

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>16 July 2020</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Video Conference</b>
<b>Title of Paper</b>	<b>Strategic Workforce Planning Update Report</b>
<b>Presented By</b>	<b>Director Jude Helliker, People and Development</b>
<b>Recommendation to Members</b>	<b>For Discussion</b>
<b>Appendix Attached</b>	<b>No</b>

**PURPOSE**

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

Members are invited to discuss the content of this paper.

## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 A detailed programme of future work covering a period of 12 months was agreed at the Police Scotland Executive Planning Day on 07 November 2019 and reported at the Scottish Police Authority (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 Strategic Workforce Planning (SWP) Project Board has been established to provide a disciplined focus on governance, monitoring and support for the project. The SPA are represented on that Board.

## **2. FURTHER DETAIL ON THE REPORT TOPIC**

### Stage 4 – Drafting

- 2.1 The development of local area plans began at the start of February 2020, with a deadline date for submissions of 31 March 2020. These plans included all Local Policing Divisions as well as specialist national areas such as C3, OSD, and SCD.
- 2.2 As part of the weekly checkpoints held with HR Business Partners (HRBPs) on the status of the draft plans, a confidence level of “medium to high” was given as of close of business 11 March 2020. This indicated that areas were engaging with the process and were committed toward delivery within the time prescribed, although support would continue to be provided by both the HRBPs and the project team over the remaining weeks of the phase.
- 2.3 An emerging concern was raised however regarding urgent business continuity work that multiple Support Superintendents, responsible for completing the drafts, had been tasked with in relation to the COVID-19 outbreak. As the situation with the pandemic escalated it meant a number of areas were impacted, with resources diverted to responding to the crisis. This was referenced at the SPA Resources Committee on 17 March 2020, where it was recognised that it would be reasonable to anticipate some slippage in the wider plan due to these circumstances but that the project team should make all efforts to document and minimise the impact wherever practicable.
- 2.4 The Project Board on 18 March 2020 agreed that communications should be issued to all local planning areas, confirming they should submit whatever they were able to complete by 31 March 2020 and advise what work, if any, remained outstanding. This was to allow

**OFFICIAL**

the team to estimate the degree of effort remaining across each area and quantify the impact this would have on the wider plan.

- 2.5 All areas complied with this request, and submitted their draft local level workforce plans in advance of that agreed deadline. Confirmation of this was provided to members and attendees of the SWP Project Board on 6 April 2020 and agreed complete at the following Project Board on 22 April 2020.

Stage 5 – Interrogation

- 2.6 Stage 5 involves 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.
- 2.7 Support was to be 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.
- 2.8 It was confirmed on 18 March 2020 that due to commitments in light of Operation Talla (Police Scotland Covid-19 response operation) this level of support could not be provided in the short term, with an expectation this would be the case for at least the entire month of April 2020. Further engagement with the project team however resolved this and it was agreed that, while their COVID-19 commitments would remain of the highest priority, it would be possible to provide support by a proportion of the team as of week commencing 13 April 2020.
- 2.9 The project took this into account, as well as completing a high level assessment of each draft plan to understand in what areas further work was needed, as part of an impact assessment which was presented at the Project Board on 22 April 2020. This review indicated different degrees of progress across the drafts, with some at a mature final draft stage and others requiring more work to reach a point where they could be meaningfully scrutinised.
- 2.10 Despite COVID-19 commitments local plan authors in those areas requiring further work remained committed to the process and progressing their drafts, taking on board initial feedback given as part of the high level review in April and thereafter providing updated drafts for detailed review.

**OFFICIAL**

2.11 The return of drafts to authors started on 24 June 2020 and completed on 10 July 2020. It will be recommended to the SWP Project Board on 15 July that the stage can therefore be considered complete.

COVID-19 – Re-Planning

2.12 At the SWP Project Board on 22 April 2020, a number of options to re-plan in light of Operation Talla and environmental changes were discussed. It was agreed the plan should be reviewed to incorporate new strategic directions and organisational learnings, and for further diligence to be done on what this would mean for project timescales.

2.13 The SPA Resources Committee on 23 April 2020 underlined the expectation that delivery of a final product by November 2020, despite likely quality impacts, was the preference of the Chair.

2.14 The direction of the project team therefore has been that the November 2020 target for approval should be retained, and given the extra time required for Stage 5 due to COVID-19 based delays this will mean the time allocated for later stages will be compressed, with Stages 6 and 7 due to complete at the end of July. This will represent a two month shift to the original timelines. It was proposed to the 22 May 2020 SWP Project Board and then approved that this time would be recouped as follows:

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Original Timeframe</b>	<b>Revised Timeframe</b>	<b>Target date</b>
Stage 8	Second Level Approval	Four weeks	Two weeks	14/08/2020
Stage 9	Scrutiny	Four weeks	Three weeks	04/09/2020
Stage 10	Aggregation	Eight weeks	Six weeks	30/10/2020
Stage 11	Governance	Twelve weeks	Two weeks	30/11/2020

2.15 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 much of this has been picked in the local planning processes to date. The

## OFFICIAL

wider strategy however is being developed and will again be included at the Aggregation Stage of the planning to ensure that the top-down elements are included in the overall plan.

- 2.16 It was also agreed at the SWP Project Board that the timelines were such that it would not be possible to incorporate final and formal learnings from Operation Talla in the aggregated plan, although any emerging learnings referenced by local areas as part of their drafts can be included over the summer months. This was also reported at the SPA Resource Committee on 15 June 2020.

### Internal Audit

- 2.17 An internal audit was conducted by Scott Moncrieff in February and March. 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.
- 2.18 The monthly Project Board now has a standing item focusing on the progress made in discharging the various actions, and updates are provided below:
- 2.19 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.

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.

- 2.20 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.

- 2.21 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.

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

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.

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

## **OFFICIAL**

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 goal/s 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 SPA's and the public's confidence in Police Scotland.

### **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 information contained within this report.