

MARTIN TIPLADY, Director of HR, MPS

6 APRIL 2009

Chair: Cindy Butts

Panel Members: Bob Purkiss, Anthony Julius and Margaret Blankson

This cassette has been proof read and names inserted only where identity is certain.

Present: Anthony Julius, Margaret Blankson, Bob Purkiss, Cindy Butts

CB We'll take it in turns talk, to ans—ask you questions. You've seen the biographies of Panel members so I'm not going to go through them. Suffice to say we've got Anthony, Margaret, and also Bob. I ought to tell you that one of our Panel members is losing her voice!

(inaudible)

CB .. And it's not me - so you'll just have to bear with her. We are taping the session and at the end, probably in about a week or so, you'll get an opportunity to have a look at your evidence session and just approve that. At the end you'll get an opportunity to ask. Ask any questions or to raise anything that you haven't had the opportunity to say. That's broadly it. Can, can I ask by, can I start by asking you to tell us about the responsibilities of the Department that you head?

MT Yes and perhaps if I could just before that, Cindy, just say one or two things

Mm

MT ..about the Inquiry. Firstly, just to say thank you to you, for the opportunity to come and speak with you. My Department has worked hard over the last period to centre-stage diversity, to see its value, to improve the composition of the work force. (inaudible) now recruitment endeavours in our levelling of attrition rates between BME and white, in our positive action initiatives, in our flexible working and also the development of our value based leadership, we have made a lot of progress. But in so much that we have led the field. Other constabularies, the fire service, the Army, some commercial organisations have come to us and asked what we do and how we do it, to take some of the learning and us from them, too. And without for one moment wishing to therefore give a feeling of complacency

and satisfaction with where we are, because I certainly don't imply that; we have a huge distance to travel but there is some good progress to note. The area, of course, that records slower progress than we would wish is in the area of progression. We are all committed to wanting that, that position to change and I hope that one of the outcomes of this Inquiry will be to help us with the wherewithal to do some of that and to improve it. My Department is responsible for effectively all things employment, recruitment, retention, training, health services, leadership development and also the logistics function across the organisation.

CB Okay. And can you tell us about how your Department works strategically with other parts of the organisation to deliver?

MT Firstly, as a member of the Management Board, I work strategically with fellow Assistant Commissioners and Directors on that Board. I have my own HR Board, that in turn has relationships with different parts of the organisation and at different levels. We have a HR strategy that is developed – in fact we're just in the process of, of reviewing and renewing that - which takes account of what customers the Service actually feels that we need, together with my assessment, my Board's assessment, as to what they require. It is entirely a strategic plan that fits in with the MPA policing plan and looks to support the objectives and directions outlined in that plan.

CB Okay, thank you. Can I hand over to Margaret, please?

MB Yeah, Martin, sorry. Can you describe to me the remit (inaudible) the Diversity Directorate?

MT As far as I am concerned, the Diversity Directorate for me is a source of advice and expertise and assistance with, with diversity across the organisation; I think its role has changed over the years. I don't believe that the role of the Diversity Directorate is to provide a service in the sense of customer facing service; it is to act as a long stop to things not going quite right but it also is, moreover, much more importantly that it is a source of advice and expertise, a centre of excellence, if you like, that the rest of us in the organisation can draw on and help us in the initiatives and programs that we put together.

MB A-- and how do, how do they work in relation to other directorates?

MT I think probably pretty much the same. Of course the responsibilities changed over the years and its location within the organisation has changed over the years. But I still, still see that it is centre-staged, both looking externally but in particular with what our approach to diversity is, how we can improve the range of our services, operationally, the development of IAGs, the development of, of a whole range of initiatives for example, externally facing and also as I say, to be about centre of expertise that we can draw upon within HR, looking at some of the internal programs that need to be developed.

MB So I'd b--, I'd, I'd be accurate describing it as a central, a focal, a di-- unit within the organisation?

MT That's how I'd like to see it, yeah.

MB Okay. Perhaps I can just take you back to some—we met with Direct, Director of Diversity I think the week before last. There's a number of things which he commented on, that I'd like just to, for you to commen-- on, to comment on. Firstly, do you think the Directory is located in the right place within the organisation?

MT Think in terms of its external focus, yes I do. Of course, TP, Territorial Policing, is not all things operational; there are other operational parts to the organisation but it probably is the largest body in area of our operational business and therefore I think it's able there to yield the most influence and the most input into developing that range of initiatives that I've referred to and of course it's accessible to any other part of the organisation through there so yes, I do think it's in the right place.

MB Okay. Perhaps that word "relation" in, if I understand it in terms of externally, you think it's key (inaudible) the units it sits alongside but in relation to in, internally?

MT Well, I think the responsibility for the delivery of internal diversity is probably much more my own departments, but of course I've got a respect for the people who work in Diversity Directorate; we draw upon their expertise. I'm very keen, for, for example, we jointly (inaudible) things; that, that therefore it creates a creditability of both my own function, as the HR function across the business and also the Diversity Directorate's as being something which has real expertise in that area that we can draw upon and (inaudible) to what we do.

MB Okay. Martin, just like you to comment on some other things. We've met with a number of people from, as you're aware from (inaudible) across the organisation, both in individual, one to one Inquiry sessions and also focus groups. A number of comments have been made about the role and the function of, of the Diverse (inaudible) and I just want to play something to you, and just to get some of your comments and responses. One of the things that we've heard is that the Directory is limited in its powers and its ability to influence change because it sits within a TP unit and that potentially, or formally that a more appropriate place for it to sit would be (reporting?) to the Deputy Commissioner, so it sits above other TP units so it has an ability to influence across the organisation. That's for your initial comments or thoughts on that.

MT I think we spend a lot of time talking structures and looking at how structures either enable or impede progress of a particular area or two. I have to say I think it is over stated where structural solutions actually

(inaudible)

MT ..enable you to develop a particular set of theories and advancements within the organisation. I do believe that it is appropriately placed, where it is; the role that the Diversity Directorate fulfils, our attention to diversity central to any policy procedure process whether it be operational or non operational or organisational, race and diversity has a centre stage within that and I don't believe that will be enhanced by putting it

(inaudible)

MT ..under the auspices of the Deputy Commissioner because I'm aware of how the Deputy Commissioner, before and current, actually also regards diversity as being central to the policy development. In other words, what I'm trying to say is I think a lot of time could be spent saying with that change, the centrality of diversity in the

(inaudible)

MT ...organisation, I don't believe actually it would, I just think we believe it would be another structural change and I'm not sure it would actually raise the profile any beyond actually where it is at the moment.

MB Okay. How?

CB Well I was going to ask, so what would, then? I mean if it's, if, if we focus too much on structures, what is the, what is the solution? What should we be focussing on, then?

MT Right

CB The people? And if so, how?

MT Well I think people are centre to

Mm

MT ..culture change.

Mm

MT I think structures are second place to struc—to cultural change and I think probably processing and policy is, is, is, is then in that order. All I say is, I'm not sure that one needs to contemplate changing the location of Diversity Directorate. I know that the Director of Derv-- Diversity feels that, that it is appropriately located where it is and for my own part, my observation of how it is performing, where it is working, where it is influencing issues across the organisation, is that I'm not seeing any impediment to that progress from where that Directorate is sitting. It is relatively young, in service

Right

MT ..in territorial policing so I do think it's probably wise to let things settle, see how that levels out and then maybe to review as to whether the structural location is correct. For my part, I think it probably is.

MB Then perhaps picking up on that, at that point, (inaudible) I just take a note of a couple of things you said about the overall Directory about it being central, centre stage to diversitively – diversity – to being experts, offering advice and assistance. I seem to draw on something that sort of perhaps doesn't sit well in my understanding, perhaps.

MT Okay.

MB We recently received the Dialogue to Delivery report which sets out the Met's response in advance of this Inquiry's finding around the issue of race, recruitment, retention and progression. And in talking with the Director of Diversity, her response to this crucial document which is the lead on diversity for the Organ--- currently sits as the lead, was (a), that she had – was aware of it, but hadn't been, been consulted on it, but hadn't necessarily been a party to it; she hasn't seen a final draft, it hadn't been made accessible to her and officers win (sic) her unit; this was further, I think, supported when we met other personnel from that Unit who were also aware of that, this document but hadn't been given --perhaps hadn't been seen as central to the development of that document, so I ask you: if the Direct—if the Diversity Directorate is central to the development of your overall strategic framework on diversity, why would the Director of Diversity and her team not be (a), potentially leading on it; secondly not, certainly not being fully involved, perhaps lastly not being conversant with the outcomes and the processes that are proposed in this document, given this is the Met's current proposed strategy.

MT Okay. I don't regard Dialogue to Delivery as being the Met's proposed strategy. What I do regard it as being was, what is in the Foreword to the document which is in preparation for the Race and Faith Inquiry. It was a stock-take as to where the organisation is at, looking at a number of things and DAC Alf Hitchcock was commissioned to prepare that; of course Alf was, in effect, Head of Diversity within TP, of which the Director of Diversity reported to him. So the document, even though it's become known as the Wolfenden Inquiry, Dick Wolfenden who did much of the leg-work on the document, actually is just simply the main person who contributed to it, but the actual document itself was commi—was commissioned to and overseen by Alf Hitchcock, who's the Director of Diversity's Line Manager.

MB So Martin, (inaudible) sorry, are you saying then it's not unusual that the Director of Diversity shouldn't see...

MT No. No, I'm not, no I'm not saying that at all;

Okay

MT ... I, what I'm saying is that it was commissioned to the person who overall was in charge of diversity across the organisation, Alf Hitchcock. In terms of then the involvement of the Director of Diversity in the document, I think you probably would want to address that question to, to Alfred Hitchcock in terms of actually why and, and, and where and when and what. But my understanding of the position is that the Director of Diversity was consulted, was involved, in the collection of the data, in the material that went in to that document and into the first draft of that document; I know that Dick Wolfenden then took all the various contributions into that and I do know that the actual document was only finalised about two, two and a half weeks ago, to inform our own preparation for this Race Inquiry. It, it certainly isn't a strategy. It is a stock-take to, to actually read the document; it is a sort of s—synopsis of where we are, what we've done, how we've done it and where we are. If it is a strategy, then it stops rather short of actually saying, This is where we should go, this is what we should do, these are the things that we should do to get there. It doesn't go that far.

MB So, so Paul Stephenson's comments to us that if we had additional comments, 'cause one of the questions I, I think you were here,

MT I was.

MB You may recall one of the questions I asked him, which was, Why this p—piece of work had been produced in advance of our Inquiry and his response, Oh, I think I (inaudible) that quote was that, if there were additional things that we identified, they would be merged, taken on board into this document and that other things

MT (inaudible)

MB ... would be removed in order to take those things on (inaudible) into account. So I'm a bit confused that this (inaudible) I'm confused that this is a (inaudible) document in one sense or it's a document which is seen to drive the organisation by, by the Dir—Commissioner, is seen as important document by other officers we've interviewed and it seems that there-- one of the key people in the organisation provides advice, expertise and assistance, isn't a party to that and the reason I'm perhaps pushing this is that I'm trying to understand the process by which – and even if her role or the role of her Unit, sorry, is to provide advice and information, you would expect to, to my mind at some point, that key person has an a-- access opportunity to look at that report, given their role in terms of potential implementation and potentially seen as one of the key drivers because they are seen to offer advice for the Departments. So I'm wondering how that works, and whether that's a reflection of how diversity is seen in the organisation.

MT I don't – I don't think so. My understanding is that the Director of Diversity has seen the initial draft of the, of, of the Wolfenden Report. Let me try and deal with the confusion

MB Okay

MT ..on the status of what I think I heard Sir Paul say and what I understand to be the position – I know to be the position.

(inaudible)

MT ..which is – of course there's a lot of very essential and very helpful material in the Wolfenden Report, that, that, that captures where we are, what we've done, where we've got, it red lights, really, where we need to actually go in the future, just in terms of posing the questions. But in itself it doesn't give actions as to what we might do in order to further enhance and improve the position. I think what Sir Paul said is that actually, that now needs to be turned into an action plan, that needs to actually inform what we now do and what he has done is commission the Diversity Board under the Chairmanship of, of, of the Deputy Commissioner, the Acting Deputy Commissioner, in order to lead the development of that overall action plan. I know from the work that in my own Directorate that is under way, that we are developing our own response

(inaudible)

MT .. to what that action plan might look like in terms of internal initiative and the like, in order that we can put that to the Diversity Board when it meets. But I think that is one of the documents that is sourcing that action plan that needs to be done. I think the line of questioning that I heard last week was, wasn't that premature, in the sense of, of, of awaiting the outcome of the Inquiry and I think what the Commissioner was saying is, we need to get under way with what we need to do. I don't think that the Inquiry would be diametrically opposed to what he would propose to do in that action plan, though if it was, actually then we'd just have to about turn.

(inaudible) let me just stop you, I think the purp--

MT We just didn't want to lose the time.

MB The purpose of my question – and, and, and the points I've made is to, is to try and elicit whether diversity is taken seriously ,so my first question (inaudible) and about where it sits in the organisation was to identify whether it's in the right place. I imagined that this report or this document at some point would go to the Management Board.

MT The document has been to the Management Board.

MB Into the Management Board. If the lead for Di-- (inaudible) for Diversity—Diversity on the Management Board, the discussion would have been had with all and I imagine it's (inaudible) Denise Milani would have had contributed to that process because sh—one of the things she does is advise and assist and provide expertise at that strategic level, so I would suggest and one of the things I'm (inaudible) I think you understand the (inaudible)

MT Yes I do

.. is it seems at, at odds with (a), what you're say—what you're saying to us, while I accept what you're saying, I understand what you're saying and what actually seems to take place. But let's leave it there 'cause I think (inaudible) point (inaudible) I've, I've elicited enough on that point and I just want to move on to another area.

MT What, what I can say though, is that when it went to the Management Board

(inaudible)

MT ..that Alf Hitchcock was present for that discussion. So in fact he presented what that Report needed to be summarised as, to the Management Board on that day.

MB (inaudible) didn't, The Director of Diversity didn't (inaudible)...

MT No, but the Director of Diversity's line manager, Alfred Hitchcock, who was commissioned to do the Report, was there.

MB But how do you keep a connection flow, if you have (inaudible), right, let's leave that and I'll move on 'cause I think there's another (inaudible) come back to that. One, one of the things that was also came up from our, our discussions for the Director of Diversity was that – was there, there were issue of the Met's failures to meet the recruitment target is in essence a Human Resource issue or responsibility is often perceived and treated as (inaudible) diversity issue. Just wondered what your comments were on that.

MT Well, (a), I don't think we've failed to meet the recruitment targets. I think if you go right back to the year 2001, the target that was set for the Met to meet in terms of BME recruitment was established at 25.9 per cent and if you measure us against the attainment of that target for police officer recruitment, then overwhelmingly we have missed that. However, the Home Office ceased to use that target three, maybe even four years ago because it realised that that target had been artificially set, it was just simply a reflection of the Census and instead had looked to set targets related to recruitment, as opposed to work force targets.

MB (inaudible) perhaps stop you and perhaps broaden it, perhaps (inaudible). We were talking about recruitment; we were also talking about recruit, retention and progression.

(Inaudible)

MB So I posed the question to Denise, to the Director and, in response to that, the overall essence of what she was saying and I can find, I'm sure we can find the transcripts for you, were that the whole issue around the recruitment retention (inaudible) and promotion of BME officers not (inaudible) faith, it's clearly an organisational issue, which is why we're here, but the responsibility for those areas are human resource, in essence, human resource issues.

MT Yeah.

MB But the issues, the failings of (inaudible) success of those issues, not just in target, but broadly in terms of the issues we know that are still prevailing in the organisation in terms of not identifying an appropriate response, are then transferred from the Human Resources to seen as a diversity failing, so I'm asking you

MT Right

MB ..whether they sit in three reports

MT They sit in mine

MB ..let me finish, (inaudible) whether, whether they're a diversity issue or clearly a human resource (inaudible). They both sit under your responsibility so I'm asking, either way – way, I'm ask for your responses, 'cause you would (inaudible) responsibility for that.

MT Okay. I would say that the, the Diversity Directorate

Yeah

MT .. (inaudible) is part of my response to it, is part of my answer to it, rather than part of the problem of it.

MB Okay.

MT The, the, the, the issue about compliance or non compliance for the targets that are set on recruitment, on attrition, on progression, is most firmly HR's. Without a doubt I can take you to my own PDR, where those targets are set, I can take you to the PDRs of my own managers where those targets are set. And, and I would regard it as a personal responsibility to either meet that or not meet that and then to explain it and account for it, but in responding to how we may do things to address (inaudible), I certainly would want to draw upon the expertise of the Diversity Directorate be part of the solution to it but I don't see that it's, it's principally advice to the Directorate target to achieve our recruitment, progression, attrition targets. That firmly is mine.

MB Move nicely on to my next area which is around the whole PDR process. I won't repeat to you the various comments that we have heard from officers and civilian staff, I'm sure you're, you're aware of the comments in relation to the Met's P, PDR process but just perhaps to give you an essence of a few of them, we've been told that the PDR process is a waste of time, that officers and civilian staff write their own PDRs, that they sign their, the pro—PDR process is more of "You're doing okay, aren't you", that very few people talked about the PDR in response to rete—identifying training needs, training gaps, poor service to, poor outputs or in their own delivery of services, that they were a waste of time, quite frankly they're a tick box. Now, given the PDRs as you just outlined are part of what is used to manage diversity (inaudible) among other things and there's a recep—and our perception's been, the perception we're receiving is they don't actually work, so the measure – one of the measurements to, the measure (inaudible) doesn't work. How – could you respond to (a), some of those comments – and I mean are, are people just, you know, and, and saying this the comments were not just from BME officers, they're from across the organisation, both civilian staff and police officers but also I think perhaps more surprising, from all the ranks (inaudible) we met,

MT (inaudible)

MB ..bar the Ec—ACPO members, of course.

MT I think we've come some considerable distance on both the development of an appropriate PDR system and one that is seen to be working in the organisation; I say that because when, when I joined the organisation there was a PDR system, it was probably more measurable in terms of the quantity of forms that one needed to fill out rather than the quality of the

process that was gone through and not surprisingly there was very little attention given to it. We've now changed that position to a very short, simple of a, a, a form and about to be, as part of the new HR model, an electronic process too.

Mm

MT But we're now on to the 90 per cent completion rates on PDRs across the organisation. Am I concerned that there are suggestions that people fill out their own, that, Oh yes, you're doing okay, aren't you and it's all a bit of a waste of time? I don't want you to misunderstand what I'm about to say

Mm

MT But it is a fact that in any HR department I'm aware of or I've worked in or talking with colleagues, the ability to get an appraisal system

Mm

MT ..that is understood, working, really contributing to what I believe it ought to be contributing to, is really a s—very significant challenge; indeed, the only PDR system that I've (inaudible) ever seen that was judiciously carried out and judiciously valued is the one where it led to pay changes for an individual. We don't want to go down that route; it's much more about objectives and assessing where people are at, assessing what people should do. So having a, having got the appropriate system in place, having tried to make sure that it's carried out effectively across the organisation in terms of it is attended to and there are half yearly reviews and the like, what I've also then tried to do is to look at how -- what it really is like, for the appraiser and the appraisee. And we have an evaluation system within HR that looks at every OCU, every Operational Command Unit, once a year and part of the, the measures they look at is the appraisal, the PDR system, to look at not only its time (inaudible) its frequency in being carried out; it goes deeper, looks at whether objectives were set, whether those objectives were reasonable, it looks at training plan and looks at whether that training plan was then informed to actually become a training response; it looks at actually what the response was like for the appraiser and the appraisee by interviewing them face to face, on a dip sampling basis. And so we get some intelligence back in real time, about what it's like.

MB So (inaudible)

MT All I say is

MB Are you saying that you don't think there's a problem or there's a problem in completion?

MT No, I, I d—I do think there's a problem

MB You do think—okay.

MT I do. I do think there's a problem. We try, we've tried to develop the appropriate response to that; we've really simplified the system as being one of the responses to one of the (inaudible) it was all too long winded, it's all too difficult but we're still having that difficulty. I think the test, for me is it, it's a cultural one, rather than one about whether we've got the right PDR system or not. I think we could dream up fifty different PDR systems and would probably still have the same response. The cultural challenge is whether managers feel that undertaking the PDR is an appropriate way of managing their relationship with their support units and I think that's probably a challenge I've still got to face.

MB What plans do you have to meet your challenge?

MT Well, through, through the Leadership Academy, through the Values Based Leadership Program, by looking at the quality of the relationship between the individual and the manager, by looking at the extent to which our managers are behaving in the way that we want them to behave, of which assessing them and being honest with feed back is one of those behaviours. We've spent a lot of time, three years ago, re-doing the values, re-doing the behaviours and then setting a whole Leadership Academy into five different programs for different levels of manager in order to try and bring about that change. The early feed back from those programs via our staff surveys is fairly positive; it's slow, steady change rather than overwhelming, overnight change and actually I've rather settled for the slow steady change, given that it's a culture change program. But certainly the value of PDRs is part of that interchange between a part of that relationship in the programs that we've put together as part of our leadership development.

CB Martin. I still want to try and get a sense from you, of what you see as the key issues, the key problems which black and minority ethnic officers and staff face within the organisation and I say that in view of, you know, we've had Lawrence, we've had Morris, we've had Cambridge, you know – loads more in between that, we've now got this Inquiry. Notwithstanding the fact that the organisation has made some success. What, why are we still here? Why are we sitting here now? So what's going on in the organisation?

MT I think probably at the heart of it is – and I think there's two or three things, Cindy, I'd like to say. One is I think ten out of ten for effort, in terms of the initiatives, the way we've tried to establish programs to overcome the sorts of challenges that we faced. Yeah, I think you know from personal experience how much challenge we faced on the recruitment front. And we've made some success and progress on that front. But all I say is, sometimes the perception is different from the reality; I'm not saying there isn't a reality of difficulty, but sometimes the as– the perception of what, on top of that reality is wrong, is sometimes what I read to be the position. On recruitment, for example, I spend lots and lots of time trying to impress upon people the progress we've made, but that is a challenge in its own right. The overwhelming thing for me, that would help to change the position, is progression. Because however much we are bringing people in to the organisation, however much we are retaining them, because there is now a myth that we are losing people; we're not – according to the attrition rates that I monitor weekly, fortnightly, the issue is about how you permeate that progression through the organisation. I'm dealing, really, with progression; that of a pro—of a, of a recruitment pull that was developed ten, twelve, fifteen years ago and how we speed up the progress of individuals through the organisation is in fact I think why this Panel is here today. How we may actually advance that position within the organisation. Because that in itself is not giving confidence to Londoners, that we have tackled some of the race and diversity issues that we've been set, because we haven't progressed people in sufficient qual—quantity through the organisation.

CB And, and, and the reason for that is, is are you using the sort of time argument?

MT Yes.

CB The, the reason that you haven't, we haven't seen any real success, or the success that we would like, is because of time.

MT Think the, the time is a very significant contributor to it. I'm not saying that I don't think there are some instances by which – look, there is no individual instance where I can put my finger on and say, Such and such and such a thing happened, but until I am convinced that the process is working fairly and the outcome is what we are looking for,

Mm

MT .. you know, I have to say the main contributor to that is time.

CB I, I, I'm having difficulty with that time argument and, and the reason why I'm having difficulty with it is because we actually convened a focus group of long serving black and minority ethnic officers. You know, officers who have been in this organisation for a long time, who have amassed qualifications, often disproportionately to their white counterparts, who have done all the things that they were told to do when they failed particular promotion processes, gone away, done them. Gone back and still getting knocked back, time and time again. So, for those individuals, the time argument simply doesn't wash. What would you say to that?

MT I think it's worth bearing in mind that I do think there is a time list—time (inaudible) issue for a vast number of those cases; for any instance by which an individual has said, I've been knocked back, we've looked at, we've reviewed, we've assessed and we've tried to put in place if we feel

MT ... there is any reasonableness to that process which, which, which tries to change that outcome. I am just very keen that, having reviewed the process *ad nauseam*, in terms of the recruitm—the promotion process, I cannot think that there is a fairer, more objective process than we already have. It's been tested by just about every possible means it can be tested by. I worry about whether people get in to the system. I am concerned about whether ever people get into that system in the first place, but I am assured that once people get into that system, then the process itself does take care of it and it is as fair and as objective as it can possibly be. I've really spent more time personally on this in the last couple of years, than any other activity to ensure that fairness and yet I'm thrown by two recruitment, by two promotion processes that fail to promote one ethnic minority.

CB Why? Why?

MT When I look

CB If the process is right,

MT When I look at, okay

CB ..why is it not working?

MT So I therefore look at the people that failed that process on that occasion and I look independently at the, at the, at the data that's been produced,

Mm

MT The assessments that have taken place, the assessors that, that, that, that made those assessments and try to see how they've drawn what they've drawn, it is almost impossible to disagree with their conclusion. Almost impossible, to disagree with it. So my response has therefore been to move it on to, Well, how can we make sure that the filter into that system is right? And we've reintroduced business groups into doing that assessment for some sort of Quality Assurance process going into it, so we try to make sure the feed in is correct and is fair and I try to make sure that the end product is fair. And therefore I hope the two will match. I also want to speed up the development. That's been my response to it.

CB How, how do you ensure that the end product is fair?

MT Well, it is completely anonymously carried out, the end product

(inaudible)

MT When the assessments take place, they all then go into this pot

CB Okay

MT ..and the Panel that finally assess who should go through and who doesn't go through, have absolutely no knowledge about who they're talking about, which business group they're from, any personal details at all. They are just looking at a grid of marks that have been assessed from three different parts of a process

Mm

MT ..and looking at them. And I'm a great believer, by the way, that the highest doesn't, highest score shouldn't always win. But that's by the way. But they have taken that assessment, drawn the line where they feel it appropriate according to what the supply to the organisation should be, the demand and, and then made their assessment accordingly. I am pleased that on the last process, the Superintendents, the Chief Superintendents, that the two people, two BME people that went into that assessment both came out of it successfully but I was hugely disappointed by the Chief Inspector to Superintendent and Inspector to Chief Inspector process. Hugely disappointed and spent a lot of time trying to look at why that should arise. What we might have done wrong, as a result. The process, I can't find fault with.

AJ It's a, it's a bit like a kind of mystery novel, isn't it – you've got the corpse, which is BME progression, but you've got no murder suspects.

(Laughter)

AJ No? I mean

(inaudible)

AJ To use a – to use a policing analogy and, and,

MT Not su--

AJ .. and you just, and you don't know, you've got no leads, either.

MT Well, I may have no leads

AJ But I mean, that's right, isn't it

MT Except what I can do is respond to those circumstances and think, Well, what can I do to change the outcome of that process?

AJ Well, I, no. I think probably no, 'cause that, to use my not completely frivolous analogy, that would be to ask the question, how can I ensure that there aren't, there aren't further fatalities? But I, I'm interested in knowing why, why the corpse is, this corpse is in the library. Why, why – if the processes are righ--- are okay and you--, you've undertaken the investigation into the particular process on that occasion and that's okay and yet, as far as we're aware, perfectly talented, eligible people didn't get through. And the only possible explanation, therefore, is that it was their colour.

MT Well, no, there is another assessment

AJ Ah. Okay.

MT There is another ---

AJ So what's the, what's the, what's the other explanation?

MT Which is that they were beaten in the race, in order to be promoted. That there were people who

BP Hang on, hang on. Can I just add to that? No, I need to add to that, because the, the, we're, we're beating around bushes here and I think what Anthony's saying is important but the evidence that we've received so far is that it's not necessarily the policies or processes that's the problem, it's those predominance of the informal practices and the networks that's create the barriers. Those 'phone calls, opportunities for people to act up given to certain people, (inaudible) which is neither open, fair or transparent so, if we're looking at the system, let's look at it in total – that's probably to develop Anthony's point.

MT If that, I assume that's an invitation to comment on the informal practices.

CB Not, not just yet. I want you to, I want, I want to finish o-- I want you to finish off this dead body s-- analogy and, and no, no murderer, no leads.

MT Well, what what I was saying to Anthony is, if I thought that the reason for any failed promotion was just simply an assessment of colour, then I have to say I would take measures to deal with that. That is not what I have found from looking at those processes, from looking at how those decisions have been taken, once people are in to that system of being assessed. All I can conclude from those assessments is that the right people got through from that overall promotion process. Now we do have different assessors because of the volume of people going through it, there's several assessors, so we haven't got the same assessors doing every assessment, but we've tried to minimise any difference between the assessors with various means of testing those assessors. At the end of it I have to conclude that the right people, whatever their race, whatever their circumstances, were the right people that got through on that promotion process.

AJ Yeah, but there's a, there's a kind of, I mean it, it's a bit like struggling with some ectoplasmic entity, you know, this because, on the one hand, there's a, there are formal acknowledgements

Mm

AJ ..that there is a problem, we've got a long distance to go and a certain amount of hand wringing, at a kind of general level; and then with, with, with particular focus on particular events, the answer is, Actually it's okay. So that, so that, so that you – and I don't mean to

be attacking when I say this, but I'm simply trying to understand the process, you know. I've come to this from outside. It's quite easy, though, when, when there is a problem and I, and one's inside it, to say, At the abstract there's a problem, but actually, at any rate on my patch, everything's fine. And I, I'm and, and it's that, it's the inability to marry the so to speak, the general critique with the, with the particular

Mm

AJ ..smugness, to use a pejorative term, that I'm wrestling with. So, so either everything is okay and the right people are getting through, okay, right? Or-- everything is not okay and the wrong people are getting through. Both those positions are coherent. What is not coherent is to say, Things are not okay, but the right people are getting through. And that essentially is your position at the moment.

MT No, it isn't,

AJ Well it, it was, because you said, in relation to that particular promotion exercise, The right people got through. Now what I'm trying to do is to reconcile a general acknowledgement that there's a problem, with a particular refusal to acknowledge that there was a problem on that occasion. And that,

(inaudible)

AJ There's no – it, it's just a matter of ordinary reason, there's no connection between those two propositions.

MT Well, what I'm trying to say is that yes, there is a problem, because we are deeply aware that we do want ethnic minorities to succeed and to develop in this organisation. The process itself I cannot fault for not being objective, fair and as transparent as it can possibly be, but I'm thoroughly disappointed with the outcome of our promotion processes, insofar that it's not been able to successfully promote more ethnic minorities than it has been able to. The number who have gone into the system does reflect the time and that is a fact that that is a major contributor to the paucity of success that we've been able to record. But I am disappointed with the outcome and all I can therefore do with that outcome, I may be allowed to, to sort of just develop the notion, is how can we speed up

(inaudible)

MT ..the ability of ethnic minority people with the experiences, the range of, of experiences and skills needed to develop in order to be able to compete for those promotion places when they're available and within the realms of the law in terms of Positive Action, that is where I have gone, in ti—in trying to develop the ideas and wherewithal in order to develop Positive Action schemes to accelerate those individuals' development. That's why I've landed up where I have.

AJ So, so there i—there is a problem, there is a corpse? There isn't a murderer, it is a problem of time in a sense that, that, that, that, that the BME officer died through old age. It's just a matter of time. And time will solve the problem?

MT Yes, quite probably, but I cannot wait that amount of time; if we are to carry on, developing our ethnic minority

AJ (inaudible), sorry, sorry, hold on –

(inaudible)

AJ --but if you, but unless you know , unless you know the problem, unless you've identified the culprit, unless you've identified the assassin, in my slightly over-elaborated analogy, how can you address the problem? See, this is what I'm struggling with. You say that there's a problem, you want to address it, I completely accept your *bona fides* but because you're unable to identify the cause of the problem, you, you surely are, are defenceless before it in the future, too.

MT Think it's a struc—it is a police structural issue by which, in order to gain advancement throughout the ranks, one needs to serve time in the ranks and to develop the range of skills or experiences one needs to, to develop. That's the time issue. All I can do,

(inaudible)

MT .. when, when I look at where—when I look at the

(inaudible)

MT ..success

Can I just interrupt (inaudible)

MT Can, can, can I just develop the answer please?

Okay, right.

MT When I look at the, the time factor of an ethnic minority individual advancing let's say to Chief Inspector or Superintendent from Constable, alongside the same time of a white equivalent, I have to say the time is, is a little shorter. Not a lot shorter but is a little shorter. What can we do, therefore, to speed that up even more? That's why I've gone where I've gone. Because there is basically an issue of time. Now, I don't think if I wait

AJ Sorry, do you know why it's shorter?

MT No. And, and I'm talking of, of a year or two – not significant periods. But it is marginally shorter, is all I'm trying to say there. If it was marginally greater, then I'd be even more concerned but it's marginally shorter. If we can speed up that development then we can try and get where we want to be, sooner or at least give confidence that the process is enabling people to succeed, in shorter periods of time. That's important to us. Because I don't think we can wait ten, fifteen years before we address this issue and start to see the numbers permeating through. When I look at -- I mean, we, we, we have gone

End of Side A

MT When I look at how those, that 2,050 more have actually joined the organisation and when, one can start to see the permeation into Sergeant and into Inspector ranks beginning to take place. It is at that point when it starts to slow down. And so, if I think that we've got 10 per cent of our Constables at the moment who are ethnic minority, we have four and a half per cent of our Sergeants who are ethnic minority and we're got four per cent of our Inspectors who are ethnic minority, we can start to see the permeation through the ranks of that time centred issue. So there is a bit of waiting, a bit more time to allow that further development, both in volume and to higher ranks too.

MB Okay, sorry to have interrupted. Just a short point. If we move away from time issue for a second, I'm just sort of sitting here just listening to Anthony has taken you through the body in the library and I won't go back there.

Thank you!

MB (inaudible) I just want to offer a suggestion – I think you'll (inaudible) probably, a suggestion that there appears to me to be two (inaudible) options. (inaudible) the process which you suggested is fair, perhaps is not as fair as you potentially think, or there is a human dimension that you can't measure, that is influencing those two things. So I just wanted to take you down that road and looking at those two issues. A, the process and B, the human dimension. And I, I (inaudible) start with your human dimension, I mean responding, can you consider this issue of the Golden Circle that, that Bob started to allude to, that we briefly we talk about, outside of what you said to Anthony, they are the only two options that appear to be left.

MT There is an amount of sponsorship of individual officers and I am aware of the number of ethnic minority individuals who are sponsored by Senior Managers in the organisation that try to actually mentor and coach and help people to develop. I'm aware, for example that Tim Godwin, the Deputy Commissioner, currently coaches two ethnic minority officers, in order to assist - or to mentor them - through the organisation.

(Inaudible)

MT And there's a great number of those sorts of instances that exist in any organisation. The human dimension for me is always making sure that in the assessments on that assessment process, that there is consistency and fairness, that individual biases (inaudible) are not

actually coming in to the equation. So how can we do that? Well, we can only do that by the way in which those two assessors actually share their information, agree a score and also by making sure that above that, the success or failure of the assessors in terms of who they're putting through the process, is also adjudged and looked at and some trends established if there is a trend to be established. All of that takes place in terms of assessing the performance of individual assessors, trying to deal with those issues of human dimension. If I go right back to before people get into the system, how we make sure that ethnic minorities are coming to the system, so long as they are qualified and skilled and experienced enough to do it, we quality assure the business group assessment, as to who they're putting forward for promotion. Now you may say that's a second guess, I'm not intending it to be – it's just trying to make sure that those coming into the system are fair and those that have been rejected from the system have also been treated fairly. What is very hard to get hold of is those people who have not applied to the system at all and may have been discouraged from doing so. I'm not suggesting there's an issue there, but it certainly is the issue that I'd want to try and find ways of trying to get hold of that group of people and look at how we might adjudge that and that, going right back to the evaluation system about of, of the PDRs, maybe a way into that which is, is the one way I've thought of, of trying to get into that.

MB Do you want to respond to the golden circle?

MT Yeah

MB (inaudible), I'm more interested in the (inaudible) formal network (inaudible). I have no doubt, to a certain extent, I mean, the thing (inaudible) you know I find interesting, in talking to officers across the organisation, be that white officers, be that female officers, they all question the fairness of "the process". So I, I'm interested that there's not, I (inaudible) well perhaps there is (inaudible) I haven't understood it, but there is a, still a feeling the process isn't fair, so you're right in, to a degree, (inaudible) the process is right, to me isn't, doesn't sit well with what I've heard but nevertheless, what I'm, I'm (inaudible) coming on to before Bob and Anthony come, is just on this informal su-- process which isn't about any process or mentoring which we've also heard, it's more of the benefit for white officers and black officers and in fact black officers and BME officers have an abundance of mentors, because it assists white officers to put in their own PDRs that they've supported –that's part of their diversity, which is another interesting process, but we won't go there, but just at this point let's just talk about this golden circle. Is it a myth? Is it true? Does it exist? How does it operate? Or actually, do you not know anything about it, as I think slightly Sir Paul Stephenson suggested.

MT Well, put it this way: I've been in the organisation-- if I can deal with the two things.

Yes.

MT One is about why, why there's still that, that countering view about the process and secondly about the golden circle. If I can deal with the golden

Yes

MT ..circle first. I've been in the organisation seven years. I am personally unaware of the existence of any golden circle that honours or puts, makes especial a group of people who may be developed in the organisation, or encouraged or given means of help. I am unaware of that. The only assistance I'm aware of is those individual relationships such as the, such as the two officers I've just referred to, with, (inaudible) Godwin, where people are helped and facilitated to get through the system. I would go a stage further and say that I have never seen any evidence of a golden circle. I accept entirely that if there is a perception of the golden circle then we've got to do something in order to counter that. But I have seen no reality of a golden circle anywhere in my travels in seven years. If I can deal with the process, we ran, last year, two major seminars, each attended by about a hundred people and they were drawn at all ranks, all levels, both officers and staff, the staff support associations were there, so on and so forth. About the promotion process and about what works and what doesn't work. And I think, I think the thing that struck me is that it wasn't that there was one view about how the system should run at each of those workshops, it's that literally there were a hundred different views about how the system should run. And whilst we are able to get some general agreement to some of the principles about what should feature in the promotion process, once we'd put that all together in – and this is how it's going to work from here on, at least half of that room disagreed with it and said, Yeah, but you're not taking account of this or you've not taken account of that. Whatever is the outcome, there is a large part of the organisation that will not feel that it's taking account of the right circumstances. So, for example, there is half of the organisation that will actually feel that time served in a rank is really important. My own view and at least half the organisation is the view that time served is less important – it's the range of experiences that you've got and whether you've been able to develop a skill and the potential at the level that you are aspiring to, which should be assessed. But there's at least half that say you should be in that rank for at least X years, before you're even eligible to apply. That's at the heart of some of the (inaudible). Just as one example. So there is a major difference of opinion as to what the promotion process should look like, from a whole organisation and I'm not surprised (inaudible) lots of different views about it.

CB Just before I bring in Bob, just you, you say that you had this event and lots of people had very different ideas about the recruitment processes. I mean, we've talked to quite a lot of people now and we actually get people saying roughly the same things about the recruitment process. It's not fair, it's not transparent. There is certainly no clear and transparent way in which people are appointed to acting or temporary positions which as we know is a prerequisite for them then getting the substantive role. We've heard lots of, of questions about the quality of assessors, not just their quality but also about whether or not they are conversant with equality and diversity issues. We've heard lots of people talking about the lack of an independent kind of external presence within the recruitment processes. So while you've, you may have heard lots of different things, we're hearing a chorus of individuals saying all the same things about the, what's lacking in current processes. I wonder if you can comment on that and then I'm going to head on to – to Bob.

MT Okay. I think there are probably four things there I need to comment on, Cindy.

Mm

MT The first is acting. Ac—acting for police regulations is for a period of up to two months and is intended for holiday cover and, and all of that. And yes, that is a local decision, as to who should act and for what reason, for what period. But it is a regulated matter, because the payroll actually dictates it, in terms of how long somebody can actually act for, which is different from temporary promotion, where I think actually you, you actually hint at the right thing. I think temporary promotions are a potential way of developing the experience, the skills quickly and I have become aware of an issue by which I don't think necessarily those opportunities have been as widely offered and circularised as they ought to be. There's always going to be an exception for operational reasons, but actually I'm talking about the rule here, rather than the exception. You may be interested to know that one of the things that we've recently announced and in fact I hope by now it's actually in place -- I say I hope because we've just got a little technical hitch to deal with-- is that all temporary opportunities are now going to be circularised across the organisation on a newly designed Web site for all opportunities across the organisation. So at least there's the ex--, there's the opportunity for everyone to express an interest that, in what that will be.

CB And, and is that decision still locally made?

MT No. Sorry, the, the up to a certain level it could be locally made

Mm

MT ..but actually above a certain level it will be centrally confirmed.

CB Right. I, I don't want to prolong this too much

(inaudible)

CB ..but I, I'd, I'd be interested to know up to what level it's

MT Up to Inspector.

CB Right

MT It would locally

CB Okay

MT ..determined and thereafter it would be centrally confirmed.

CB Right.

MT At different levels, it would be centrally confirmed.

MT But just the sheer fact of circularising that on the Web site, of the fact that anyone can actually have their – throw their hat into the ring for that

It

MT ..and it's, it'll be regulated, I assure you

Mm, mm

MT ..in terms of the success or failure

Mm

MT ..of that, because it is early days.

CB It is a step in the right direction, I, I admit but I, I would still have concerns about that still being a local decision, without any effective monitoring of that, because I think all too often, when we – and Margaret raised the question around the golden circle, I think we all, we all too often think the golden circle sits up here.

Yeah

CB It can also sit down here as well, with people you know, appointing to temporary positions their friends, people they've liked, people they've --you know, gone through really difficult kind of, you know, very, you know, challenging policing kind of situations with and they've formed bonds with them, very close bonds and friendships and, and, and I think that, that I would be concerned at, that that is still a very local decision, rather than something that would ensure much more transparency and give confidence to officers and staff

Yeah, well

CB So it's not

MT Perhaps if I hear that and I will take that away and just

Okay

MT ..reflect on whether we might need to just slightly revisit that. I will be more than happy to do that.

Okay.

MT Can I just finish on the other two bits which was the quality of the assessors

Mm

MT ..and also the lack of, of, of independence which I think

(inaudible)

MT I started from the point of thinking, Are our assessors of the right calibre? And again, given the volume of what we're talking about, there's always going to be an odd occasion when an assessor fails to come up to the calibre. Actually I need to assure the Panel that those assessors that don't come up to the calibre on the overall Quality Control that is, is established afterwards about trend and success and all of that, actually we remove assessors and the systems that Dick Wolfenden, who does manage the process at the moment, has in place to try and evaluate the assessors, what they score, what their consistencies are, so on and so forth, are pretty good, but he is fairly firm with dealing with assessors who don't come up to the mark. He has recently, just as a way of again trying to provide some assurance, developed a new program as well, by which those assessors go through some further awareness issue, aware, diversity awareness just to make sure that we actually are all evaluating as well to the right level, to the right standard, to the same standard across. On the lack of independence, I think you know my views. And actually we're going to introduce an independent person on to the Panels, the assessment panels. That person needs to be a skilled interviewer, as far as I'm concerned and preferably we can

actually draw those from a diverse range of backgrounds and experiences. We don't particularly just want an observer, we want somebody to contribute and help, contribute to the selection decision. But that (inaudible).

Okay. Okay.

BP I'm having some, some difficulty in, in squaring away the things that you're saying to us with the reality of examples that we're being given at our focus group meetings, where we're meeting officers and staff from right across the board as my colleagues have already referred to. And the examples that they have been given, whether it's on time, whether it's on promotion boards, whether it's on ability and the judgements that are made on them, that are preventing the progression and it's the progression issue that I want to talk about. It, it doesn't square up with all the, the good processes from, probably where you're sat, seem to be okay. For example: you spoke on mentoring. Now, we've had so much evidence given to us that the mentoring benefits the mentor, rather than the mentee. It is a tick box for those white officers who are putting down in their example of diversity for their own promotion, that they have mentored a BME person. And yet, when you follow through, whether the mentoring has resulted in any progress of the individual, that seems to be lacking. We don't have programs called Equip to Achieve and a lot of people are saying, To achieve what? That's a question mark. We've seen the answer that's been put out, but that's what the people are saying. Development processes you've referred to. Many, many people feel they're over-developed; any time that it comes h—they need some development, whether it's PDR or just trying to revisit why they've failed, it's about development and, and people saying, Well, we're over-developed, compared to those people who seem to go through. So the whole point that I'm trying to say here, I mean you spoke about fairness, I mean I, I've been involved in industrial relations for forty years and what may be seen to be fair to you ain't necessarily fair to me. So -- rather talk about equality and that seems to be the -- or inequality. That identification of difference. And I just want to square all this up and put one question to you, really and that is, that we've heard a lot too about cultures -- command and control, defend and blame seems to be quite a, a prevalent culture within the police service and yet Taylor's come out now with this whole concept of learn and develop. And that's going to be putting much more of dealing with misconduct and poor performance down at line management. And if we're talking about an identification of problem in terms of Inspectors, Chief Inspectors and Superintendents of, from what people have told us, actually understanding and respecting and promoting equality to give you the diversity that's required, do you feel that the capacity of line managers to deal with the change in Taylor reforms is adequate?

MT I will confess to concern. I will confess that I would be perturbed that for the very reasons that Taylor was, was introduced, which was largely in response to the Morris Inquiry, which was about how one ensures a closer equilibrium between decisions, dis—discipline decisions taken about officers alongside those taken with staff, with a more popularly understood set

of controls, employment laws, Taylor is the response that was given to that and I have to say on face value, is an altogether wise and sensible way of proceeding. Of course, the devil is in the detail,

Mm

MT ..and how that will actually be enacted by local managers who have to take those decisions, based on what and how we ensure consistency across the piece, so in other words, what is serious misconduct

Mm

MT ..in one part is not serious misconduct in another part, does need to be carefully assessed. There's a very extensive training regime that has been put in place and most of our managers have been through that. But of course, the test will be how people actually enact it. And I think we are going to have to get into the system to actually see how that gets enacted and what inconsistencies, if there are any, are actually adjudged as a result. But I do share the concern. That I am perturbed that there may be, particularly across a large number of different parts of the organisation, actually different standards and tests that are applied. It will be the responsibility of our Professional Standards Department to try and ensure that consistency and I would anticipate that, for at least for a period of time, there will not be a second-guessing process, but there will be some evaluating as to those decisions and were they objective and consistent across the police. I should say of course they are at the lower level of discipline. Anything that is of a greater level of misconduct (inaudible)

Mm

MT ..will still be referred into the Professional Standards domain and dealt with as such. Can I just comment on the Equip to Achieve and Promoting Difference programs? Because I'd hate people to get the wrong idea about what those programs are about. They are intended as genuine Positive Action programs about how we can fast track individual advancements. The Promoting Difference program has somewhere round about 160, 170 people taking part on it. It's available to any ethnic minority individual who satisfies a Box 3, which is the Acceptable box on our PDR appraisal system. And it activates a whole range and any number of development opportunities: secondment, training, coaching, mentoring, training,

learning, attaching, seconding, whatever, to that individual, over a period of time. And out of that program is then the Equip to Achieve program where we are taking the elite from that program, those who are really performing outstandingly at Box 1 or Box 2 levels and through a modular process we are fast tracking their development, which at s—at the Constable and Sergeant level, then equips those people to enter the High Potential Development scheme or, at the more senior level, enables people to enter our own internal Accelerated Promotion scheme. Fourteen people are taking part in that program and I am very confident that a large number of those people will be successful as a result. It's easy to knock that system as being just one of development – you know, we're developed to death. It's a genuine endeavour to try and fast track and speed up the advancement of individual ethnic minorities within the organisation.

BP (inaudible) success. I want to come back later on the MPA, but I'll come back.

(inaudible)

Yes please.

CB Margaret.

MB (inaudible) sorry. Could I just pick up on just one small point on the Equip to Achieve program. I've met with the Equip to Achieve trainers and, and six of the fourteen, I think it is,

MT Yes.

MB ..Equip to Achieve programs and I think you're a—you know, you're absolutely accurate in describing their enthusiasm and the benefits that they can already identify from having participated in that program and I think there's a lot of hope and expectations for what will, what will hopefully der-- be derived as a result of that process. But the question I want to ask you is, what, what are the organisational changes that are being met – sorry, being made, to meet the change, to meet those, those fourteen officers that are going to have all that training, have all the development, what are the organisational changes? 'Cause my concern, can I just suggest, is for the Met or fear, I might suggest is that those fourteen officers will go through that program, will come away even more skilled, even better at

networking, understanding the systems, will have met the time requirement and if they fail, (inaudible) a bigger risk for the organisation about what happens next. 'Cause if the resources, the attention, the focus, that you've talked about and those officers and the trainers at the ch—people who are delivering that program have exhorted about the program, the other thing that needs to happen, there needs to be (inaudible) movement, otherwise you're having something moving towards something that remains static. I just want to understand what the organisation's thinking is, or what the operate—organisation's preparatory work has been done, to meet those fourteen officers, once they come off the program.

MT Well, it is a fact that not all fourteen will be successful. It is a, a pass or fail process and --and it may be that fourteen get through, or it may be that a number less than fourteen get through but we are, we are also optimistic. Frankly, the people who are on that program wouldn't be on the program unless they'd been very carefully selected on to it so we are genuinely and sincerely optimistic about it. I think there are two pieces of internal training (inaudible) have happened or will, in one case might need to happen. The first thing is the change that's happened is that those people don't just go back into the promotion pot and apply. They actually go on to an automatic promotion process, which is akin to the High Potential Development scheme that advances them up to and including the rank of Superintendent, within the organisation. That's an organisational change that we have actually introduced ourselves. So there is guaranteed promotion, as long as people come out of the Equip to Achieve program successful and then in turn assess what our are, are our High Potential criteria at each rank thereafter. The second thing which I think we do need to ensure is that when those people are posted into roles, (inaudible) are posted into genuine operational roles by which their skills and experiences can be properly developed in real time and in real policing work. What I don't want to do is to put them into roles which are frankly removed from what our operation should be about and I think that's the change we've still got to make. so we need to ensure their appropriate posting, once they've come out of the Achieve program.

CB A, a few more questions, Martin. Can, can I ask you to be quite brief, 'cause we're quickly running out of time. Can I ask you what learning you took away from the experiences of last year in the so-called Race Wars? What learning did you take away from that, as the HR Director and what organisational learning do you think was achieved as a result of that very difficult period and then I'll hand you over to Bob and, and then Anthony for a final question.

MT I think it's a personal learning I've taken is that whatever actions, whatever endeavours one may take personally, they're not always read by whoever might be receiving those actions, in the same way, in the same terms, as what I thought my motivation was. I do feel that in some cases, in those cases, those high profile cases of last year, there has been some misunderstanding about motive and intent and that's the learning I take from that, not to assume, in the eyes of the receiver, what necessarily you meant in the aims of the giver. In

terms of organisational learning, no I think the on—the real lesson that one has to learn from it is the public profile of it. None of us can actually look upon those, that time and be proud of what went on. It was a squabble in public and the organisation, and all parties, were the losers as a result of it and nobody can gain in those circumstances and the longer that went on, the more misfortune was created for all parties as a result. Is there anything that we could have done, therefore, to avoid that or to alter that? I don't know, but be sure that, in terms of any further high profile cases, I'd want to be aware of what we might do, to try and minimise the damage that was done organisationally as a result of the play out in the media of those cases.

C B Okay. I, I, I am surprised about that, though, that you haven't, that the organisation hasn't learnt the importance of getting things right at home and how that can affect public confidence and of course service delivery.

MT I think that's what I was meaning by the personal lesson episode and I mean it is (inaudible)

CB Yeah, no, well, I'm surprised that the organisation didn't sort of quite get the importance of what happens internally and how that plays out, publicly and how that has the ability to destabilise relationships between the organisation and, and London's community.

MT Forgive me if I didn't say it clearly. That is what I'm referring to.

CB Okay

MT That actually the organisation is aware of what has been done as a result of those cases and what recovery we need to make as a result of it. We can only damage ourselves in the way that those cases were played out.

CB Okay.

Ask a question (inaudible)

BP Yes, just a very quick one. The, this Inquiry, as you're aware, is into the Metropolitan Police Authority as well as the Metropolitan Police Service. They have the responsibility for carrying out the scrutiny and oversight of the activities of the Metropolitan Police Service. If there's been failure over the past three years in terms of, three or four years, in terms of the area of progression, do you think that they've been as effective and efficient as they should be in carrying out their scrutiny and oversight role?

MT Well, there's been lots of reports prepared for and commissioned by the Police Authority around all of the areas of recruitment, attrition, progression and they've certainly held me to account personally in challenging – like today – terms of questioning and querying whether we've done everything that we can do in the process. A recent example of that is the report that we prepared for the HR and Remuneration – sorry, the Communities Equalities and Policing Committee and Personnel Committee on the recent promotion process, is that we've referred to just a few moments ago. So they've certainly held me to account in reporting to it over the period when I've been here.

BP Yeah, but that's you. I'm talking about the rest of the Service. Do you think they've been

MT Right

BP ..as, as robust as they could have been in their

MT Well, (inaudible)

BP ..oversight over those within the rest of the Service?

MT Well, on these matters, I would be the person that would be responding so if I say I've been held to account, I mean the "I" on behalf of the organisation

BP Okay

MT ..have been held to account.

BP Okay.

CB Last question from Anthony please.

AJ Completely different topic. We, we had a lot of evidence about the, the advantages of multi point entry. What, succinctly please, what's your position on that?

MT When I joined the organisation, I thought multi point entry was the right way ahead. I saw it as a way of actually increasing the market place, increasing the, the diversity of

Mm

MT ..of people who could enter the organisation. I have to say I've probably changed my view

AJ Because?

MT ..over a period of time. Because of reading the culture, reading the confidence that is generated by a police officer who is leading police officers in managing operations and the way that police officers are posted across the organisation to just about any eventuality. I think changes my view that we would want police officers to direct other police officers. Maybe the – where my thinking has moved on, Anthony is not so much multi point entry, but perhaps by looking at each role and actually saying, Does that really need a warranted officer in order to carry out that role, even at a very senior level? Now, I'm not saying that I do necessarily feel that Borough Commanders should or shouldn't be police officers but there might be a case of looking at a role and saying, That does not need a warrant in order to do that role, so therefore what skills are we looking for? And if that led to a slightly different position by which somebody who is not a police officer actually occupying a role, then I think that's probably the more sophisticated way of looking at multi point entry. I think for me, simply before joining the organisation at multi point entry, I think I, I, I (inaudible)

AJ So, so, you, you, you were in favour of it when you joined the organisation, you ceased to be in favour of, in relation to warranted officers, because you now think that the existing culture would be resistant to it?

MT No, I think that the ability of a non police officer to direct police officers operationally would be very difficult (inaudible)

AJ But they would be police officers; they would just come in at a more senior level than Constable. I mean, that's the point about multi point entry.

MT Well, (a), that would need quite a lot of regulation and law change to enable that

AJ Yeah, course, of course. Take that for granted.

MT But - the confidence that comes from a police officer that has actually been there,

AJ Right

MT ..done it (inaudible)

AJ So the, the confidence is a matter of the existing culture. Confidence reflects the existing culture.

MT Yeah, and

AJ Yes.

MT ..the requirement.

AJ Okay. All right, thank you very much.

CB Okay. I don't think there's anything else. Is, is there a question that we haven't asked you for which you'd prepared the most amazing response that you want to

MT No, but I just wanted to thank the Panel for listening. And I also just wanted to assure you that our desire to further improve the position and of our, my own and my department's req-- desire to assist the Inquiry and whatever they produce.

CB Okay, well, thank you ever so much. It was a very useful session and apologies that we kept you waiting

MT Don't worry.

CB ..at the start.

MT (inaudible)

CB Thank you. Right, we're, we're just taking a five-ish minute break, if that's okay. Can you -- Anthony ...

