

Meeting	SPA Resources Committee
Date	6 August 2020
Location	MS Teams
Title of Paper	Strategic Workforce Planning Progress Update
Presented By	Jude Helliker, Director of People and Development Peter Blair, Head of Strategic Workforce Planning
Recommendation to Members	For Discussion
Appendix Attached	No

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to update the SPA Resources Committee on progress toward the development of the Police Scotland Strategic Workforce Plan (SWP).

Members are invited to discuss the content of this report.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 A detailed programme of future work covering a period of 12 months was agreed at the Executive Planning Day on 7 November 2019 and reported at the SPA Board on 27 November 2019. This detailed the structure of the future draft plan at macro and micro levels, the approval structure at each level, and a timeline for production of a completed plan for Police Scotland approval in November 2020.
- 1.2 A SWP Project Board has been established to provide a disciplined focus on governance, monitoring and support for the project. The Authority is represented on this Board.
- 1.3 As noted in the last paper report in June, Stages 1, 3 and 4 of the plan are complete.

2. FURTHER DETAIL ON THE REPORT TOPIC

Stage 5 – Interrogation

- 2.1 Stage 5 involved the interrogation of all local area plans for robustness and full adherence to the 6-Step Methodology, as prescribed by Audit Scotland and the Authority's auditors Scott Moncrieff. This is a key part of the process to ensure that the plans, underpinning the final SWP, are capable of withstanding internal and external scrutiny and fulfil the requirements of the Audit Scotland Public Sector Workforce Planning Guide.
- 2.2 Support was provided by staff from the Demand and Productivity Unit (DPU) to test and assure all demand data used to evidence conclusions drawn in local area plans. Failure to apply this level of rigour would critically compromise the credibility of the final product in the eyes of stakeholders.
- 2.3 The capacity of the DPU was at a reduced level than planned due to their critical commitments in supporting Operation Talla, and this was taken into account as part of the Correction Plan approved at the May SWP Project Board and reported to the Committee in June. This outlined the aim of competing Stage 5 at the end of June, with Stages 6 and 7 following during the month of July.
- 2.4 The detailed review of the draft plans by the project team and the DPU proved to be the resource intensive process it was expected to be throughout the month of June. It was reported at the June Project Board that the intention was to begin the feeding back of comments to authors in week beginning 22 June, and this duly began on 24 June – representing the beginning of Stage 6 of the plan.

- 2.5 With the exception of three areas – C3, A Division and E Division – all draft plans were returned in advance of the deadline of 30 June. This was because C3 required more time to complete their draft in light of the impact Operation Talla had on their availability, while A and E Division drafts required further work to get them into a position where they would withstand scrutiny.
- 2.6 In all instances there was an understanding that this meant comments would be provided to them later than the rest and therefore reduce the time available to them for Stages 6 and 7, although the project team would make all efforts wherever practicable to minimise this.
- 2.7 The final draft was returned on 10 July, and with all drafts reviewed it was approved by the Project Board on 15 July that Stage 5 can now be considered as complete.

COVID-19 – Re-Planning

- 2.8 As reported to the Committee in June, a Correction Plan is now being followed retaining the November 2020 target date for an approved plan, whereby the extra time required for Stage 5 due to COVID-19 based delays will mean the time allocated for later stages will be compressed. This is reflective of the desire of the Chair to see a final product by November 2020, despite likely quality impacts.
- 2.9 With Stage 5 finishing two months later than the original timeline set out, the target dates for future phases are as follows.

Stage	Task	Revised date
Stage 6	First Level Approval	31/07/2020
Stage 7	Timeline Generation	31/07/2020
Stage 8	Second Level Approval	14/08/2020
Stage 9	Scrutiny	04/09/2020
Stage 10	Aggregation	30/10/2020
Stage 11	Governance	30/11/2020

- 2.10 It was also agreed at the May Project Board, and noted at the last Resource Committee in June, that the timelines were such that it would not be possible to incorporate final and formal learnings from Operation Talla in the aggregated plan. While any immediate

OFFICIAL

learnings identified by local areas as part of their drafts can be incorporated over the summer months, due to the ongoing situation regarding the outbreak, any such learnings would need to be suitably caveated in the final plan.

Stage 6 – First Level Approval

- 2.11 Within this phase local plan authors will update their drafts to incorporate the feedback given as part of Stage 5, before passing over to First Level Approvers (Divisional Commanders in the case of local policing, and ACCs in the case of national services) to consider whether the local area plan is accurate and reflective of their area.
- 2.12 Since the issue of the drafts, some concerns have been expressed over the capacity of local plan authors to absorb the level of re-drafting required within the available timescales, with the project team reiterating their commitment to supporting plan authors wherever practicable. Work remains ongoing at the present time with all areas indicating their commitment to the work required.

Stage 7 – Timeline Generation

- 2.13 During this stage First Level Approvers will review the direction and goal(s) laid out in the plan, and confirm that the future priorities and projected demand contained in it are accurate. In conjunction with the Human Resources Business Partners (HRBPs) a timeline of actions will be created, based on the recommendations in the plan and taking into consideration any Force-wide activities that may impact on their resources and capacity.
- 2.14 A recommendation to aim at finishing the Stage 6 incorporation of feedback by the middle of July was given to each area so that First Level Approvers and HRBPs had sufficient time to develop and / or scrutinise the timeline ahead of the 31 July deadline.

Stage 8 – Second Level Approval

- 2.15 In this stage Second Level Approvers will examine and endorse all local area plans within their remit. Given the length and detail in the various plans – and the reduced amount of time available for this stage in line with the Correction Plan – consideration is being given to creating an Executive Summary template that can be used to highlight the key sections in the plans:
- Step 2 – outlining current demands
 - Step 3 – defining workforce requirements
 - Step 5 – an action plan addressing any gaps between Step 2 and 3

- 2.16 As per the Correction Plan, the deadline for this phase is 14 August however taking into account annual leave commitments the Project Board agreed at its meeting on 15 July to allow this to be pushed back to 25 August. Whilst this will mean less time for Stage 9 it is not intended to impact the end date for the project.
- 2.17 The team will also be providing further guidance and information to Second Level Approvers and ensure they are confident in approving plans and ensuring the aggregated plan fulfils Audit Scotland requirements.

Stage 9 – Scrutiny Panel

- 2.18 In this phase the approved local area plans would then be discussed by the Chief Constable and Deputies at a specially-convened Scrutiny Panel. This will ensure local prioritisation within the various plans aligns with the strategic priorities of the service, consider any broader people, social, political or reputational impacts from the development of the SWP, apply questions from the Audit Scotland Good Practice Guide, and be in receipt of assurance that the component parts of the plan are in a mature position to pass to the next phase of the plan.

Stage 10 – Aggregation

- 2.19 Following the Scrutiny Panel in early September all agreed local area plans will be aggregated up and drafted into an overarching Force plan.
- 2.20 During this phase, the team will also draw on available information from the Change PMO in terms of what projects are in the pipeline, when they will deliver, the predicted workforce impact in terms of productivity and capacity, and a view from Portfolio Assurance on the confidence levels behind these projections. Also taken into account will be links with enabler strategies such as Fleet, Estates and ICT, and updates on the work of areas such as Recruitment.
- 2.21 The end of this phase will see the aggregated plan then socialised amongst internal stakeholders, as until that point the document will be incomplete.

Key Risks and Dependencies

- 2.22 Engagement continues with the SPA representative on the Project Board to ensure that the Authority is better informed and is able to have confidence in the ongoing process. In addition, the Strategic Workforce Planning Oversight Board, chaired by DCC Taylor, provides

OFFICIAL

an additional level of scrutiny and assurance to key stakeholders, including staff associations, trades unions, HMICS, Scottish Government and the SPA.

- 2.23 It should be noted that the work done so far in this project has not included the area of the Force included in the Transforming Corporate Support Services (TCSS) project. It has always been the intention of the project to use the work undertaken by TCSS and utilise it in the Aggregation Stage (Stage 10) of the project to inform that element of the workforce plan. This will avoid duplication of effort and utilise the extensive work already done in this area. In terms of inclusion of the Cyber requirements this was an area of focus in the local planning processes to date. The wider strategy however is being developed and will again be included at the aggregation stage of the project to ensure that the top-down elements are included in the overall plan.
- 2.24 The guidance that will be issued to Second Level Approvers for Stage 8, and the consideration of the scrutiny panel in Stage 9, are in place to ensure the aggregated plan is robust enough to withstand internal and external scrutiny, and fulfil the requirements of the Audit Scotland Public Sector Workforce Planning Guide.

Internal Audit

- 2.25 An internal audit was completed by Scott Moncrief in terms of the project. Initial interviews took place the day after the establishment of the Project Board, as recognised in the audit report when it commented on the recent formalising of project management and governance arrangements.
- 2.26 The monthly Project Board now has a standing item focusing on the progress made in discharging the various actions, and updates are provided below:
- 2.27 Control Objective 1: The SWP project has robust governance arrangements in place, with regular reporting to each governance forum on progress, issues arising and follow-up of any agreed remedial actions.

The Project Board reports into Change Board through highlight reports to Portfolio Management Group. Project updates are also provided at Corporate Finance and People Board, Strategic Oversight Group, and SPA Resources Committee. Progress on the Audit recommendations are supplied to Audit and Risk Board and the SPA Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee.

OFFICIAL

As outlined in the audit, the project is managed in line with Portfolio Management Framework which allocates responsibility for producing all governance documentation and reporting to the PMO. This was a document concurrently reviewed by Scott Moncrieff during their separate audit into the Transformation Portfolio.

A broader Communications and Engagement Strategy is being drafted, drawing a distinction between the current project and its possible outcomes, as well as underlining those outcomes are not being written with any pre-determined outcome in mind.

2.28 Control Objective 2: Sufficient sustainable and resilient capability and capacity exists within the SWP project team, with members having clearly defined roles, responsibilities and targets, with each role being appropriately defined and communicated

The management of this risk has continued to mature since the time of this audit, with reviewing and redistributing workload within the project team the primary mechanism for mitigation. This was an area that involved robust management during Stage 5, where the workload on the Workforce Planning & Design Manager was at its height. It is anticipated this will not be an active problem requiring the same degree of mitigating activity until Stage 10 – Aggregation.

2.29 Control Objective 3: The objectives of the project have been clearly articulated and translated into a SMART project plan that allocates timescales, actions and responsible owners

The plan continues to develop with adherence to the PRINCE2 “Planning Horizon” concept, capturing detail of upcoming stages and the individuals allocated to each task. This is used, similar to all Police Scotland projects, to track and manage progress. The experience of Stage 5 has demonstrated this was a logical approach, as it would not have been possible to assess before receipt of drafts the amount of time required to review them. Equally an overly prescriptive approach for later phases would not take into account the size or nature of work required by local areas as this would only be clear after the draft review process had ended.

It is the understanding of the project team that Scott Moncrieff will include this item as closed in their report to the SPA Audit Risk and Assurance Committee on 16 July.

2.30 Control Objective 4: The project is delivered under a defined project management methodology that includes proportionate risk management arrangements

OFFICIAL

The response to this action is linked to the wider and concurrent review into the Transformation Portfolio, as this will ensure there is no risk of introducing inconsistencies or silo working across the portfolio. The PMO stance is that this is left to Programme and Project Boards to make their own decisions regarding minutes of meetings, and that these are only explicitly required for full governance groups such as the Change Board.

2.31 Control Objective 7: The project plan provides assurance that the key objectives are appropriately factored into the approach

The end date of April 2021 recognises full completion of this action can only be fully measured once the full Strategic Workforce Plan has been written and approved, with all significant phases complete. In the meantime however there are several steps along the way that will be taken to expand upon the level of expertise within the organisation in following the prescribed methodology.

While feedback as part of Stage 5 included points specific to each local area plan, it also included generic points aimed at increasing the organisational capability in utilising the methodology. This covered the consistent use of data and its comparisons, the tools available from the DPU in assessing demand (e.g. the newly released Missing Person Dashboard), and the requirement to set clear and measurable goals in Steps 1 and 2 that allow for a set of measurement criteria (which can demonstrate alignment with forcewide strategic priorities) under Step 6.

Any lessons learned throughout the rest of the project lifecycle will continue to be captured.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 There are no specific financial implications associated with this paper.

4. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no specific personnel implications associated with this paper.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no specific legal implications associated with this paper.

6. REPUTATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The failure to deliver a SWP will adversely affect Police Scotland’s ability to meet its budgetary responsibilities, to fully maximise the opportunities presented by ongoing business change transformation projects, to effectively realign its workforce to meet future demand, impacting on public confidence.

7. SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no specific social implications associated with this paper.

8. COMMUNITY IMPACT

8.1 There are no specific community impact implications associated with this paper.

9. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no specific equalities implications associated with this paper.

10. ENVIRONMENT IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no specific environmental implications associated with this paper.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are invited to discuss the content of this report.