership has been inspected since the 2015 PEEL Inspection. However, based on our discussions with HMICFRS, we understand that HMICFRS have identified two key challenges to their inspections: there is not a single model of leadership used within policing, and there is a lack of evidence concerning the effectiveness of the methods undertaken. Therefore, the approach to leadership assessment is still being developed and different methods have been implemented in the 2015, 2016 and 2017 PEEL inspection cycles.

In the 2015 inspection, leadership was assessed through a series of questions that were embedded within two of the three pillars (efficiency and legitimacy). The core questions assessing leadership (see Table A1, Appendix A) evaluated the following dimensions and/or indicators of leadership within a force:

- current leadership capabilities (question 1);
- setting direction (question 2);
- leadership development (question 3);
- engagement and motivation (question 3); and
- the relation between leadership and the other pillars of PEEL (question 4).

In 2016, the leadership inspection was informed by the College of Policing's *Guiding Principles for Leadership*, which divides leadership into three themes: **understanding leadership**, **developing leadership** and **displaying leadership** (see Figure One). Three principles are set out within each theme, some of which are reflected in the questions used in the 2016 inspection. As shown in Table A2 (Appendix A), the questions assessed the following dimensions or indicators of leadership within police forces:

- Current leadership capabilities (questions 1 and 2);

- Learning and development (question 3);
- Diverse leadership team (question 5); and
- Innovation (question 4).

Although inspection has been assessed in the previous two PEEL cycles, unlike for efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy pillars, the collected data have not yet been used to grade police forces on leadership. Reflecting the absence of evidence of effective approaches to inspecting leadership, HMICFRS have acknowledged potential validity issues with the collected data. The potential for different interpretations of the leadership questions and “*how well does the force display leadership?*” in particular have been identified in HMICFRS’s own internal review (PEEL Leadership 2017 Narrative Document).

In the 2017 PEEL Inspection, leadership is being assessed through a new methodology. Leadership questions will be embedded within the other three pillars (as in 2015) and are informed by the College of Policing’s *Guiding Principles for Leadership* (as in 2016). Three broad areas of organisational leadership will be considered:

- Organisational justice, where leaders ensure that there is fairness in the force;
- Cultural change, where leaders manage change through an innovative, learning and adaptable culture and leadership selection that considers adaptation and change is promoted; and
- Deliberate people development, where leaders strategically develop the future organisational capability of the force.

The 2017 questions to be used in the spring inspections of legitimacy and efficiency are presented in Table A3 (Appendix A). The table indicates which dimension of leadership is being assessed through each question, for example: ‘how well do leaders demonstrate that they understand the importance of treating people with fairness and respect?’ addresses the dimensions of fairness and respect. Although some dimensions reflect the College of Policing’s guiding principles, others go beyond them.

HMICFRS anticipate that the findings from this research project, alongside the 2017 PEEL inspection results, will advance their understanding of effective approaches to the assessment of leadership within police forces. These findings will then be used to strengthen future

assessment approaches to ensure valid and reliable results are achieved
– in particular they should inform HMICFRS’s approach to inspecting
‘effective’ leadership.

3. Key Findings

3.1. Introduction

Phase One of the research explored how organisational leadership is assessed in other UK-based public sector institutions as well as in police forces in Canada, the United States, Australia and Scandinavia. The key findings from both the rapid review of the literature and interviews on UK approaches are presented in this section of the report, beginning with the findings from UK-based organisations. Following this, an overview of some of the key issues facing assessments is offered.

3.2. The inspection approach of UK organisations

This phase of the research investigated UK-based organisations known to conduct regular inspections of public sector authorities including the CQC, Ofsted, the prison service and the MOD. Consideration was also given to the approach of EFQM's Excellence Model, which is used within the private sector to assess leadership.

Like HMICFRS, the purpose of CQC, Ofsted and HM Inspectorate of Prisons is to conduct in-depth site visits of their respective service of interest. Data is collected during these visits and later combined to provide a score or rating. Although CQC, Ofsted and HMICFRS all consider leadership, the HM Inspectorate of Prisons does not, but relevant information in relation to their assessment process will be included later in this section of the report. The approaches taken by HMICFRS, CQC and Ofsted are summarised in Table Two below.

Table Two: Summary of the approaches of HMICFRS, CQC and Ofsted

	Who they inspect	Frequency	Duration	Scope	Outcome
HMICFRS	43 Home Office-funded police forces in England and Wales	Annual	3-4 days	Effectiveness Efficiency Legitimacy Leadership	Outstanding Good Requires improvement Inadequate
CQC	Services that provide health and social care (e.g. hospitals, GPs and doctors, care homes, dentists and mental health services)	Differs by service. Most inspected every 3 years but others (e.g. adult social care) are inspected every 12-24 months, depending on previous inspection (requiring improvement/ inadequate leads to an annual inspection).	1-4 days	Safe Effective Caring Responsive Well-led	Outstanding Good Requires improvement Inadequate
Ofsted	Schools and childcare, adoption and fostering agencies, and local authority children's services	Schools: usually every 3-5 years but dependent on previous inspection. Requires improvement/ inadequate schools are inspected every two years, 'good' schools typically inspected through a one-day inspection every three years and outstanding schools are exempt from inspections until a concern surfaces. Local authorities: every 3-4 years, except for inadequate services which are inspected every 3 months until their rating improves.	Schools: 2 days (but 1 day for 'good' schools unless evidence of a change in the rating is uncovered – which triggers a full inspection) Local authorities: 1-4 weeks, depending on the results of the previous inspection.	Schools: overall effectiveness Effectiveness of leadership and management Quality of teaching, learning and assessment Personal development, behaviour and welfare Outcomes for pupils Local authorities: Overall effectiveness Experiences and progress of children Leadership, management and governance	Outstanding Good Satisfactory Inadequate Outstanding Good Requires improvement Inadequate

As Table Two shows, the grading systems of both Ofsted and CQC are similar to that used by HMICFRS. Organisations are rated as Outstanding, Good or Requires Improvement (Satisfactory in school inspections) or Inadequate. Further details on CQC’s approach to grading is provided in the text box below.

CQC’s Grading System

To rate a key question within a core service, CQC makes an overall judgement as to which rating is most appropriate against the published ratings characteristics. Not all elements of a characteristic have to be present for a rating to be awarded, and all pieces of evidence aren’t necessarily awarded equally. For example, a single piece of evidence, could be weighted heavily enough to drag an otherwise Good rating down to Requires Improvement. The weighting of evidence is dependent on how significant the issue is for patient safety or the quality of care.

CQC are planning to change their approach slightly for the rating of well-led at the overall trust level. In future, the overall well-led rating will be based on an independent assessment of well-led at the organisational level rather than the aggregated service and location level ratings (these lower-level ratings will still be taken into account, but no longer directly determine the overall well-led rating).

However, there are also differences in the approaches taken by CQC, Ofsted and HMICFRS. The inspection frequency is a key difference across the organisations. Unlike HMICFRS, both CQC and Ofsted tailor the frequency of inspections to the outcome of previous inspections. Ofsted has developed different approaches for schools and local authorities; the worst ranking local authorities receive more frequent inspections until they improve their outcome to ‘require improvement’ and outstanding schools are exempt from inspections. However, it should be noted that the inspection exemption granted to schools receiving an outstanding Ofsted rating has been criticised. For example, 1,283 outstanding schools have not been inspected in over seven years, and 106 schools for over a decade².

² Yorke, Harry. “More than 1,200 schools have not received an Ofsted inspection for over seven years. The Telegraph. 6 January, 2017, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/2017/01/06/1200-schools-have-not-received-ofsted-inspection-seven-years/>

The CQC uses an *Intelligence Monitoring* (IM) tool that assesses a range of indicators to create “priority bands for inspection”. This is used to help them “to decide when, where and what to inspect” (CQC Provider Handbook, How CQC regulates NHS and independent acute hospitals). This tool measures a range of quantitative indicators in the five core areas of inspection in order to determine how a particular service rates in relation to other similar services and whether the service experienced any significant variation from previous results. For leadership, these indicators include, for example, staff surveys measuring “the proportion of staff who would recommend the Trust as a place to work or receive treatment” and the “proportion of staff reporting good communication between senior management and staff” (CQC, Intelligence monitoring, NHS acute hospitals: Indicators and methodology guidance).

Although IM allows CQC to target its resources, its ability to correctly prioritise inspections has been questioned. In 2014, 60 GP practices were initially assessed as being a higher priority for inspection but later reclassified as a lower priority after GP patient survey indicator was removed from the tool (Kmietowicz, 2014). More recently, Griffiths et al. (2017) conducted what they describe as the first peer-reviewed assessment of the predicative ability of IM. The study found that the IM tool could not predict which Trusts were more likely to provide poor-quality care. Although the reasons for this were not identified within the study, the authors suggested that tool may have been too simplistic, inspectors’ ratings may be unreliable, or that statistical models and inspectors assess different things. Griffiths et al. concluded that CQC required a new approach to statistical surveillance and inspection planning. This finding highlights the difficulty in developing a valid and reliable statistical tool that can inform the assessment of large and complex organisations.

Full details of the criteria used by CQC and Ofsted to assess leadership are shown in Tables A4 and A5 (Appendix A), respectively.

Although HMIP does not assess for leadership, a group interview was conducted with three representatives from HMP Dartmoor to further advance understanding of approaches to inspection across the UK public sector. The information presented on inspections in HMP Dartmoor is drawn from this interview.

There was a feeling amongst prison officers that they are 'over-inspected' in the prison service; HMIP inspections take place alongside other security audits and assessments from governing bodies such as National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and Ofsted. Priorities and actions throughout the year were described as being influenced by the timetabling of inspections, audits and reviews. As one of the interviewees described, the 'direction of travel is influenced by who is coming in next.'

The different approaches to inspection and assessment were felt to conflict, with HMIP inspections described as being more qualitative and 'around a feel of a prison' whereas a security audit was more quantitative. In terms of more recent HMIP inspections, all interviewees felt that the inspections did not take into account or make allowances for austerity measures. Cuts to resources had meant that the grading of performance did not correlate with the resources available to meet targets. Furthermore, there was a perception that 'a big issue for the service was that it was being driven by the treasury – with the influence of politics and lack of funding'. The extent to which similar contextual factors are salient within police forces may be a point to consider when developing HMICFRS's approach to inspecting leadership.

Other UK-based organisations

The purpose of HMICFRS, Ofsted and CQC is to inspect and/or regulate public services; their assessment of leadership is conducted within this context. Although the approach to leadership assessment in organisations which do not share this remit differs significantly, consideration of them can still advance understanding of the effective measurement of leadership. Here we include information on the approach taken by the MOD and in EFQM's Excellence Model.

MOD

In the MOD, leadership is considered a critical aspect of their doctrine, which is composed of three components of fighting power. The *physical component* describes the means to fight and involves the manpower, equipment and collective performance of the forces. The *conceptual component* comprises the thought processes involved in fighting and includes conceptual innovations and principles of war. Finally, the *moral component* describes the ability to get people to fight, and encompasses

moral cohesion, motivation and leadership. According to British Defence Doctrine, “welfare is a human activity and the moral component exerts a decisive psychological influence, individually and collectively” (page 4-7), and hence the moral component is considered the key component that can become “the deciding factor” in a combat.

The moral component is maintained through two aspects: a transactional aspect, which takes into consideration how task success is achieved and how individuals are supported (e.g. standards of housing and health); and a transformational aspect, which take into account relationship-building leadership behaviours. The MOD measures the performance of these two aspects of the moral component in three ways:

1. Individual leaders undergo an annual performance appraisal
The appraisals use performance indicators of excellence and determine an individual’s areas of strength and development. The appraisals are also used to consider readiness and capability for promotion. Although the individual is graded against a series of competencies, the MOD does not prescribe a type of leader or style of leadership. This allows for the context of missions, tasks and individual dynamics to be considered.
2. Each distinct organisation (e.g. ship, battalion or air station) is inspected annually
The main component of this annual inspection, which evaluates overall performance of the organisation, is an advanced simulation exercise that tests the purpose of the organisation (for instance, a ship is put through a whole series of manoeuvres in the English Channel). In addition, inspectors also collect documentation and interview members of the senior cadre after the simulation. Conclusions about the leadership of the organisation are drawn from its performance in the simulation. For instance, if organisational members were motivated to work harder than needed to pass the test, demonstrating a commitment to excellence, and they displayed a cheerful demeanour during the simulation, good leadership is assumed.
3. Through an online Continuous Attitude Survey
This survey annually evaluates the moral component within the forces. A random sample is selected to complete this survey.

Several questions in this survey examine the collective leadership of the forces directly and indirectly, through leadership indicators such as morale, commitment, engagement, and fairness at work (see Table A6 in Appendix A, for questions in the survey addressing leadership). The results of this survey are published as descriptive statistics; it is therefore not known how it informs any grading of leadership.

EFQM

Estimates suggest that approximately 20,000 European organisations have employed the model of excellence proposed by the EFQM (McCarthy and Greatbanks, 2006). In this model, leadership is considered to be one of the five enablers of excellence in an organisation. The model is based on nine criteria, which are divided into enablers and results. Enablers, which are defined as “what an organisation does and how it does it”, include: (1) leadership; (2) people; (3) strategy; (4) partnerships & resources; and (5) processes, products & services. Results, which are defined as “what an organisation achieves”, involve people results, customer results, society results and business results.

As an enabler, leadership is described in the EFQM in the following way:

*Excellent organisations have **leaders** who shape the future and make it happen, acting as role models for its values and ethics and inspiring trust at all times. They are flexible, enabling the organisation to anticipate and reach in a timely manner to ensure the on-going success of the organisation”³ (bold added)*

This quote suggests that the EFQM model equates leadership with the individual rather than organisational level. Furthermore, in the questionnaire available for non-members to assess leadership, the EFQM maintains that they are examining “the activities and behaviour of the leaders” and specifies that “the term ‘leaders’ refers to the chief executive [or most senior executive] and those reporting to him/her” (EFQM 2013, Determining Excellence, p.8), hence concentrating their leadership assessment exclusively to the senior cadre of the organisation.

³ Source: <http://www.efqm.org/efqm-model/criteria/enablers>

Despite that, it is interesting to note that issues associated with organisational leadership seem to permeate the fundamental concepts of excellence, which form the foundation from which the nine criteria (which include leadership as an enabler) were developed. The EFQM advocates eight *fundamental concepts of excellence* that they believe “outline the foundation for achieving an excellent organisational culture”⁴. As illustrated in Table A7 (Appendix A), the narrative around these concepts, both in their terms and their descriptions” encompass many elements that other organisations include when assessing organisational leadership, such as “organisational capability”, “vision”, and “empowerment”.

Regarding methodology of assessment, the EFQM offers an array of self-assessment tools ranging from short questionnaires to simulations that replicate the process necessary to receive the EFQM Award of Excellence.⁵ These assessment tools are organised in a two-by-two matrix of effort (low to high effort) and source (based on opinion to supported by evidence). These assessments differ in the accuracy of their results and the amount of resources required to complete them, as the amount of time, energy, commitment and financial costs increase with the complexity of the assessment tool. The EFQM suggests that the selection of a particular tool should take into account the objective of the establishment and the availability of resources as well as the stage of the organisation within a path towards excellence.

In addition to applying the same model of excellence, these tools share two other characteristics. First, they require a strong element of self-assessment on the part of the organisation. Even in the case of an award simulation, the organisation is required to produce their own evidence and to conduct their assessment and later an external party corroborates those results. Second, they involve eight steps, which may take place concurrently, to be applied. These steps comprise of (1) developing commitment within the organisation; (2) planning the self-assessment; (3) creating teams that will be responsible for conducting the assessment and educating the rest of the organisation about it; (4) communicating to the rest of the organisation the plans to be executed; (5) performing the self-assessment; (6) generated an action plan based on the results; (7)

⁴ Source: <http://www.efqm.org/efqm-model/fundamental-concepts>

⁵ EFQM’s Award of Excellence assessment methodology is not publically available yet they suggest that organisations should carry out self-assessment as part of their preparations for the Award.

implementing the action plans; and finally (8) reviewing the success of these actions plans.

3.3. The inspection approach in police authorities beyond the UK

The second question this review addressed was “*How do police authorities in other countries inspect leadership?*” and focused on authorities in the United States, Canada, Australia and Scandinavia. Although exploring the different approaches advances understanding of leadership assessment, it is important to note that differences in how police authorities are structured may mean that one country’s assessment framework cannot be easily translated to another. As Tiwana et al. (2015) have observed, some of these forces are decentralised; in the US for example, each of the 50 states regulates its own policing creating differences in responsibilities, powers and funding. Indeed, as the interview with the member of the US Justice Department revealed, there are over 80,000 different law enforcement agencies acting at various levels (town, state, district and even for institutions such as Universities) in the US.

In reviewing the approaches taken to inspecting police forces internationally, it is of interest that HMICFRS’s measurements of performance have been identified as the most advanced and comprehensive system in policing, due to its centralised, integrated and systematic emphasis (e.g., Tiwana et al., 2015). These authors did not specify particular instruments utilised by HMICFRS. Rather, they highlighted the “well-document national regime” (p.12) that is present in the UK, which contrasts significantly with the fragmented and piecemeal tools that are utilised in the police forces of other countries, such as the United States and Canada. The results of this literature review also confirm the absence of other nation-wide approaches to assessing the performance of policing. Nevertheless, features of each of the approaches utilised by these other countries are discussed in turn below in order to highlight the differences between them.

In the US, the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), was created in 1979 with the objective of providing a credentialing process and stimulating “best practices” in policing at national level. Despite initial enthusiasm from early supporters, only three

per cent of local, state and federal police agencies in the United States were accredited by CALEA (Hougland and Mesloh, 2005 cited in Doerner & Doener, 2009). A lack of evidence of the benefits of CALEA accreditation, particularly against the perceived high costs (resources and finances) has been attributed to the low take up. The member of the US Justice Department who was interviewed confirmed that CALEA is vastly under-utilised by police forces in the US. As a result, forces select their own approach to assessing leadership creating a varied picture across the US. Examples of leadership assessment used in some US police forces are summarised in Figure Two below.

In Canada, police forces are not required at the federal level to comply with specific performance criteria or measurements. Thus, different provinces establish their own laws for specific performance measures and there are no national guidelines or framework for performance measurement. A study examining what performance metrics were used found that 15 representatives of police boards, who have the oversight of the administration of police services, indicated that there were no performance measurement system in place in their agencies or they were not knowledgeable about how they operated (Kiedrowski, Petrunik, MacDonald, & Melchers, 2013).


In Australia, each of the six states and two territories has jurisdiction over its own policing agencies. This includes the Australian Federal Police, which is responsible for policing the Australian capital territory. Each State's policing authority has its own policies concerning how forces within its territory are audited. The main focus of audits which are undertaken concern issues of accountability and corruption. From 1994-1997, there was a 'Royal Commission' which was charged with looking at the way in which police forces were managed and lead within policing in Australia. This was a 'one-off' event, driven by the realisation that changes needed to be made in the way policing in Australia was happening. This resulted in the introduction of new selection processes to ensure a more diverse police population as well as new forms of development to foster leadership which was more outward-facing and community responsive in its approach.

In contrast to the US, Canadian and Australian police forces, Scandinavian forces have a more centralised structure (Carmona and Gronlund, 2003; Vanebo et al., 2015). However, language differences and the time available for the rapid review limited the ability to examine

leadership assessment processes in these countries. Nonetheless, it was evident that the Norwegian Police Service had been subject to scrutiny in the wake of the terror acts in 2012. Leadership was identified as a crucial area for improvement, which led to recommendations within their quality reform that have “an emphasis on leadership selection and development, developing a set of clear requirements and criteria for leadership, and facilitating a unified leadership in Norway” (Sviland, 2014, p.32)

Four examples of how organisational leadership is assessed by police forces in other countries were identified in this review; the key features of each assessment are summarised in Figure Two below. Details of how the US police forces graded their results were not identified in this review.

Figure Two: Examples of leadership assessment in other police forces



3.4. Performance measurement in policing: Issues and challenges

The documents reviewed here suggest that although outdated assessments of performance are still common (many of which focus on a restricted number of crime indicators) (Davis, 2012), there appears to be a growing interest in performance measurement in policing (e.g. Tiwana et al., 2015). In Canada for example, Kiedrowski et al. (2013) explored performance measures in police services and found that the quality of performance frameworks were improving over time. Despite this, and unlike in England and Wales, efficiency and effectiveness dimensions were reported to be rarely assessed and leadership was not identified as a component in any of police agencies reviewed by Kiedrowski et al.

Based on the documents reviewed here, it appears that where leadership is assessed, it can focus on the individual or organisational (collective) level. Individual performance appraisals are the main component of performance measurement in a number of the police services considered in this review. For example, individual evaluations have been reported to be emphasised in the US (e.g. Manning, 2008) and in Canada, most provincial regulations focus on the performance of their chief of police. However, a focus on individual performance was considered problematic by some authors; Lilley and Hindjua (2007) for example, argue an individual focus does not reflect the influence of the organisational context. Also, the outcome may reflect the purpose of the assessment (individual development vs. control) and the evaluator. Similarly, a Canadian study found that there was a lack of consistency in individual performance evaluations.

Performance assessments at the organisational level were also identified. A review by Tiwana et al., (2015) identified that the most utilised frameworks are:

- Compstat;
- The Balanced Scorecard; and
- Data Envelope Analysis.

These three frameworks usually focus on technical or hard measures instead of soft or social measures such as leadership and therefore outside the scope of this study. Measures of this type have been criticised

as inadequate in modern society (e.g. Gorby, 2013, Wang et al 2000, Davis, 2012); for example, Carmona & Grolund (2003) examined the use of the balanced scorecard by Swedish law enforcement and found that “easy-to-measure indicators” were emphasised. Conversely, other activities considered critical to community policing, such as building relationships with the community, were not assessed. For Gordon (2013), leadership abilities, creative problem solving skills and communication skills are the measures that police agencies should use to evaluate the performance of police officers.

Despite this, relatively little literature that assesses leadership at the institutional level within police forces was identified. Schafer (2010) argues that there is a lack of objectives for police forces to assess themselves against and that there has been “limited empirical attention to the consideration of how leadership efficacy is manifested, assessed and developed” (p. 645). One notable exception to this is Pearson-Goff and Herrington’s (2013) systematic review of police leadership in the US, Canada, Australia and the UK. A total of 57 sources were reviewed and the authors considered questions such as: who are police leaders?; what do police leaders do that makes them lead?; and what is the best way to develop police leaders? A total of seven key leadership characteristics and five key activities were identified, and are summarised in Table Three below. In considering these characteristics and activities, it is important to note that they have emerged from the literature and have not necessarily been applied in leadership assessment frameworks.

Table Three: Key leadership characteristics and activities

Key Leadership Characteristics	Key Leadership Activities
Ethical behaviour	Problem solving
Trustworthiness	Creating a shared vision
Legitimacy	Engendering organisational commitment
Being a role model	Caring for subordinates
Good communication	Driving and managing change
Decision making	
Critical and creative thinking	

Source: Pearson-Goff and Herrington, 2013

Like Schafer, Pearson-Goff and Herrington concluded that there was a lack of objective measures of successful leadership and that much of the research drew upon police and stakeholder perceptions of what

constituted good leadership. The authors concluded that further research was needed to develop understanding of what successful leadership is and how it might be measured.

A related issue is the lack of empirical understanding of the effectiveness of leadership assessments. Although much can be learnt from approaches taken to leadership assessment outside of police forces, it is important to note that evaluations of their effectiveness appear to be largely absent. Ofsted and CQC were identified in this review as having a relatively well developed approach to assessment, yet appear to base their assessment approach on intuition and experience rather than a systematic evaluation of their methods. This absence is a feature of leadership assessment processes more generally; there is a lack of evaluative work concerning leadership development processes themselves, let alone the processes by which such evaluation might be assessed.

4. Conclusions

4.1. Introduction


The research conducted to date has reviewed evidence from both academic and grey literature sources on leadership assessment approaches. In addition, 10 interviews have been conducted with representatives from nine organisations conducting inspections or with expertise on inspections. This final section of the report summarises the key findings and then outlines Phase Two of the research.

4.2. Summary of results

Content of assessment

Organisations assessing leadership can be seen to focus on two dimensions of leadership: its purpose (working along a continuum from ‘enabling’ to ‘transformational’) and its location (at the individual or collective level). Figure Three below plots where organisations included in the Phase One research can be located in respect to these dimensions.

Figure Three: Underpinning assumptions



Dimensions of leadership assessed

Based on the documents reviewed here, organisations seem to vary in regards to the dimensions or indicators of leadership that they evaluate. Nevertheless, there seem to be similarities in the many terms utilised by the different assessment instruments. Although a wide range of terms and categories are used across the different instruments, they can perhaps be summarised into eight overarching dimensions:

1. Setting direction
2. Morale and well-being
3. Fairness
4. Personal development
5. Innovation
6. Job satisfaction
7. Trust and support
8. Teamwork

Table A10, in Appendix A, summarises the different indicators used by all of the instruments and tools reviewed here against these dimensions.

Processes and methods of inspection


Similar types of processes were used by organisations investigated. The most frequently used processes include:

- 3-4 day on-site inspections undertaken by teams of assessors. These inspections would require up to 5-6 days of preparation, and involve the assessment of strategic plans, performance management indicators and other governance documents. During the inspections the following activities would take place:
 - Interviews with Senior management teams;
 - Focus groups with cross-sectional organisational representation
 - Attending Board meetings
 - Meetings with stakeholders outside of the organisation (such as commissioning bodies, patients, community members)
 - This type of process was used by CQC and Ofsted
- Remotely conducted surveys of senior management teams and their staff. This would include the completion of questionnaires aimed at assessing either individual leaders (as is done by SUPA) or the organisational culture overall (as is done by the police force in Austin Texas).

- Sometimes these surveys would be followed up by interviews or focus group activities.
- This type of inspection was carried out by police forces in the US (Austin, Texas, Princeton).

The use of in-depth inspections seems to have a historical component, given the similarities of methodology utilised by other inspecting organisations in the UK Government. It might be interesting to explore the use of a survey instrument (similar to the examples of leadership assessment found in police forces in the US for instance). The advantage of a survey for HMICFRS could be its guarantee of anonymity for respondents (who do not have to be concerned about sharing something within a focus group, for instance) and the ability to respond to specific questions concerning certain dimensions and/or indicators of leadership. The results of this study indicate that there seems to be balance between the use of qualitative and quantitative methods within the organisations examined (see Figure Four). Most police forces seemed to apply quantitative leadership assessment tools (with the exception of the Princeton Police Force), whereas there seemed to be a tendency for UK organisations to use qualitative methods or a mix of it.

Figure Four: Use of qualitative and quantitative assessment methods



The process by which inspections are carried out differs in other ways:

- Frequency of inspection
 - Ofsted carries out targeted inspections (although this has been criticised);
 - CQC is currently carrying out a comprehensive inspection across all NHS Trusts in terms of the 'well – led' aspect but this is newly instituted and other inspection elements are more targeted.
- The use of self-report information or not;
- The inclusion of quantitative or qualitative data, or both;
- Who carries out the inspection (external or internal people) and the extent to which inspection teams involve 'specialist' inspectors;
- The extent to which inspections are carried out at a national, or more localised level;
- Whether or not the inspection is voluntary or mandatory;

- In the US, the CALEA inspection process is voluntary and has only received a 3% uptake

A range of different aspects of assessing leadership at an institutional level also emerged from the interview data. These should be considered when designing HMICFRS's leadership assessment process:

- Organisational members situated in different hierarchical roles can have very different views of how leadership operates in the same organisation. In particular, the views of senior management can vary from that of their followers. These variations can lead to difficulties for inspecting teams trying to make sense of varying perspectives in order to arrive at an overall judgement. For HMICFRS, this means that it will be important to create mechanisms in which views among inspectors can be shared and integrated judgements reached.
- It is often desirable for organisations to know how leadership will be evaluated in advance. For instance, CQC has found it valuable for Trusts being inspected to prepare self-report material concerning how governance and performance management issues are conducted prior to their inspection. Similarly, HMICFRS could include pre-work for organisations to undertake prior to the inspection process and provide clear guidance on the scope of the leadership assessment.
- Data from interviews conducted with representatives of the Kings Fund and Victoria Police Force in Australia emphasised the way in which the mode and focus of the assessment process will itself perpetuate a particular 'model' of leadership. A key question to consider in designing the assessment process concerns how that process supports a particular form of leadership, and whether HMICFRS intends to promote that form of leadership through the inspection process.
- It is also interesting to note that both Ofsted and CQC (who, it could be argued represent the most well-developed leadership assessment processes we have reviewed) are in the process of changing the content of their leadership assessment. Both are beginning to include more outward-facing, community-related dimensions to their inquiries, and the CQC is also including exploration of facets of leadership pertaining to IT security and systems, proactive attention to longer-term financial sustainability, as well as the assessment of systems that foster

continual learning. The reason for these changes, however, does not seem to have originated from a systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of the methodology of assessment previously utilised. Rather, these seemed to be based on experience and on an increased perception on the importance of leadership and the need to understand its impact. HMICFRS may want to consider the extent to which they wish to incorporate these aspects of leadership into their own assessment process.

- No evaluations of the effectiveness of the leadership assessments within the reviewed organisations have been identified in Phase One of the research. This is in line with the broader leadership development literature in which there is a dearth of evaluative studies.

Although there is potential for a more quantitative approach to enable inspections to be carefully targeted, the issues associated with CQC's own tool highlight the difficulty in developing a valid and reliable measure.

4.3. Next steps: Phase two

The University of Plymouth research team discussed the findings presented in a draft version of this report with HMICFRS on the 13th April 2017 and again via teleconference on the 24th April 2017. As a result, it was agreed that Phase Two would focus on testing different methods of assessment, rather than content. This meant that the questions developed by HMICFRS, and currently being used in the Spring 2017 PEEL inspections, would be used to develop new assessment methods. It was agreed that these methods would be tested in two police forces in England: this approach would control for differences associated with context (i.e. police forces across England and Wales operate in different social, economic and physical environments) and therefore allow the effectiveness of different methods to be explored. The inclusion of two different forces will inform understanding of the extent to which findings concerning the merits of each approach could be applied more widely throughout UK police forces. HMICFRS will secure the participation of two police forces on behalf of the research team.

Three new methods will be tested in Phase Two as follows:

1. A quantitative survey instrument

Leadership sub-diagnostic questions from the PEEL Spring 2017 Question set will be converted into 5-point Likert scale response items and administered as an online survey. Officers and staff from both police forces will be invited to complete the survey. Wherever possible, the survey will be administered to a range of different ranks and job roles as appropriate to the size of the force.

To contribute to understanding of the effectiveness of an online survey as a method to assess leadership, the survey will also include questions about its applicability and ease of use.

2. A qualitative survey instrument

This will also involve using questions from HMICFRS's current inspection process, but will ask participants to provide descriptive comments about their experiences of different aspects of leadership. Again, the survey will be administered online and questions on its applicability and ease of use will be included. A sample of staff and officers from each of the two police forces participating in Phase Two will be invited to complete the survey. The size of the sample will be appropriate to each police force and also the scope of the research (i.e. this is a time limited project and therefore there is a limited capacity to analyse large volumes of qualitative data in the depth required).

3. A process for extending participation in the inspection process for reality testing purposes

This will involve inviting external stakeholders to participate in a focus group and therefore allow internal perceptions of leadership to be compared with those held externally.

The University of Plymouth research team also proposed a fourth method: to observe HMICFRS's own inspection process. This would have represented a 'control' against which the data collected from the other methods could be compared. However, it was agreed that HMICFRS would conduct their own internal review of the data collected via the research project and their own inspection process.

The data collected via each method will then be analysed and compared. The following criteria will inform the analysis approach:

- Participation rates;
- Breadth of participation;
- Quality of the data:
 - The extent to which the data evokes a range of responses from across the police force;
 - The extent to which it is abstract or specific;
 - The extent to which it is in some way actionable; and
 - The extent to which the data is robust
- The reported experience of undergoing the particular method:
 - The time and resource commitment; and
 - The degree to which the method allows participants to be heard or represented accurately.

A further assessment of the findings will be conducted through 'sense-checking' workshops with participating forces. These workshops will be used to both feedback the results and test the extent to which they align with participating members' experiences. This process will inform the research team's recommendations about the value of the different assessment methods, and therefore support HMICFRS in its review of its future approach to inspections. Although this analysis will greatly advance understanding of the effectiveness of different methods of assessing leadership in police forces, the scope of the research project means that the findings will provide an indication of effectiveness only. More rigorous validity and reliability testing would require additional time and resources.

These recommendations will be presented in a draft report which will be submitted to HMICFRS in July 2017 and then discussed at an Inspection Development Group meeting.

5. Bibliography

- ANZPAA. 2013. Australia New Zealand police professionalisation strategy 2013-2018. Melbourne: Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency.
- Bou-Llusar, J. C., Escrig-Tena, A. B., Roca-Puig, V., & Beltran-Martin, I. 2009. An empirical assessment of the EFQM Excellence Model: Evaluation as a TQM framework relative to the MBNQA model. *Journal of Operations Management*, 27(1): 1-22.
- Carmona, S., & Gronlund, A. 2003. Measures versus actions: The balanced scorecard in Swedish law enforcement, *IE Working Paper*. Madrid: Instituto de Empresa.
- Carter, D. L., & Sapp, A. D. 1994. Issues and perspectives of law enforcement accreditation: A national study of police chiefs. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22(3): 195-204.
- College of Policing. 2017. Guiding principles for organisational leadership, Vol. February 2017: College of Policing.
- CQC. 2015. How CQC regulates: Community Health Services. Appendices to the provider handbook, Vol. March 2015: Care Quality Commission.
- CQC. 2015. How CQC regulates: Community health services. Provider handbook, Vol. March 2015: Care Quality Commission.
- CQC. 2015. How CQC regulates: NHS GP practices and GP out-of-hours services. Appendices to the provider handbook, Vol. March 2015: Care Quality Commission.
- CQC. 2015. Intelligent monitoring. NHS GP practices: Indicators and methodology, Vol. August 2015: Care Quality Commission.
- CQC. 2015. Intelligent monitoring. NHS acute hospitals: Indicators and methodology guidance, Vol. May 2015: Care Quality Commission.
- CQC. 2015. How CQC regulates: NHS and independent acute hospitals. Provider handbook, Vol. March 2015: Care Quality Commission.
- CQC. 2015. How CQC regulates: NHS and independent acute hospitals. Appendices to the provider handbook, Vol. March 2015: Care Quality Commission.
- CQC. 2016. How CQC regulates: NHS GP practices and GP out-of-hours services, Vol. January 2016: Care Quality Commission.
- CQC. 2016. How CQC regulates: Community adult social care services, Vol. April 2016: Care Quality Commission.
- CSU. 2016. CSU Police Leadership Survey.
- CSU. 2016. CSU Police Leadership Survey - Bakersfield.
- CSU. 2016 CSU Police Leadership Survey - Bakersfield results.
- Davis, R. C. 2012. Selected international best practice in police performance measurement: RAND: Center on Quality Policing.
- Doerner, W. G., & Doener, W. M. 2009. The diffusion of accreditation among Florida police agencies. *Policing: An international journal of police strategies &*

- management**, 32(4): 781-798.
- EFQM. 2012. EFQM excellence model.
- EFQM. 2013. Assessing for excellence:
<http://www.efqm.org/sites/default/files/assessingforexcellenceteaser.pdf>.
- EFQM. 2013. Determining excellence.
<http://www.efqm.org/sites/default/files/determiningexcellenceteaser.pdf>.
- Fleming, J., & Scott, A. 2008. Performance measurement in Australian police organisations. *Policing*, 2(3): 322-330.
- Gay, T. 2012. Leadership command profile assessment tool Texas State University.
- Gorby, D. M. 2013. The failure of traditional measures of police performance and the rise of broader measures of performance. *Policing*, 7(4): 392-400.
- Griffiths, A., Beaussier, AL., Demeritt, D. and Rothsteing, H. 2017. Intelligent Monitoring? Assessing the ability of the Care Quality Commission's statistical surveillance tool to predict quality and prioritise NHS hospital inspections? *BMJ Quality and Safety*, 26(2): 120-130.
- Hides, M. T., Davies, J., & Jackson, S. 2004. Implementation of EFQM excellence model self-assessment in the UK higher education sector: lessons learned from other sectors. *The TQM Magazine*, 16(3): 194-201.
- HMICFRS. 2016. PEEL: Police leadership 2016, Vol. December 2016.
- HMICFRS. 2017. PEEL SPRING 2017 Question set.
- HM Inspectorate of Prisons. 2017. Inspection framework Vol. February 2017. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons.
- Hougland, S. M., & Mesloh, C. 2005. Reliability of risk management data in measuring police performance: An initial empirical analysis. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum* 5(1): 45-51.
- Kiedrowski, J., Petrunik, M., MacDonald, T., & Melchers, R. 2013. Canadian police board views on the use of police performance metrics: Law Enforcement Policing Branch, Public Safety Canada.
- Kmietowicz, Z. (2014). Regulator apologises to 60 general practices for wrongly prioritizing them for inspection. *BMJ*, 349: g7564.
- Lilley, D., & Hindjua, S. 2007. Police officer performance appraisal and overall satisfaction. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35: 137-150.
- Manning, P. K. 2008. Performance rituals. *Policing*, 2(3): 284-293.
- Mastrofski, S. D. 2007. Police organisation and management issues for the next decade, *National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Policing Research Workshop: Planning for the Future*, Vol. 218584. Washington, DC, November 8-29, 2006.
- McCarthy, G., & Greatbanks, R. 2006. Impact of EFQM Excellence Model on leadership in German and UK organisations. *International Journal for Quality and Reliability Management*, 23(9): 1068-1091.
- MOD. 2011. Joint Doctrine Publication 0-01: British Defence Doctrine, 4th edition ed., Vol. JDP 0-01: Ministry of Defence.
- MOD. 2016. UK Regular Armed Forces Continuous Attitude Survey 2016, Vol. May

- 2016: Ministry of Defence.
- MOD. 2016. Continuous Attitude Survey: What is Life in the Royal Navy like for you?: Tell us - your views are important, Vol. NG 15/837: Ministry of Defence.
- NASUWT. 2015. The common inspection framework: Maintained schools and academies. Guidance for School leaders: NASUWT - The teacher's union.
- Ofsted. 2016. School inspection handbook: Handbook for inspecting schools in England under section 5 of the Education Act 2005, Vol. August 2016: Ofsted.
- Pearson-Goff, M., & Herringotn, V. 2013. Police leaders and leadership development: A systematic literature review: Australian Institute of Police Management.
- Price Waterhouse. 2000. Strategic human resources analysis of public policing in Canada. <http://www.policecouncil.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Strategic-Human-Resources-Analysis-of-Public-Policing-in-Canada-2000.pdf>: Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police.
- Pullen, W., & Gallant, W. 2009. Embedding HPT: Improving police performance by implementing human performance technology in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. *Performance Improvement*, 48(3): 7-12.
- Rodgers, F. 2013. Proposal to conduct - Organisational health and leadership analysis of the Princeton Police Department.
- Rosenbach, W., & Sashkin, M. 2014. *The leadership profile: On becoming a better leader through leadership that matters.*
- Sashkin, M., & Rosenbach, W. 2013. *Organisational culture assessment questionnaire.*
- Schafer, J. 2010. Effective leaders and leadership in policing: traits, assessment, development and expansion. *Policing: An international journal of police strategies & management*, 33(4): 644-663.
- Steward, K. 2014. Exploring CQC's well-led domain: How can boards ensure a positive organisational culture?, Vol. Leadership in action: The King's Fund.
- Sviland, E. 2014. *Perceived effective leadership of criminal investigations in Norwegian police districts* University of Oslo.
- Tiwana, N., Bass, G., & Farrell, G. 2015. Police performance measurement: An annotated bibliography. *Crime Science*, 4(1): 1-28.
- Vanebo, J. O., Bjorkelo, B., & Aaserud, T. 2015. Police leadership development: Intentions and critical success-factors. *International Public Administration Review*, 12(3-4): 11-26.

Appendix A – Leadership questions in assessment instruments

Table A1 – PEEL 2015 Leadership questions

PEEL 2015 Leadership questions	
CORE QUESTION: How well led is the force?	Q1 How well does the force have a clear understanding of the current state of its leadership at every level?
	Q2 How well has the force provided a clear and compelling sense of the future direction of the organisation?
	Q3 How is the force developing leadership, motivating the workforce and encouraging staff engagement?
	Q4 To what extent is leadership improving the effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy of the force?

Source: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/HMICFRS/peel-assessments/how-we-inspect/2015-peel-assessment/>

Table A2 – PEEL 2016 Leadership questions

Leadership questions	Diagnostic questions
How well does the force understand leadership?	Q1 To what extent is there a clear understanding in the force of what is expected of effective leaders?
	Q2 How well does the force understand the relative strengths and effects of its current leadership?
How well does the force develop leadership?	Q3 How well does the force identify and develop potential senior leaders?
How well does the force display leadership?	Q4 To what extent is the force encouraging innovation and swiftly implementing new ideas, approaches and working practices?
	Q5 To what extent is the force developing diverse leadership teams in terms of experience, background and skills?

Source: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/HMICFRS/peel-assessments/how-we-inspect/2016-peel-assessment/>

Table A3 – PEEL 2017 Leadership questions embedded in the Legitimacy and Efficiency inspection

Area of organisational leadership	Leadership questions	Component of leadership*	Dimensions of leadership
Organisational Justice	Q01 How well do leaders demonstrate that they understand the importance of treating people with fairness and respect?	Understanding leadership	Fairness & Respect
Organisational Justice	Q02 To what extent can the force demonstrate that its leaders model and maintain the values it expects of them?	Displaying leadership	Modelling Values
Organisational Justice	Q03 To what extent is the force taking an ethical approach to decision-making at all levels?	Understanding leadership	Ethical decision-making
Organisational Justice	Q04 How well do leaders seek feedback and challenge from all parts of the workforce?	Displaying leadership	Openness to feedback and challenge
Culture Change	Q05 How well do leaders demonstrate that they understand and actively champion the benefits of workforce wellbeing?	Displaying leadership	Wellbeing
Culture Change	Q06 How fairly does the force identify high potential members of the workforce to become senior leaders?	Developing leadership	Fair and transparent selection
Culture Change	Q07 How fairly does the force select for leadership roles at all levels?	Developing leadership	Fair and transparent selection
Culture Change	Q08 To what extent are leaders influenced and informed by the workforce in respect of innovation and change?	Displaying leadership	Innovation
Culture Change	Q09 How well does the force understand what skills it needs in its leaders to meet its demands now and in the future?	Understanding leadership	Current and future leadership capabilities
Culture Change	Q10 How well does the force understand the skills and capabilities of its	Understanding	Current leadership

Area of organisational leadership	Leadership questions	Component of leadership*	Dimensions of leadership
	leaders?	leadership	capabilities
Culture Change	Q11 Is the force taking advantage of new talent selection and development opportunities?	Developing leadership	Learning and Development
Culture Change	Q12 To what extent does the force look externally for innovation and best practice, and swiftly implement new ideas, approaches and working practices?	Displaying leadership	Innovation
Deliberate People Development	Q13 How well is the force planning to ensure the leadership skills and capabilities that it has in its workforce matches those it needs?	Understanding leadership	Future leadership capabilities
Deliberate People Development	Q14 How well is the force employing succession planning in leadership development?	Developing leadership	Talent

Source: PEEL Spring 2017 Question Set

* Classification into the three themes of organisational leadership (from the Guiding Principle of Leadership, College of Policing, 2017) provided by the PEEL Leadership 2017 Narrative Document, with the exception of Q3, Q8, Q10, and Q12.

Table A4 – CQC Key lines of enquiry and prompts for assessing “Are they (services) well-led?”

Key lines of enquiry	Prompts
Is there a clear vision and a credible strategy to deliver good quality?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a clear vision and a set of values, with quality and safety as top priority? 2. Is there a robust, realistic strategy for achieving the priorities and delivering good quality care? 3. How have the vision, values and strategy been developed? 4. Do staff know and understand what the vision and values are? 5. Do staff know and understand the strategy and their role in achieving it? 6. Is progress against delivering the strategy monitored and reviewed?
Does the governance framework ensure that responsibilities are clear and that quality, performance and risks are understood and managed?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there an effective governance framework to support the delivery of the strategy and good quality care? 2. Are staff clear about their roles and do they understand what they are accountable for? 3. How are working arrangements with partner and third part providers managed? 4. Are the governance framework and management systems regularly reviewed and improved? 5. Is there a holistic understanding of performance, which integrates the views of people with safety, quality, activity and financial information? 6. Are there comprehensive assurance system and service performance measures, which are reported and monitored, and is action taken to improve performance? 7. Are there effective arrangements in place to ensure that the information used to monitor and manage quality and performance are accurate, valid, reliable, timely and relevant? What action is taken when issues are identified? 8. Is there a systematic programme of clinical and internal audit, which is used to monitor quality and systems to identify where action should be taken? 9. Are there robust arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks, issues and mitigating actions? 10. Is there alignment between the recorded risks and what people say is ‘on their worry list’?
How does the leadership and culture reflect the vision and values, encourage openness and transparency and promote good quality care?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do leaders have the skills, knowledge, experience and integrity that they need – both when they are appointed and on an ongoing basis? 2. Do leaders have the capacity, capability, and experience to lead effectively? 3. Do the leaders understand the challenges to good quality care and can they identify the actions needed to address them? 4. Are leaders visible and approachable? 5. Do leaders encourage appreciative, supportive relationships among staff? 6. Do staff feel respected and valued? 7. Is action taken to address behaviour and performance that is inconsistent with the vision and values, regardless of seniority?

Key lines of enquiry	Prompts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Is the culture centred on the needs and experience of people who use services? 9. Does the culture encourage candour, openness and honesty? 10. is there a strong emphasis on promoting the safety and wellbeing of staff? 11. Do staff and teams work collaboratively, resolve conflict quickly and constructively and share responsibility to deliver good quality care?
<p>How are people who use the service, the public and staff engaged and involved?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are people’s views and experiences gathered and acted on to shape and improve the services and culture? 2. How are people who use services, those close to them and their representatives actively engaged and involved in decision-making? 3. Do staff feel actively engaged so that their views are reflected in the planning and delivery of services and in shaping the culture? 4. How do leaders prioritise the participation and involvement of people who use services and staff? 5. Do both leaders and staff understand the value of staff raising concerns? Is appropriate action taken as a result of concerns raised?
<p>How are services continuously improved and sustainability ensured?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When considering developments to services or efficiency changes, how is the impact on quality and sustainability assessed and monitored? 2. Are there examples of where financial pressures have compromised care? 3. In what ways do leaders and staff strive for continuous learning, improvement and innovation? 4. Are staff focused on continually improving the quality of care? 5. How are improvements to quality and innovation recognised and rewarded? 6. How is information used proactively to improve care?

Source: How CQC regulates: NHS and independent acute hospitals. Appendices to the provider handbook. March 2015. P. 18-20. Bold from original.

Table A5 – Ofsted list of items Inspectors take into consideration when assessing effectiveness of leadership & management

List of items under consideration	Key Words of Items
1 The leaders' and governors' vision and ambition for the school and how these are communicated to staff, parents and pupils	Vision and ambition
2 Whether leaders and governors have created a culture of high expectations, aspirations and scholastic excellence in which the highest achievement in academic and vocational work is recognised as vitally important	Culture of high expectation
3 Whether leaders have the highest expectations for social behaviour among pupils and staff, so that respect and courtesy are the norm	Respect and courtesy
4 The rigour and accuracy of self-evaluation and how well it leads to planning that secures continual improvement	Continual Improvement
5 The design, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, ensuring breadth and balance and its impact on pupils' outcomes and their personal, development, behaviour and welfare	Outcome
6 How well the school supports the formal curriculum with extra-curricular opportunities for pupils to extend their knowledge and understanding and to improve their skills in a range of artistic, creative and sporting activities	Opportunity
7 How effectively leaders use the primary PE and sport premium and measure its impact on outcomes for pupils, and how effectively governors hold them to account for this	Outcome
8 How well the school prepares pupils positively for life in modern Britain and promotes the fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect for and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs and for those without faith	Promotion of values
9 The effectiveness of the actions leaders take to secure and sustain improvements to teaching, learning and assessment and how effectively governors hold them to account for this	Improvements
10 How well leaders ensure that the school has a motivated, respected and effective teaching staff to deliver a high quality education for all pupils, and how effectively governors hold them to account for this	Motivation and respect
11 The quality of continuing professional development for teachers at the start and middle of their careers and later, including to develop leadership capacity and how leaders and governors use performance management to promote effective practice across the school	Professional development, leadership capacity and performance management
12 How effectively leaders monitor the progress of groups of pupils to ensure that none falls behind and underachieve, and how effectively governors hold them to account for this	Progress monitoring
13 How well leaders and governors engage with parents, carers and other stakeholders and agencies to support all pupils	Engagement with

List of items under consideration	Key Words of Items
	stakeholders
14 How effectively leaders use additional funding, including the pupil premium, and measure its impact on outcomes for pupils, and how effectively governors hold them to account for this	Financial accountability
15 The effectiveness of governors in discharging their core statutory functions and how committed they are to their own development as governors in order to improve their performance	Development
16 How well leaders and governors promote all forms of equality and foster greater understanding of and respect for people of all faiths (and those of no faith), races, genders, ages, disability and sexual orientations (and other groups with protected characteristics), through their words, actions and influence within the school and more widely in the community	Equality and respect
17 The effectiveness of safeguarding	Safeguarding
18 The effectiveness of leaders' and governors' work to raise awareness and keep pupils safe from the dangers of abuse, sexual exploitation, radicalisation and extremism and what the staff do when they suspect that pupils are vulnerable to these issues.	Safety

Source: School inspection handbook, August, 2016, No150066, p. 37-8

Table A6 – MOD Leadership Questions within the Continuous Attitude Survey

Approach to Leadership	Dimensions of Leadership	Survey Questions
Indirect Measures of Leadership	<i>Morale</i>	Q4. How would you rate the level of morale of: myself my unit the Royal Nay as a whole
	<i>Job Satisfaction</i>	Q5. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your current job? a. My job in general b. The sense of achievement I get from my work c. The challenge in my job d. The amount of variety in my work e. My current work location
	<i>? (culture)</i>	Q6. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following? a. My superiors do not interfere excessively in my work activities b. I am given sufficient authority to make decisions c. If I make a genuine mistake at work, I do not feel that it will be held against me d. Where I work people do not automatically look for someone to blame when things go wrong e. I am encouraged to find better ways of doing things at work f. I am always given a clear deadline as to when work needs to be completed g. When I am set a task at work, I am told very clearly what output is required h. I have a choice in deciding how I do my work i. I know that if I do my job well I will be praised or rewarded
	<i>Teamwork</i>	Q15. In considering your immediate working team, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following? a. My team know exactly what their responsibilities are b. The people in my team can be relied upon to help when things get difficult in my job c. We have confidence in ourselves as a team d. The people in my team work together to find ways to improve the service we provide e. Team members work well with personnel from different backgrounds
	<i>Personal Development</i>	Q28. How satisfied are you with the following? a. My opportunities for professional development b. My opportunities for personal development c. The timing of the training I have received in order to carry out my current job roles d. The extent to which I am doing the job for which I was trained
	<i>Fairness</i>	Q39. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement regarding fairness and equality

Approach to Leadership	Dimensions of Leadership	Survey Questions
		in the Royal Navy? a. I am treated fairly at work Q54. Overall how satisfied are you with your life nowadays? Q55. Overall how happy did you feel yesterday? Q56. Overall how anxious did you feel yesterday? Q.57. Overall to what extent do you feel the things you do in your life are worthwhile?
Direct Measures of Leadership	<i>Direct Supervisor</i>	Q9. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your immediate superior? a. Understands and represents my interest b. Supports me in my job c. Sets a positive example d. Encourages me to develop my skills e. Is supportive over work/life balance issues f. Provides regular feedback on my performance g. Tells me what's going on at work h. Is someone I trust i. Helps me to understand how I contribute to Royal Navy's objectives j. Helps me to understand how major change decisions will affect me k. Works well with personnel from different backgrounds l. I am satisfied with the leadership provided by my immediate supervisor
	<i>Leadership in Unit</i>	Q11. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements? a. I trust my Divisional Officer to support me b. My Divisional Officer knows me well
	<i>Senior Leadership</i>	Q12. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the senior leaders of the Royal Navy (i.e. Commodore and above)? a. They understand and represent my interests b. They are keen to listen to Service people's feedback c. They champion the Royal Navy's interests in Tri-Service issues d. They communicate decisions to personnel e. They understand the impact of change on personnel f. I have confidence in the leadership of the Royal Navy
Questions about the survey		This survey is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too long • About right • Too short

Approach to Leadership	Dimensions of Leadership	Survey Questions
		<p>How long did it take you to complete this survey?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 10 minutes • 10-20 minutes • 20-30 minutes • 30-40 minutes • 40-50 minutes • 50-60 minutes • Over an hour

Survey rated in a five-point scale. Q4 (very high, high, neither high nor low, low, very low). Q5, Q28 (very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied). Q6, Q9, Q11, Q12, Q15, Q39 (strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree strongly disagree, n/a). Q54 to Q57 rated from 0 (not at all) to 10 (completely).

Source: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/523964/Annex_A_to_2016_AFCAS_questionnaires.pdf

Table A7 – EFQM Fundamental Concepts of Excellence utilised as base for the criteria of the Excellence Model

Fundamental Concept of Excellence	Description of the Concept
Adding value for customers	Excellent organisations consistently add value for customers by understanding, anticipating, and fulfilling needs, expectations and opportunities
Creating a sustainable future	Excellent organisations have a positive impact on the world around them by enhancing their performance whilst simultaneously advancing the economic, environmental and social conditions within the communities they touch
Developing organisational capability	Excellent organisations enhance their capabilities by effectively managing change within and beyond the organisational boundaries
Harnessing creativity & innovation	Excellent organisations generate increased value and levels of performance through continual improvement and systematic innovation by harnessing the creativity of their stakeholders
Leading with vision, inspiration & integrity	Excellent organisations have leaders who shape the future and make it happen, acting as role models for its values and ethics
Managing with agility	Excellent organisations are widely recognised for their ability to identify and respond effectively and efficiently to opportunities and threats
Succeeding through the talent of people	Excellent organisations value their people and create a culture of empowerment for achievement of both organisational and personal goals
Sustaining outstanding results	Excellent organisations achieve sustained outstanding results that meet both the short and long term needs of all their stakeholders, within the context of their operating environment

Source: <http://www.efqm.org/efqm-model/fundamental-concepts>

Table A8 – Statewide University Police Association Police Leadership Survey

Dimension of leadership	Question*	Question*
Integrity	Q1	Rate the manager in the following behaviour categories: Integrity (Defined in the survey as: Does the manager have integrity? Integrity is a firm adherence to a code of especially moral values. Do you believe the manager is an honest person and has the personal character to make honourable decisions, based on what is proper?)
Crime Fighting	Q2	Rate the manager in the following behaviour categories: Crime Fighting (Defined in the survey as: Is fighting and preventing crime one of his/her top priorities? Does the manager provide coherent plans for fight crime? Are officers encouraged to make arrests? Are they supported when they do? Are officers deployed in a manner that will increase the overall number of arrests?)
Officer Concern	Q3	Rate the manager in the following behaviour categories: Officer Concern (Defined in the survey as: Does the manager establish a supportive environment to enhance unit morale? Is the manager interested in the career paths of individual officers and does he/she promote a healthy balance between personal lives and work responsibilities? Does the manager demonstrate loyalty to line-level officers?)
Character	Q4	Rate the manager in the following behaviour categories: Character (Defined in the survey as: Does the manager place his/her concern for the welfare of the line officer above his/her own self-interest (promotion)?)
Vision	Q5	Rate the manager in the following behaviour categories: Vision (Defined in the survey as: Does the manager set clear goals for the unit and chart progress toward those goals?)
Leading by Example	Q6	Does this chief of police lead by example?
Inspiring Respect	Q7	Does the Chief of Police display personal integrity, which inspires respect from the employees of the agency, as well as members of the campus community and senior administrators (I.E. Campus President, VP, etc.)?
Accessibility	Q8	How would you rate the overall accessibility of the Chief of Police?
Level of Trust	Q9	How do you rate the level of trust between top-level management and the rank and file?
Morale – group	Q10	How do you rate the level of morale at the campus police department?

Dimension of leadership	Question*	
Morale – individual	Q11	How do you rate your morale, individually, as a police professional working at the campus PD?
Satisfaction	Q12	Given the opportunity, would you leave the campus police department for another law enforcement opportunity?
Confidence	Q13	How do you rate your level of confidence in the current Chief of Police?
Mission Articulation	Q14	Rate the Chief's ability to clearly articulate the mission and policies of your agency
Overall Assessment	Q15	Please provide your overall assessment of the chief of police

Source:

* Survey measured in a 5-point scale: Q1 to Q5 (unsatisfactory, needs improvement, satisfactory, very good and outstanding); Q6 and Q7 (no, not often, sometimes, most of the time, yes); Q8 to Q11, Q13, Q14 (poor, needs improvement, average, good, excellent); Q12 (no, I would not leave my current campus police department; maybe, but I would probably stay in my current position; I might consider leaving; yes, I would consider if the offer was attractive; yes, I would absolutely leave if given the opportunity); Q15 space for comments

Table A9 –Austin Police Department’s Command Leadership Profile Assessment Tool

Areas measured	Question
Leadership	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander has a leadership style that promotes trust, teamwork and continuous improvement
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander helps his/her employees have a better understanding of the department's vision and mission
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander understands and shares with his/her employees the "big picture" regarding the direction of the command/org
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander embraces and shares the mission, values and goals of our department
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander has set clear expectations for his/her employees
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander provides regular feedback on my performance
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander encourages his/her employees to identify problems and come up with creative solutions
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander is appreciative, compassionate and concerned for his/her employee's well-being
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander keeps his/her employees informed on the progress towards the goals and objectives of your command
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander leads by example
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander is supportive of me
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander is approachable
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander is available to his/her employees
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander is flexible
	The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander has the ability to influence his/her employees for the good of the department
The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander exhibits trust by giving his/her employees meaningful levels of responsibility	
The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander recognizes/rewards his/her employees appropriately	
The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander takes corrective actions when necessary to improve his/her employee's performance	
The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander has a clear understanding and knowledge of departmental policies and procedures	

Areas measured	Question
	<p>The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander is seen as credible and knowledgeable by his/her employees</p> <p>The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander is capable of helping his/her employees analyse complex issues related to the command's objectives</p> <p>The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander is willing to confront and resolve issues associated with inadequate performance by his/her employees</p> <p>The leaders in my command/my direct supervisor/my commander properly motivates his/her employees towards the good of the department</p>
Communication	<p>I believe communication is free and open within the command</p> <p>I believe leaders provide timely and relevant information to their employees within the command</p> <p>I believe employees have the opportunity to express their concerns or ideas up their chain of command</p> <p>I believe employees have input on decisions that will affect them</p> <p>I believe leaders in the command are approachable and willing to listen to their employees</p> <p>I believe leaders in the command adequately share the mission and values of our department with their employees</p> <p>I believe leaders in the command provide timely follow-up to the questions their employees have asked</p> <p>I believe there is good communication between our command and other commands</p>
Teamwork	<p>I believe my command has clearly defined goals that are understood by the entire unit</p> <p>I believe my command is successful working towards the goals/mission of our command</p> <p>I believe my command is provided sufficient resources to accomplish our mission</p> <p>I believe my command has co-workers that I trust</p> <p>I believe my command has free and open communication</p> <p>I believe my command has members who work well together and are able to resolve conflict</p> <p>I believe my command has members who share responsibility for tasks</p> <p>I believe my command effectively communicates with each other</p> <p>I believe my command trains enough as a unit</p> <p>I believe my command acts as a team</p> <p>I believe my command has a high morale level</p> <p>I believe my command has the ability to be creative and innovative to address problems</p> <p>I believe my command has members who actively share their knowledge and expertise with one another</p> <p>I believe my command works as a team with other units WITHIN the command when addressing problems</p>

Areas measured	Question
	I believe my command works as a team with other units OUTSIDE the command when addressing problems
Workplace Environment	I believe there is a general atmosphere of trust, supportiveness and respect within my command
	I believe I enjoy coming to work each day or most days
	I believe I have confidence and trust both up and down my chain of command
	I believe my command encourages team members to come up with ideas to improve the way our command conducts business
	I believe that the command is a safe climate for command members to openly and supportively discuss any issue related to the commands success
	I believe the work environment is one that promotes productive problem solving
	I believe employees are treated fairly within the command
	I believe employees are open to change within the command
	I believe what I am doing each day is important and contributing to the success of our command
Personal Development	I believe my supervisor is truly concerned and willing to help with my personal development
	I believe my supervisor has set high standards for my achievement regarding my personal development
	I believe I receive regular feedback from my supervisor in order to improve my work performance
	I believe I have the support of my supervisor regarding my professional goals
	I believe I am afforded enough time to develop the necessary skills to perform my duties as assigned
	I believe the shift training I receive is effective in helping me accomplish my daily tasks
	I believe I have the support form my command to help me reach my goals within our department
	I believe there are enough training opportunities to allow me to professionally grow and improve my performance
	I believe I have been given the necessary skills to perform my job well
	I believe that command promotes an environment for continuous learning

Source: Gay (2012). Survey scored in a four-point scale of: strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree.

Table A10 –Summary of different assessment dimensions and terms

Dimension of leadership	Terms
Setting direction	Setting Direction (College of Policing) Vision & Strategy (CQC) Vision, Mission, “Big Picture” (Austin Police Department) Vision and ambition (Ofsted) Setting direction (PEEL 2015) Vision (SUPA) Mission articulation (SUPA)
Morale & well-being	Morale and well-being (College of Policing) Morale (MOD) Well-being (MOD) Safety and wellbeing (CQC) Morale (SUPA) Life/work balance (SUPA) Wellbeing (Austin Police Department) Safe climate (Austin Police Department) Fair treatment (Austin Police Department) Respect and courtesy (Ofsted) Wellbeing (PEEL 2017) High morale level (Austin Police Department)
Fairness	Fairness & respect (PEEL 2017) Fairness and transparent selection (College of Policing) Respect (CQC) Fairness (MOD) Equality and respect (Ofsted)
Personal development	Development of skills to accomplish goals (Austin Police Department) Continuous learning (Austin Police Department) Continuous Improvement (Ofsted) Leadership development (PEEL 2015, PEEL 2016) Professional development (Ofsted) Personal development (MOD) Learning and development (PEEL 2017, College of Policing) Personal improvement (College of Policing) Future leadership capabilities (PEEL 2017, College of Policing) Development (Ofsted) Regular feedback (Austin Police Department) Fair and transparent selection (PEEL 2017) Current leadership capabilities (PEEL 2017, PEEL 2015, PEEL 2016, College of Policing)
Innovation	Innovation (College of Policing) Continuous learning, improvement and innovation (CQC) Developments and change (CQC) Continuous improvement (Austin Police Department) Creative solutions (Austin Police Department) Creative and innovative (Austin Police Department) Encourage new ideas (Austin Police Department) Productive problem solving (Austin Police Department) Open to change (Austin Police Department)

Dimension of leadership	Terms
	<p>Openness to feedback and challenge (PEEL 2017) Innovation (PEEL 2017, PEEL 2016) Ability to make mistakes and learn Participation and involvement (CQC) Raising concerns (CQC) Openly and supportive discussions (Austin Police Department)</p>
Job satisfaction	<p>Job satisfaction (MOD) Authority to make decisions (MOD) Autonomy (MOD) Clear understanding of task and output – what is expected (MOD) Choice in how to do work (MOD) Praised or rewarded for good work (MOD) Role clarity (CQC) Holistic understanding of performance (CQC) Performance measurements (CQC) Supportive environment (SUPA) Clear goals (SUPA) Satisfaction (SUPA) Clear expectations (Austin Police Department) Feedback on performance (Austin Police Department) Progress of goals and objectives (Austin Police Department) Supportive (Austin Police Department) Performance management (Ofsted) Engagement and motivation (PEEL 2015) Feedback on performance (Austin Police Department) Meaningful levels of responsibility (Austin Police Department) Recognition (Austin Police Department) Performance (College of Policing) Provides feedback (MOD) Enjoy coming to work (Austin Police Department) Contribution to success (Austin Police Department)</p>
Trust & support	<p>Supportive (MOD) Sets positive examples (MOD) Senior leaders as role models (College of Policing) Represents my interest (MOD) Someone I trust (MOD) Visible and approachable (CQC) Integrity (CQC) Appreciative and supporting relationships (CQC) Culture of candour, openness and honesty (CQC) Integrity (SUPA) Loyalty (SUPA) Leading by example (SUPA) Inspiring respect (SUPA) Accessibility (SUPA) Level of trust (SUPA) Confidence (SUPA) Trust (Austin Police Department) Values (Austin Police Department) Appreciative (Austin Police Department)</p>

Dimension of leadership	Terms
	Compassionate (Austin Police Department) Leads by example (Austin Police Department) Trust (Austin Police Department) Flexible (Austin Police Department) Available (Austin Police Department) Approachable (Austin Police Department) Atmosphere of trust, supportiveness and respect (Austin Police Department) Confidence and trust (Austin Police Department) Modeling values (PEEL 2017) Ethical decision-making (PEEL 2017) Express ideas and concerns (Austin Police Department) Personal integrity (SUPA) Character (SUPA)
Teamwork	Diverse leadership team (College of Policing) Teamwork (MOD) Teamwork – collaborative and constructive (CQC) Teamwork (Austin Police Department) Trust in co-workers (Austin Police Department) Share responsibility (Austin Police Department) Share expertise (Austin Police Department) Free and open communication (Austin Police Department)

University of Plymouth
Drake Circus
Plymouth
PL4 8AA

RESEARCH
WITH
PLYMOUTH
UNIVERSITY