HMICFRS Judgment Criteria

We will assess each police force in England and Wales, giving graded judgments for the three principal areas in our inspection methodology of effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy, and the ten core questions that sit below them. Our categories of graded judgment are: outstanding; good; requires improvement; and inadequate.

The judgment criteria indicate the expected levels of performance consistent with each grade. These criteria allow our inspectors to make consistent assessments across forces and for forces to see what they are being graded against. The criteria are examples to help inspectors to determine appropriate judgments. They are not intended to prescribe specific standards, relate directly to the sub-diagnostics, or to be exhaustive lists of how we expect forces to perform at these levels.

The criteria take account of existing national guidance, authorised professional practice and evidence from research. We will take into account new guidance, standards and research as they become available.

Question	Outstanding	Good	Requires Improvement	Inadequate
1.1 How well does the force understand and prioritise crime prevention?				
1.1.1 How well do force leaders prioritise crime prevention? 1.1.2 How well does the force understand the threats facing its communities?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** is at the forefront (within its region and nationally) of developing, sharing and influencing plans to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour is innovative in gathering and using information to increase the understanding of threats to its communities is proactive in leading, developing and influencing cross-organisation activity to understand local threats	the force has a comprehensive strategy for neighbourhood policing, focused on proactive prevention in line with College of Policing guidelines has enough resources in place to enable effective crime prevention equips officers and staff with the skills they need to carry out effective crime prevention activity holds officers and staff to account for effective crime prevention activity has a strong understanding of the threats facing communities, developed with good involvement of other organisations takes steps to assess complex, emerging or hidden threats	the force has a strategy for neighbourhood policing which isn't focused enough on proactive prevention in line with College of Policing guidelines often has insufficient resources in place to enable effective crime prevention doesn't equip a significant number of officers and staff with the skills they need to carry out effective crime prevention activity doesn't adequately hold staff to account for effective crime prevention activity doesn't have a good enough understanding of the threats facing communities, with little involvement of other agencies takes insufficient steps to assess complex, emerging or hidden threats	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement, the force:** doesn't use its understanding of threats, or understand enough about these threats has no force-wide strategy underpinning its work on crime prevention crime prevention isn't a high enough priority for the force, with insufficient resource allocated to prevention activity

1.2 How well does the force protect the public from crime and anti-social behaviour?				
1.2.1 How well does the force solve problems in its communities? 1.2.2 How well does the force use tactics and interventions to prevent crime, tackle anti-social behaviour and keep people safe? 1.2.3 How well does the force use evidence to strengthen its ability to prevent crime?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** prevention activities are innovative and have had a big impact on preventing crime has an established culture of continuous improvement with outstanding examples of sustained service development and improvement that translate into better service for the public can demonstrate how effective its evaluated activity is through a reduction in crime and an improved service to the public.	the force has a structured and collaborative approach to problem solving based on evidence of what works, with adequate involvement of other organisations and community members ensures that officers and staff proactively engage in preventative work with other agencies and community members assesses the impact of responses and shares good practice makes appropriate use of tactics and powers to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour targets activity according to the needs of specific communities, co-ordinating responses with other agencies to maximise impact uses early intervention appropriately to reduce harm in communities evaluates its activity, and uses external sources of evidence and good practice to improve the services it provides to the public	the force has an unstructured approach to problem-solving and/or insufficient involvement of other organisations or community members doesn't always ensure that officers and staff proactively engage in preventative work with other organisations and community members doesn't consistently assess the impact of responses or share good practice makes little or no use of tactics and powers to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour doesn't have the systems or processes necessary to target activity according to the needs of specific communities, or to co-ordinate responses with other organisations to maximise impact makes little or no use of early intervention to reduce harm in communities doesn't evaluate its activity enough and makes limited use of evidence to improve services to the public.	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires Improvement, the force:** prevention activity does not align with the threats or the activity set out in its neighbourhood policing plans fails to prevent crime.

2.1 How well does the force investigate crime?				
2.1.1 How well managed is the force's approach to investigation? 2.1.2 How well does the force carry out investigations? 2.1.3 How well does the force support victims during investigation?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** is at the forefront (within its region and nationally) of developing, exchanging and influencing approaches to investigating crime and supporting victims has an established culture of continuous improvement with outstanding examples of sustained service development and improvement that translate into better services for the public	the force conducts thorough investigations leading to satisfactory outcomes for victims allocates the vast majority of investigations to appropriately skilled officers or staff conducts thorough telephone investigations, leading to satisfactory outcomes for victims exploits opportunities to gather early evidence at crime scenes well supervises, reviews and directs investigations adequately, requiring staff to achieve high standards provides victims with a satisfactory service which addresses their specific needs makes sure victims and witnesses are interviewed by appropriately trained staff pursues justice appropriately when victims don't support police action	the force doesn't consistently conduct thorough investigations, so doesn't consistently secure satisfactory outcomes for victims sometimes allocates the vast majority of investigations to appropriately skilled officers or staff telephone investigations aren't good enough and don't secure satisfactory outcomes for victims doesn't consistently exploit opportunities to gather early evidence at crime scenes well doesn't always adequately supervise, review and direct investigations doesn't consistently provide victims with a satisfactory service which addresses their specific needs victims and witnesses are routinely interviewed by staff who are not appropriately trained doesn't pursue justice appropriately when victims don't support police action	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** has an inappropriate range of resources to investigate crimes and support victims can't consistently and effectively investigate crime and support victims.
2.2 How well does the force catch criminals and resolve investigations?				
2.2.1 How well does the force apprehend offenders? 2.2.2 How well does the force resolve investigations, building the case for the public?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** consistently, effectively and robustly manages offenders to keep the public safe and resolve its investigations has an established culture of continuous improvement with outstanding examples of sustained service development and	the force actively pursues and manages offenders who are a risk to the public works proactively with other agencies to manage foreign national offenders understands and effectively uses post- and pre- charge bail monitors its use of powers to release suspects under supervision	the force reactively pursues and manages offenders who pose a risk to the public sometimes works with other agencies to manage foreign national offenders has an unsatisfactory understanding of post- and pre- charge bail or makes unsatisfactory use of its powers	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** puts the public at risk by its lack of effective offender management doesn't understand outcome data and can't explain how it can

	improvement that translate into better service for the public	generally achieves satisfactory investigative outcomes for victims uses investigation outcome data well to improve its services to the public makes sure it discharges disclosure obligations effectively	inconsistently monitors its use of powers to release suspects under supervision doesn't achieve satisfactory investigative outcomes for victims in a considerable number of cases isn't routinely making adequate use of investigation outcome data to improve its services to the public doesn't effectively discharge enough of its disclosure obligations	improve investigative outcomes for victims

3.1 How well does the force understand the scale and nature of vulnerability?

3.1.1 How well does the force understand the nature and scale of vulnerability? 3.1.2 How well does the force identify vulnerable people and assess risk?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** has a sophisticated and continually improving understanding of the nature and scale of vulnerability, developed with other organisations always identifies vulnerable and repeat victims at the first point of contact	the force understands comprehensively the nature and scale of vulnerability, developed with other organisations officers and staff have a strong understanding of the force's approach to vulnerability identifies vulnerable and repeat victims at the first point of contact assesses, records and manages risk to victims well	the force doesn't understand well enough the nature and scale of vulnerability and/or the understanding was not developed with other organisations officers and staff don't understand well enough the force's approach to vulnerability inconsistently identifies vulnerable and repeat victims at the first point of contact doesn't routinely assess, record and manage risk to victims well	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** doesn't use its understanding of the nature and scale of vulnerability to inform its services to vulnerable people (or this understanding isn't good enough to do so) officers and staff don't even have a basic understanding of the force's approach to vulnerability rarely identifies vulnerable and repeat victims at the first point of contact

3.2 How well does the force protect vulnerable people from harm?

3.2.1 How well does the force respond to incidents involving vulnerable people?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** has an established culture of continuous improvement with outstanding examples of sustained	the force attends incidents within response time targets, and generally reassesses risk if delays occur thoroughly assesses vulnerability at initial response	the force consistently doesn't attend incidents within response time targets, and/or sometimes reassesses risk if delays occur assessment of vulnerability at initial	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:**

3.2.2 How well does the force continue to keep people safe after initial response? 3.2.3 How well does the force work with partners to keep victims safe? 3.2.4 How well does the force manage offenders known to pose a risk to vulnerable people?	service development and improvement that translate into better service for the public	always conducts face-to-face DASH risk assessments for reported domestic abuse incidents takes immediate and effective safeguarding action at initial response, tailored to the needs of vulnerable individuals makes effective use of neighbourhood teams to safeguard vulnerable victims effectively uses protective powers or measures to safeguard vulnerable victims works with a range of partner agencies to ensure bespoke specialist safeguarding arrangements are in place for vulnerable people seeks and uses feedback from vulnerable victims and service users to improve services is well prepared to manage the risk dangerous and sexual offenders pose manages and assesses the risk of any backlogs of unassessed registered sex offenders and operates effective processes to manage the risk to the public neighbourhood and response teams are generally aware of RSOs in their area	response is inconsistent or unstructured and not always detailed enough only sometimes conducts face-to-face DASH risk assessments for reported domestic abuse incidents doesn't consistently take immediate and effective safeguarding action at initial response, and doesn't always tailor this to vulnerable individuals' needs doesn't use neighbourhood teams effectively to safeguard vulnerable victims doesn't use protective powers/measures effectively to safeguard vulnerable victims doesn't consistently or effectively work with a range of partner agencies to ensure appropriate specialist safeguarding arrangements are in place for vulnerable people doesn't routinely seek and use feedback from vulnerable victims and service users to improve its services isn't adequately prepared to manage the risk dangerous and sexual offenders pose has a considerable and unmanaged backlog of RSOs, with limited understanding of potential risk to the public by not closely managing the backlog neighbourhood and response teams have little or no awareness of RSOs in their area	puts vulnerable victims at serious risk by not responding appropriately approach to risk assessment and safeguarding puts vulnerable victims at serious risk

4.1 How well does the force understand the threat and risk posed by serious and organised crime (SOC)?

4.1.1 How well does the force assess the threat and risk from serious and organised crime? 4.1.2 How well does the force use intelligence to develop its understanding of the threat from serious and organised crime? 4.1.3 How well does the force identify and assess organised crime groups, urban street gangs and other criminal networks?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** innovatively gathers and uses information to increase its understanding of the threat SOC poses	the force comprehensively understands SOC threats, developed with other organisations, and has a SOC local profile which includes other organisations' data uses a range of intelligence sources to increase its understanding of SOC develops and disseminates SOC intelligence that it can act on appropriately is generally proactive in its approach to identifying new organised crime groups (OCGs) maps OCGs promptly and accurately, in accordance with national guidance and in conjunction with the ROCU uses a structured approach to assess urban street gangs, county lines and other criminal networks to understand the threat they pose	the force has an unsatisfactory understanding of SOC threats, and/or with little input from other organisations, including a SOC local profile which doesn't include other organisations' data uses an unsatisfactory range of intelligence sources to increase its understanding of SOC doesn't consistently develop and disseminate SOC intelligence that it can act on appropriately is only sometimes proactive in its approach to identifying new OCGs doesn't consistently map OCGs promptly and accurately, or in accordance with national guidance and in conjunction with the ROCU only sometimes uses a structured approach to assess urban street gangs, county lines and other criminal networks to understand the threat they pose	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** doesn't use its understanding of threats and risks to make an effective integrated risk assessment (or this understanding isn't good enough to do so)

4.2 How well does the force mitigate risk and prevent serious and organised crime (SOC)?

4.2.1 How well does the force deter people at risk being drawn into serious and organised crime? 4.2.2 How well does the force manage offenders to help prevent organised crime? 4.2.3 How well does the force communicate with the public about serious and organised crime?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** prevention activities are innovative and have had a significant impact on preventing SOC proactively leads, develops and influences plans of other organisations to prevent SOC	the force has effective initiatives in place in principal locations to identify those at risk of being drawn into SOC and deter them from offending has an effective approach to lifetime offender management with other organisations, which prevents organised criminals re-offending engages effectively with the public about SOC to raise awareness, give	the force has ineffective initiatives in place to identify those at risk of being drawn into SOC and deter them from offending has an ineffective approach to lifetime offender management with other organisations, which doesn't prevent organised criminals re-offending doesn't engage effectively with the public about SOC to raise awareness,	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** lacks any structured or systematic approach to preventing SOC doesn't prioritise preventing SOC highly enough, allocating insufficient resource to prevention activity and only carrying out

		reassurance, offer advice or publicise success stories.	give reassurance, offer advice or publicise success stories	limited prevention activity with partner organisations
4.3 How well does the force respond to serious and organised crime (SOC)?				
4.3.1 How well does the force manage its response to serious and organised crime? 4.3.2 How well does the force disrupt, dismantle and investigate organised crime in collaboration with partners? 4.3.3 How much impact does the force's activity have on serious and organised crime?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** activities have had a significant effect on disrupting and dismantling serious and organised crime has an established culture of continuous improvement with outstanding examples of sustained service development and improvement that translate into better service for the public	the force objectively prioritises activity aimed at tackling SOC through a structured process, which includes the ROCU and other organisations uses OCG mapping and other analysis alongside professional judgment to inform its prioritisation decisions assigns competent LROs to mapped OCGs, taking a long-term approach to managing OCGs based on the 4Ps has an active force-wide SOC partnership board disrupts and investigates SOC in collaboration with a satisfactory range of other organisations, offering effective protection to victims and witnesses consistently and appropriately involves neighbourhood policing teams in OCG disruption accesses specialist ROCU and NCA capabilities in order to tackle SOC, with little duplication at force level can demonstrate a positive and significant impact on SOC across the 4Ps as a result of its activity reviews SOC investigations to encourage learning, and shares effective practice internally and externally	the force subjectively prioritises activity aimed at tackling SOC and/or has insufficient involvement from the ROCU or other organisations inconsistently uses OCG mapping and other analysis alongside professional judgment to inform its prioritisation decisions doesn't routinely assign competent LROs to mapped OCGs and/or only sometimes takes a long-term approach to managing OCGs based on the 4Ps force-wide SOC partnership board isn't active enough disrupts and investigates SOC in collaboration with an unsatisfactory range of other organisations, and/or offers ineffective protection to victims and witnesses only sometimes appropriately involves its neighbourhood policing teams in OCG disruption doesn't consistently draw on ROCU and NCA capabilities to tackle SOC, with unnecessary duplication at force level can demonstrate only some positive impact on SOC across the 4Ps as a result of its activity doesn't routinely review its SOC investigations to encourage learning, and/or only sometimes exchanges	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** can't consistently assertively and effectively tackle SOC doesn't use all available force resources and those of partners to disrupt, dismantle and investigate SOC doesn't keep victims and witnesses safe

				effective practice internally and externally	

5.1 How effective are the force's specialist capabilities?

5.1.1 How well led is the force's response to threats requiring armed response? 5.1.2 How well does the force understand the current and future demand for an armed policing response?	**UNGRADED**			

6.1 How well does the force understand demand?

6.1.1 How well does the force understand the demand for the services it provides? 6.1.2 How well does the force understand the things that affect demand?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** innovatively gathers and uses information to improve its understanding of demand leaders always listen to workforce views, and involve them in developing processes	the force understands satisfactorily the demand it faces, sufficiently supported by data understands the need, and takes steps, to identify hidden demand operates effective processes to realise the benefits and minimise the consequences of change leaders generally listen to workforce views, and involve them in developing processes new and existing processes take account of the risks of inadvertently suppressing and/or hiding demand	the force has an unsatisfactory understanding of demand that is focused on reacting to calls and/or isn't sufficiently supported by data concentrates on demand more likely to be reported, rather than identifying specific types of hidden demand has ineffective processes in place to realise the benefits and minimise the consequences of change leaders sometimes listen to workforce views, and only sometimes involve them in developing processes processes sometimes intentionally or inadvertently suppress and/or hide demand	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** understands demand poorly and doesn't address hidden demand operates no processes to realise the benefits and minimise the consequences of change leaders rarely listen to workforce views, or involve them in developing processes processes often intentionally or inadvertently suppress and/or hide demand

6.2 How well does the force manage demand?

6.2.1 How well does the force work with others to manage demand and improve efficiency collectively?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:**	the force has a commitment to joint working and has effective arrangements to manage demand efficiently across agencies	the force is committed to joint working, but has ineffective arrangements for managing demand efficiently across agencies	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:**

6.2.2 To what extent does the force look externally for innovation and best practice and swiftly implement new idea? 6.2.3 How well does the force use its investment?	is innovative and at the forefront of techniques and approaches for managing demand can demonstrate and explain how it has reduced demand	understands the benefits of collaborating, and why chosen options are preferable to alternatives understands satisfactorily where partners' resources may decrease and is proactively mitigating proactively identifies new opportunities for service improvement from outside the force has a plan to develop innovation as part of organisational culture leaders are generally willing to experiment with new approaches, which have resulted in innovation generally demonstrates the benefits arising from investments has strong evidence for its investment decisions	partially understands the benefits of collaborating and/or why chosen options are preferable to alternatives understands satisfactorily where partners' resources may decrease, but is only taking reactive mitigating action reacts effectively to new opportunities for service improvement from outside the force, but doesn't seek them out has some ad hoc development of innovation as a component of organisational culture, but no strategy leaders are sometimes willing to experiment with new approaches sometimes demonstrates the benefits arising from investments doesn't consistently have strong evidence for its investment decisions	doesn't understand or have an effective approach to demand reduction management of demand puts the public at risk
6.3 How well does the force allocate its resources?				
6.3.1 How well does the force prioritise different types of demand? 6.3.2 How well does the force vary the level of service it provides to reduce cost and/or respond to changes in demand across each force area and department?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** has a sophisticated understanding of the resources it needs to meet demand, and always prioritises its activity based on a detailed understanding of demand, local priorities, national requirements and public expectations has a clear rationale for decisions that is the organisation at all levels understands comprehensively	the force prioritises activity based on a detailed understanding of demand, local priorities, national requirements and public expectations has a rationale for decisions that the organisation at all levels understands understands what cutting/investing x% of budget would mean for individual services in each area/department, and uses this information to inform its strategic decisions about its priorities	sometimes prioritises activity based on a basic understanding of demand, local priorities, national requirements and public expectations has a rationale for decisions, but the organisation doesn't understand this well at every level has a high-level understanding of what cutting/investing would mean in each area/department and/or makes little use of this information to inform its strategic decisions about its priorities	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** budget decisions aren't made based on business need prioritises activity on an ad hoc basis, with little understanding of demand, local priorities, national requirements and public expectations has a poor or no rationale for decisions, and which the organisation at all levels doesn't understand well

6.4 How well does the force maximise the productivity of its resources and assets?				
6.4.1 To what extent do force leaders and staff have the skills and abilities they need to meet its current demand? 6.4.2 To what extent does the force provide the public with services that are good value for money? 6.4.3 How well does the force collaborate with other organisations to provide better services and improve efficiency? 6.4.4 How well does the force invest in technology to fight crime and improve efficiency?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** has in-depth knowledge of the skills it requires now and in future, and uses this information to direct its recruitment and training is at the forefront (regionally and nationally) of developing, sharing and influencing approaches to ensure productivity is maximised shows how it is getting better value for the tax payer	the force has a good understanding of the skills it needs, including its leadership skills, and how the necessary skills will change in the future has undertaken a meaningful skills audit to understand any skills gaps, and is using this to inform its recruitment and training to meet these gaps plans its change programme so as to realise benefits, monitoring and evaluating this regularly has a measurable and consistent track record of achieving savings and/or shows how it has reinvested savings or efficiency gains into priority areas has formal plans in place with other agencies to meet local demand collectively understands what technology can offer policing and criminals, and how this is changing, and uses this understanding to inform future plans investments in technology have led to improved productivity and/or enhanced services to the public	the force has a limited understanding of the skills it needs, including its leadership skills, and how the necessary skills will change in the future lacks any meaningful skills audit to understand any skills gaps, and is using this to inform recruitment and only limited training to meet any identified gaps doesn't have sufficient plans to realise the full benefits from its change programme doesn't have a consistent track record of achieving savings and/or cannot show how it has reinvested savings or efficiency gains in priority areas has had some engagement with other agencies, but this is focused on specific actions not how to meet local demand collectively has no clear measurement of collaboration benefits understands what technology can offer policing and criminals, but does little to understand trends has invested in technology but there is no evidence to show this has improved productivity and/or enhanced services to the public	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** doesn't understand or measure the extent to which its services provide value for money lacks even a basic understanding of the skills it requires to meet current and future demand

7.1 How well does the force predict likely future demand?				
7.1.1 How well does the force identify and assess emerging or likely future demand for its services? 7.1.2 How well does the force consider public expectations in its understanding of likely future demand for its services?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** has a proven track record in predicting future demand uses technology, data and other organisations' resources to evaluate predicted demand in line with public expectations	the force effectively uses technology and a wide range of data to understand trends in demand can evaluate likely future demand and has tested its assumptions effectively understands what its public wants, and how public expectations are changing uses its understanding to inform its view of the future and adapt its services appropriately	the force's understanding of trends in demand is limited in scope and/or its use of technology and data is restricted can't evaluate fully what likely future demand could be has some understanding of what its public wants, but not sophisticated enough to clearly understand how public expectations are changing	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** has made little attempt to understand future trends or public expectations, or its attempts were seriously flawed
7.2 How well do the force's plans meet likely future demand?				
7.2.1 How well do the force's plans meet public expectations, organisational priorities and financial requirements? 7.2.2 To what extent will the force's plans improve the way it operates or provides a service? 7.2.3 How well does the force use succession planning in leadership and workforce development? 7.2.4 Are the forces plan built on sound planning assumptions that have been subject to informed challenge?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** vision set out in its plan will go beyond what the force needs to meet future demand and public expectations workforce plans are directly linked to the likely demand it will face, and the force is selecting leaders from all areas to ensure it has the necessary capabilities all plans have faced external challenge and scrutiny from experts to ensure plans realise maximum efficiencies	the force has set out a clear vision of future demand and public expectations, resourced it adequately, and the workforce understands it plans take account of likely future funding and expenditure, and any assumptions in these plans are sound and supported by the PCC (or equivalent) plans are innovative and flexible, will change the way the force operates at an appropriate pace and scale, and assure the quality and sustainability of its service to the public understands the costs of services, is fully prepared to flex its allocation of resources to meet changing demand, and plans state explicitly the impact of any reduction of service workforce and training plans have been designed to ensure the force has the skills and capabilities to meet anticipated future demand sustainably	the force vision set out in its plans doesn't meet the force's assessment of future demand and/or the workforce doesn't understand it resourcing of these plans isn't based on realistic capacity and/or capability assumptions plans don't take full account of likely future funding or expenditure and/or the assumptions are not sound plans will partially change the way the force operates, but aren't innovative compared with other forces doesn't clearly understand the costs of services, can't flex its allocation of resources to meet changing demand, and plans don't state explicitly the impact of any reduction of service. workforce and training plans are limited and not designed to ensure the force has the right skills and capabilities to meet future demand	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** has no clear vision or evidence set out in its plan, or this vision is inadequate has no established pathways for promotion or identifying talent and isn't seeking to develop them overall, the force's plans will do little to improve how it operates

		has succession plans in place, and has or is developing career pathways that allow for specialisation and are accessible to both officers and staff is open to the idea of recruiting externally, and/or is benchmarking talent in this way plans are realistic, built on sound assumptions and have been subject to adequate challenge by experts understands clearly the benefits to be gained from joint working and collaboration invests in infrastructure to make savings in the future	has established paths of promotion and talent management schemes, but these are outdated and haven't been reviewed or evaluated is (a) not open to the idea of external recruitment and hasn't benchmarked its talent against external skills; or (b) offering few, if any, internal secondment opportunities, and isn't exploring future development of them plans are overly optimistic or the assumptions on which they are built aren't adequately supported by evidence, or haven't been scrutinised enough by experts doesn't understand the benefits from joint working and collaboration invests in infrastructure but doesn't know how that will help it make future savings	

8.1 How well does the force understand the importance of engaging with the people it serves and treating them with fairness and respect?

8.1.1 How well do leaders understand the importance of engaging with people they serve treating them with fairness and respect? 8.1.2 How well does the force engage with its communities to understand and respond to what matters to them? 8.1.3 How well does the workforce understand why and how to treat the public with fairness and respect?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** takes a particularly innovative and/or effective approach to ensuring that its workforce understands the importance of engaging with the people they serve and treating them with fairness and respect, and the workforce applies this in practice to a high standard	force leaders foster a culture that values engagement with communities, and where police encounters with the public are characterised by fair and respectful treatment policies and procedures make clear the importance of fair decision making and respectful treatment, particularly during interactions with the public leaders consider the importance of treating people with fairness and respect when making force-wide/strategic decisions. uses enough channels (including social and other digital media) to engage	force leaders partially understand procedural justice but only have limited arrangements in place to give the workforce the necessary knowledge and skills uses only a limited range of channels to engage, or infrequently engages with local communities to identify local problems and seek their views, or excludes those who traditionally interact less often with, or who have less trust and confidence in the police, or isn't taking steps to remove barriers to engagement	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** does not have an organisational culture that values engagement with communities, and the importance of treating the people it serves with fairness and respect

		regularly and effectively with local communities, including those who traditionally interact less often with, or who have less trust and confidence in the police takes steps to remove barriers to engagement engagement influences its neighbourhood policing priorities and policing and partnership activity, and the force tells its communities about the actions it takes as a result of this engagement involves local people in its local crime prevention activity recently trained most frontline officers and staff on unconscious bias and effective communication skills, which they understand and can show how they have used them	local engagement isn't influencing the force's neighbourhood policing priories and subsequent policing and partnership activity or action taken is not routinely fed back to communities or local communities aren't involved in crime prevention activity. most frontline officers and staff haven't had recent training on unconscious bias or effective communication skills, or can't show how they have recognised and sought to overcome unconscious bias or communicated effectively with the public	
8.2 How well does the force understand and improve the way it uses force?				
8.2.1 How well does the workforce understand how to use force fairly and respectfully? 8.2.2 How well does the force record, monitor and understand data and information to improve the way it uses force? 8.2.3 How well does the force use external scrutiny and challenge to improve the way it uses force?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** takes innovative approaches to understanding and improving how it uses force, including a range of avenues for independent scrutiny and challenge.	the force trains all relevant officers and staff on how to use force fairly and respectfully, and they understand well how to apply this complies with the national recording standard on use of force and operates an effective process for frequently scrutinising comprehensive data on all types of force understands well how force is being used and uses this to identify trends and issues - including disparities has an effective forum for being externally scrutinised and challenged on its use of force data and other information with a diverse range of well-trained external members (including an	the force doesn't train all relevant officers and staff how to use force fairly and respectfully and/or some relevant officers or staff don't understand fully how to apply this doesn't monitor data and information on use of force comprehensively enough to understand well how it uses force, or it isn't identifying trends and problems (including disparities) has a forum for being externally scrutinised and challenged on its use of force data and other information, but it doesn't reflect all the features described in 'Good' or it relies on limited data and information	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** doesn't understand effectively how it uses force, with little or no external scrutiny of its use, so it can't show that it uses force fairly and appropriately, or takes effective action to improve the way it is used which is damaging its legitimacy in the eyes of the community.

		independent chair) who challenge the force confidently monitoring (internal and external) identifies individual and organisational learning which leads to improvements in how it uses force evaluates and communicates to the public its responses to this monitoring, and has other ways of seeking public (including young people) views on its use of force	internal and external scrutiny isn't leading to individual and organisational improvements to how it uses force doesn't have other ways of seeking public (including young people) views on its use of force	

8.3 How well does the force understand and improve the way it uses stop and search powers?

8.3.1 How well does the workforce understand how to use stop and search fairly and respectfully? 8.3.2 How well does the force record, monitor and understand data and information to improve the way it uses stop and search? 8.3.3 How well does the force use external scrutiny and challenge to improve the way it uses stop and search?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** takes innovative approaches to understanding and improving how it uses stop and search, including a range of avenues for independent scrutiny and challenge	the force trains all relevant officers how to use stop and search powers (including College of Policing APP) and they understand well how to apply this supervisors routinely monitor their officers' use of the powers and take remedial action the vast majority of recorded grounds for stop and search are reasonable has an effective process for frequently scrutinising comprehensive data and information on its use of stop and search so understands well how it uses stop and search has an effective forum for being externally scrutinised and challenged on its use of stop and search data and other information at force and local levels with a diverse range of well-trained external members (including an independent chair) who challenge confidently internal and external scrutiny identify individual and organisational learning,	the force trains all relevant officers how to use stop and search powers (including College of Policing APP), but some don't understand enough how to apply this supervisors don't routinely monitor their officers' use of the powers or take remedial action most (but not the vast majority of) recorded grounds for stop and search are reasonable has a process for scrutinising stop and search data and information, but it isn't frequent enough or the data and information is limited, and the force doesn't understand enough how it uses stop and search forum for being externally scrutinised and challenged on its use of stop and search data doesn't reflect all the features described in 'Good' or it relies on limited data and other information internal and external scrutiny doesn't lead to improvements in how it uses stop and search	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** doesn't understand effectively how it uses stop and search has little or no external scrutiny of its use, so can't show it's used it fairly and appropriately, or take effective action to improve its use which in turn damages its legitimacy in the eyes of the community

		which it uses to how it uses stop and search	doesn't have other ways of seeking public– (including young people) views on its use of stop and search	
		evaluates and communicates to the public its response to this scrutiny, and has other ways of seeking public (including young people) views on its use of stop and search		

9.1 How well does the force develop and maintain an ethical culture?

| 9.1.1 How well do leaders promote an ethical approach to decision making at all levels?

9.1.2 How well does the force vet its workforce?

9.1.3 How well does the force clarify and reinforce acceptable and unacceptable standards of behaviour? | **In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:**

takes a particularly innovative and effective approach to developing and maintaining an ethical culture | force leaders continue to promote the Code of Ethics, and its workforce understand its principles

has an established and well-used process for the workforce to refer difficult ethical issues into, and the force acts on learning and feeds back to the workforce

operates effective mechanisms to make sure its policies and procedures are accessible, equality impact-assessed and in line with the Code of Ethics

force leaders act as role models and foster a no-blame culture, and the workforce understands and effectively applies ethical decision-making

complies with all aspects of the vetting code and APP (or is on track to comply by December 2018)

almost all officers and staff have up-to-date vetting appropriate to their role

restricts the role of people waiting for vetting renewals or aftercare to mitigate the risk, and has a low backlog of these cases | force leaders promote the Code of Ethics but the workforce either doesn't fully understand this, or doesn't understand the importance of or doesn't apply ethical-decision making effectively

doesn't operate a well-established or sufficiently used or understood process for considering difficult ethical issues or policies

leaders don't understand fully the importance of acting as ethical role models and fostering a no-blame culture, or the workforce doesn't perceive leaders as ethical role models

doesn't comply sufficiently with the vetting code and APP (and isn't on track to comply by December 2018)

some officers and/or staff have no vetting or some aren't vetted to the correct level

doesn't have sufficient arrangements in place to mitigate the risk from those waiting for renewals or aftercare and has an unacceptable backlog of cases being progressed | **Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:**

is not actively developing and maintaining an ethical culture, which seriously undermines the confidence the community can have in its legitimacy |

		routinely monitors vetting decisions to identify disparities and considers mitigating actions	doesn't routinely monitor vetting decisions to identify disparities and consider mitigating actions	
		complies with its obligations for barred and advisory lists	mostly complies with its obligations for barred and advisory lists	
		officers and staff understand the expected standards of behaviour and are aware of their obligations associated with business interests, reportable associations and gifts and hospitality policies	not all officers and staff understand the expected standards of behaviour, and while some officers and staff are aware of their obligations associated with business interests, reportable associations and gifts and hospitality policies this is not consistent in all areas of the force	

9.2 How well does the force tackle potential corruption?

9.2.1 How well does the force identify and manage organisational corruption risks? 9.2.2 How well does the force look for and assess intelligence about potential corruption? 9.2.3 How well does the force identify and tackle the problem of abuse of position for a sexual gain?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** takes a particularly innovative approach to understanding and tackling corruption risks, including seeking and tackling abuse of position for a sexual gain	the force has an effective anti-corruption strategic assessment and is subject to a satisfactory governance and refresh process collates and analyses data from several sources to identify early any corrupt behaviour or vulnerability to corruption, and intervene early to mitigate this risk the workforce reports business interests and notifiable associations, and the force follows up refusals, to ensure compliance proactively seeks corruption intelligence from external organisations and the workforce, which gives it good corruption intelligence develops intelligence satisfactorily and in a timely manner, with minimal backlogs mostly protects and supports those who report wrongdoing	the force has a poorly developed anti-corruption strategic assessment, with ineffective governance and insufficiently refreshed doesn't collate and analyse sufficient data from a range of sources to identify early any corrupt behaviour or vulnerability to corruption, and doesn't intervene early to mitigate this risk. the workforce rarely reports business interests and notifiable associations, and the force rarely follows up refusals, to ensure compliance acts upon corruption intelligence reactively, with limited evidence of seeking it out proactively and/or intelligence received is poor misses intelligence development opportunities or is slow to exploit them, with unacceptable backlogs operates confidential reporting mechanisms, but the workforce doesn't widely know, trusted or used them and that the force only protects	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** doesn't clearly understand its corruption risks and isn't tackling them effectively, including the problem of abuse of position for a sexual gain

		has passive monitoring systems in place across almost all of its ICT assets recognises and records the abuse of position as serious corruption, referring cases to the IOPC as required abuse of position is in the force's anti-corruption strategic assessment, and the force has made satisfactory progress with implementing its control strategy to tackle this problem has raised awareness of the problem among its workforce, and trained most supervisors to look for the signs among their staff works to reassure the public by publicising cases and encouraging the reporting of inappropriate behaviour	or supports some who report wrongdoing has passive monitoring systems in place across some of its ICT assets, but can't monitor many processes, or can't direct systems to record additional evidence as part of an investigation recognises and records the abuse of position as serious corruption inconsistently, not referring many cases to the IOPC as required abuse of position isn't in the force's anti-corruption strategic assessment and/or the force has made limited progress with implementing its control strategy to tackle this problem has only raised awareness of the problem among some of its workforce, and most supervisors don't not generally know the signs to look for among their staff makes little effort to reassure the public by publicising cases or encouraging the reporting of inappropriate behaviour	

10.1 How well does the force identify and improve potential unfairness at work?				
10.1.1 How well do leaders seek feedback and challenge from all parts of the workforce? 10.1.2 How well does the force identify and resolve workforce concerns? 10.1.3 How well does the force identify and reduce disparities in workforce representation?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** takes a proactive approach to involving the workforce in identifying and resolving potential unfairness at work, including seeking challenge, involving the workforce in improvements, and/or innovative approaches to reducing disparities in workforce representation	the force uses a range of effective methods for leaders to seek feedback and challenge from the workforce, and the workforce has confidence in, and uses, these systems leaders have made improvements as a direct result of feedback from the workforce regularly monitors a range of information and data to identify the problems that influence workforce perceptions of fair decision-making and respectful treatment acts effectively and promptly in response to these problems, involving its workforce in decision-making and communicating its response operates effective processes to scrutinise workforce information and data to identify disparities in the recruitment, retention and progression of its workforce workforce values the force's processes for recruitment, retention and progression and perceives them as fair identifies and seeks to reduce other workforce disparities, including in complaint and misconduct allegations for officers	the force operates systems and processes for leaders to seek feedback from the workforce, but the workforce doesn't have confidence in or rarely uses these systems and so leaders can't demonstrate that they have made improvements as a result of feedback occasionally monitors a limited range of information and data to identify workforce concerns, and/or takes limited action in response to these concerns, rarely involving the workforce in decision-making and doesn't generally communicate or evaluate progress and outcomes does enough to identify disparities in workforce representation but only acts ineffectually to reduce these disparities, and so the workforce doesn't value this or perceive it to be fair the workforce doesn't value the force's processes for recruitment, retention and progression and/or doesn't perceive them to be fair doesn't look to identify or reduce other workforce disparities where it finds them, including in complaint and misconduct allegations	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** doesn't seek feedback and challenge from its workforce effectively, or monitor a range of information and data to identify, understand or resolve potential unfairness at work isn't taking enough action to identify and reduce disparities in workforce representation

10.2 How well does the force support the wellbeing of its workforce?				
10.2.1 How well do leaders understand and promote the benefits of wellbeing? 10.2.2 How well does the force identify and understand the wellbeing needs of its workforce? 10.2.3 How well does the force take preventative or early action to improve workforce wellbeing?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** workforce feels the benefit of the force's commitment to promoting wellbeing, and identifying and tackling concerns at the earliest opportunity implements and evaluates innovative and sustainable wellbeing provision, including but not limited to occupational health services	force leaders understand, prioritise and promote wellbeing, including mental health, and take account of good practice, and the workforce values this focus supervisors at all levels understand and are confident of fulfilling their wellbeing responsibilities uses a variety of ways – including consulting the workforce and analysing a range of management information – to identify and understand risks and threats to workforce wellbeing, and their underlying causes. regularly acts early to minimise effects of threats to wellbeing equips supervisors adequately to recognise individual warning signs and to intervene early to prevent future escalation provides adequate occupational health support and operates a range of effective preventative measures to improve workforce wellbeing gives effective support to those involved in misconduct investigations and grievances	force leaders promote wellbeing, but the workforce doesn't understood it fully or value it, or this activity doesn't take enough account of good practice some supervisors only have a limited understanding of – and the force doesn't adequately prepare and support them to fulfil – their wellbeing responsibilities doesn't consult the workforce on its wellbeing, or only has a limited understanding of risks and threats to workforce wellbeing and their underlying causes takes limited early action to minimise the effects of threats to wellbeing doesn't routinely equip supervisors to recognise warning signs and intervene early to prevent future escalation occupational health provision does not meet demand and/or the force only operates a limited range of preventative measures to improve workforce wellbeing gives limited or ineffective support for those involved in misconduct investigations and grievances	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** workforce doesn't feel that force leaders prioritise, understand or support its wellbeing wellbeing provision is limited or the force only takes minimal preventative and early action to minimise effects of wellbeing threats, which has a serious impact on workforce morale and performance

10.3 How fairly and effectively does the force manage and develop individual performance of its officers and staff and selection process?				
10.3.1 How well does the force manage and develop the individual performance of its officers and staff? 10.3.2 How fairly does the force identify members of the workforce with high potential to become senior leaders? 10.3.3 How fairly does the force select people for leadership roles at all levels?	**In addition to performing at levels described in Good, the force:** has a particularly innovative or effective approach to managing individual performance, selecting high potential officers and staff, or ensuring promotion is fair and seen to be so.	the force operates consistent and inclusive arrangements to assess, manage, and develop individual performance of both officers and staff, across the whole workforce, based on clear objectives and good, regular one-to-one conversations consistently manages poor performance effectively regularly scrutinises application of performance management arrangements across the force to ensure fair and consistent practice has a transparent, well-publicised system for identifying talent across all grades and ranks, using the Competencies Value Framework (CVF) role profiles to ensure section of high-potential officers and staff fairly and objectively identifies and removes potential barriers to having access to talent schemes reviews promotion processes in line with good practice and the CVF, which includes identifying and removing the barriers to promotion has acted to ensure that its leaders represent a range of styles, approaches and backgrounds, and that promotion is based on competence (not existing relationships and line manager opinions) the workforce understands, values and perceives as fair the processes for performance and talent management and promotion	the force operates limited arrangements to assess, develop and manage individual performance of both officers and staff (e.g. lack of objectives or regular one-to-one conversations, and/or no regular scrutiny of compliance to ensure a fair and consistent approach in practice) doesn't consistently manage poor performance effectively the process for identifying talent isn't inclusive, and is generally only for officers, and/or the force is only taking limited or ineffective action to remove barriers to having access to talent management schemes doesn't adequately identify and remove barriers to promotion hasn't acted to ensure its leaders represent a range of styles, approaches and backgrounds competency is part of the promotion process but line manager opinions or existing relationships still hold weight, or the rationale behind posting opportunities is not based on evidence the workforce doesn't understand, value or perceive as fair the processes for performance and talent management and promotion	**Having not achieved the performance described in Requires improvement, the force:** doesn't have an effective process for managing individual performance of both officers and staff and doesn't manage poor performance effectively, or doesn't identify talent or manage promotion fairly or effectively, or all of these doesn't manage poor performance effectively these weaknesses lead to a serious adverse impact on workforce morale and performance