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Purpose of the MPF Guidance

The purpose of this guidance is to inform all officers and staff, line managers and the HR community on the principles of the MPS Performance Framework (MPF) and to assist others to understand how the MPF may be used for selection, promotion and development purposes. This document is not a comprehensive account of any particular selection, development or promotion process. If you seek this information, please refer to the process-specific ‘Guidance Notes’ as they become available.

Please visit the MPS Performance Framework webpage to view the MPF frameworks.

Departure from the ICF

Context

The MPS has developed its own MPS Performance Framework (MPF) to replace the ICF. However, to provide some national context, the Integrated Competency Framework (ICF) has been redesigned nationally, by the NPIA and Skills for Justice. Having been used since its implementation in 2003, there was a growing need to review the ICF in order to keep it up to date with modern policing, and to reduce some of the bureaucracy that was created by multiple lists of behaviours, activities and indicators. The new national framework, the ‘Policing Professional Framework’ (PPF), has now been developed. This consists of National Occupational Standards (NOS) and Behaviours, branded as ‘Personal Qualities.’

In order to make the move away from the ICF as useful and relevant as possible, the MPS has chosen to create an alternative to the national behavioural framework. This has allowed us to reflect some of the more specific challenges we face as a service with respect to our size, complexity and the environment in which we operate. By developing our own bespoke MPS Performance Framework (MPF), we are able to focus on achieving our priorities in a productive and efficient way and ensure that our definitions of effective performance are current and fit for purpose.

HR received regular feedback that the ICF indicators encouraged a ‘tick box’ approach to assessment and evidence gathering, against an overly complex and rigid list of indicators that did not enable identification of effective performance within a wide enough range of roles. As a result, officers and staff reported that it was very challenging to evidence the ICF indicators sufficiently without being abstracted away from their main responsibilities. To address this, the MPF features criteria that support effective and efficient working more directly, and that are more appropriate for all.
MPF - Key differences from the ICF

The MPF is a behavioural (or competency) framework, as were the ICF Behaviours. However there are some key features of the MPF that differ from the ICF:

- More concise criteria of effective performance, instead of positive and negative indicators
- Specific reference to local and/or corporate priorities
- Increased focus on outcomes, rather than behaviour alone (particularly evident within Operational Effectiveness and Resource Management)
- Increased focus on efficient working
- Increased focus on Leadership
- Increased applicability to specialist roles and business areas
- A more holistic model, i.e. where all three ‘Driver’ areas can interact, rather than being evidenced completely separately

Development of the Drivers

For each phase of the MPF development, best practice design principles were applied. Therefore each framework was developed individually through:

- Interviewing of representative sample of role holders
- Job analysis interviews and/or focus groups with Line Managers
- Job analysis interviews and/or with Stakeholders
- Data coding and consolidated to form Driver definitions at each rank and role type
- Validation in partnership with the business, Staff Associations and Trade Unions

Because each framework was developed in this way for each and every rank and staff role type, the information is current and reflects the requirements of that rank or role type for the majority of current role holders. If criteria do not appear in a framework it is because it was not shown to be sufficiently applicable for role holders in that rank or role type.

More information is available if required via mailbox: HR Mailbox - MPS Performance Framework.
Behaviours and Role Profiles

Prior to the introduction of the MPF, Role Profiles based on the ICF used to be structured in the following way. For each Role Profile, the ICF was composed of Activities (with underpinning National Occupational Standards (NOS)), and Behaviours (sometimes also known as Competencies). Activities and NOS described the role, and featured detail specific to the role. Behaviours, on the other hand, tend to describe the role holder.

The MPF solely replaces the Behaviours. The MPF intentionally does not contain role-specific detail such as Activities, NOS or Core Responsibilities.

The MPF explained

Structure

The MPF is not one single framework, but rather a series of frameworks that help to define what effective performance should look like for MPS officers and staff. Each officer rank has a single corresponding framework, whereas police staff frameworks are structured by the nature of the role and broad level of responsibility.

The frameworks are structured into three key ‘Drivers’ that have been shown to drive effective performance for all MPS officers and staff. The definitions for each Driver are different for each officer rank and for each category of police staff roles; however the three Driver headings themselves remain the same. The frameworks consist of the category of the framework, the Drivers, Driver sub-headings and the statements that together provide the broad definition of effective performance. Figure 2 shows a screenshot of the Constable framework as an example.
The Drivers

The following provides an overview of each of the three Drivers. Please note that specific definitions are contained within each PDF framework document and these are available via the MPS Performance Framework webpage.

Figure 3 - The MPF Drivers
Operational Effectiveness

Operational Effectiveness is being effective in the role in which you operate, whatever the nature of the role might be. The word ‘operational’ denotes that the MPS business is policing, and that all those who work in the organisation play a part in that business. This is therefore applicable to all officers and staff in all types of roles. It does not mean you need to be in a role which is traditionally perceived as ‘operational’ or ‘front line’ in order to be operationally effective. It is crucial that officers and staff are not treated unfairly by this.

Operational Effectiveness is about achieving a high quality outcome for your customers and the organisation, in line with what is relevant to your role and the priorities and objectives to which you are expected to work. Your customers are those individuals or groups to whom you provide a service. They might be external such as members of the public or other organisations, or internal, such as team members, managers, other departments or the organisation as a whole.

Operational Effectiveness is also about using your knowledge, skills and experience to make or help others to make effective decisions. The meaning of ‘effective decision’ will depend on your role. It might be about minimising risk to public safety. It might be about gathering the right information to aid a decision-making process. No matter what your role, Operational Effectiveness involves a consideration of how things can be done better, which might include doing things differently, identifying opportunities, or capturing learning from research and experience.

Organisational Influence

Organisational Influence stands for behaving and interacting in a way that has a successful and positive influence on others and the organisation. All MPS officers and staff are expected to act in a professional and ethical manner by showing commitment to and accepting responsibility for what is expected of them - in their specific role and as a representative of the MPS. You might be a line manager and hence be expected to demonstrate ‘strong leadership’ by managing the performance, development and welfare of your members of staff; however you do not need to be in a senior role in order to demonstrate professionalism and exert influence. Depending on your role there may be an element of continued professional development such as training to maintain professional or specialist skills, or you may be responsible for the development of others as well as yourself. It is important to note that Organisational Influence should be demonstrated in the ways set out below and is not simply a measure of an individual’s ‘informal network’.

Organisational Influence is partly about working with and/or leading others to deliver an effective outcome by acting professionally and engendering respect and motivation in others. This involves treating others in a respectful way that shows awareness of their specific needs or concerns, respecting confidentiality and acting openly and honestly wherever appropriate. Depending on your role, this could mean the way in which you interact with
external or internal individuals in order to achieve positive outcomes, or could mean how you achieve a positive influence over a larger group through negotiation or leading by example. Please note that all role holders are expected to uphold and comply with professional standards such as dress code and health and safety responsibilities.

Promotion of equality and valuing of diversity is most explicit within Organisational Influence. This is applicable both externally, in terms of the external customers and communities we serve, and internally, in terms of how we understand and interact with colleagues. Therefore this applies to all officers and staff in all roles.

Organisational Influence is also about the way in which you communicate with others. Depending on your role this might range from conveying messages clearly and accurately to managing the effective flow of information across larger groups. In addition, all officers and staff are expected to build effective relationships with individuals or groups and achieve mutual trust and respect.

Resource Management

This is about how you achieve effective outcomes by planning and managing the resources that are available and/or relevant to you in your role. For all officers and staff this involves using your time effectively in order to achieve the objectives of your role. You might be in a role where your ‘resources’ include the members of staff who are involved in work for which you have a responsibility. In this case Resource Management is partly about planning the work of others, taking into account requirements such as time and skills required in order to deliver an effective outcome. Similarly, all are expected to use MPS equipment and property responsibly, such as uniform, kit, technology and office resources, and depending on your role you might also be expected to manage their provision or maintenance.

Part of effective Resource Management is also about working efficiently. Therefore in addition to delivering work to time and to quality, officers and staff must take account of doing so economically, in order to achieve the maximum value for money or effort that is possible and appropriate. Depending on your role, this might mean managing your time and resources so that they are not used or wasted unnecessarily, or it might mean effective management of budgets and financial operations. When dealing with financial and resourcing matters, officers and staff are expected to obtain professional advice and be compliant with relevant corporate arrangements.

It should be noted as a point of clarification that the development of people as a ‘resource’ is relevant to Resource Management (such as identifying a team training need to improve team capability), whereas working towards the more individual development of oneself and others relates to Organisational Influence.
**Which framework applies to me?**

There is one set of officer frameworks that apply to both special and regular police officers. Police officers should work to the framework that corresponds to their rank. All MPS ACPO officer ranks ranging from Commander to Commissioner should use the ‘ACPO’ framework.

Police staff should work to the framework that is most appropriate for their role, and should seek advice from their line manager. In order to maximise the relevance of the frameworks across the diverse range of roles held by police staff, the frameworks do not relate to pay band but instead relate to the nature of the role and broad level of responsibility. It is strongly recommended that each (B)OCU or department ensures that where necessary the agreed frameworks for staff are applied consistently.

The definitions contained within the frameworks provide a *likely* indication of what effective performance should look like in each officer and staff role, but these do not need to be rigidly followed. It is strongly suggested that individuals and their line managers discuss and agree how the selected framework applies to the individual’s role. This is because each framework will inevitably contain some elements that are highly relevant and some elements that are less relevant. Therefore the selected framework for the role should not be expected to be a ‘perfect fit’ but rather a sensible ‘best fit’ that can be tailored and interpreted according to the more detailed requirements of the role. This flexibility allows the frameworks to remain as appropriate as possible across all roles and situations.

However, various types of roles and their *suggested* relevant framework are set out in Table 1, which may assist in selecting the most appropriate framework for police staff roles.
Table 1 - Suggested framework categories per role type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework Category</th>
<th>Role type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Functional</td>
<td>• Administrators, clerks and assistants in generalist roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>• Security officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>• Senior pay grade (SPG) and Premier band staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>• Junior managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Middle managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSO</td>
<td>• Police and community support officers (PCSO’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>• Senior managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heads of Department or Unit (below Director level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist and Technical</td>
<td>• Skilled professionals, practitioners or advisors in specialist and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technical roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Designated detentions officers (DDO’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Custody nurses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operational specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communications officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note this is not an exhaustive list and the points of guidance above should be applied. For example, a senior Lawyer role holder may be both a specialist practitioner and a manager of others. In this case a single framework would still be selected but it would be interpreted to allow for both these functions. In this example, it might be that the Specialist and Technical framework is the most appropriate all considered, but that the element of ‘managing others’ is interpreted as relevant through ‘delivers quality outcomes to meet objectives’ (Operational Effectiveness), ‘acts with professionalism’ (Organisational Influence) and ‘manages relevant resources effectively’ (Resource Management).

How the Drivers work

All three Drivers work together to give a complete picture of effective performance. All HR processes should make use of each Driver area and should ask for evidence of the broad scope of the Driver area but each statement under each Driver is not to be treated as mandatory or as an indicator. Generally, there are two sub-headings under each Driver area. This is because each Driver is broad and covers a range of different criteria. Providing evidence for the broad scope of a Driver area means covering each of the headed areas within each Driver area. For example, for most ranks and staff categories Organisational Influence consists of Leadership and
Communication (the two sub-headings). Therefore an individual should cover the scope of the Driver by ensuring they provide evidence of Leadership as well as Communication. Both sub-headings should be tested for each Driver area.

Positive and negative indicators are not included in the new framework as they contributed largely to the bureaucracy of the ICF and were often used, incorrectly, as a checklist. The new behaviours featured in the national Policing Professional Framework (PPF) are also without positive and negative indicators.

The ICF indicators were never designed to be used as a checklist. They were examples of how the individual may be likely to demonstrate the broader definition, or ‘strap-line’, contained within the two boxes at the top of each Behaviour. They were not intended to be an exhaustive list. One of the criticisms which led to the removal of the ICF was that increasingly, where the indicators were being used as a checklist, individuals within certain roles were being adversely impacted because the indicators were too narrow and specific. Similarly, the MPF statements should not be used as an exhaustive checklist, but rather a likely indication of what effective performance looks like. Please note that the statements within each MPF framework are not presented in order of importance.

**The MPF in practice**

**Key processes using the MPF**

The MPF should help guide development needs as well as performance. When completing PDR evidence Line Managers are required to provide evidence for the Drivers only. However, in addition to the relevant framework, any role profile and/or job description should be referred to as a helpful source of job-specific detail in order to make the PDR as accurate and useful for the individual as possible. This is particularly advisable where Line Managers are using the same framework for members of staff with differing roles and responsibilities. Subsequent sections of this guidance may be helpful, with respect to the advice offered to assessors and candidates.

For more detailed information about the PDR process, please visit the [PDR webpage](#).

**Selection**

Applicants are advised to refer to the advertisement and role profile for the particular role for which they are applying in order to gain an understanding of how the Drivers should be interpreted for that particular role. For example, this can help to clarify what the objectives are, what the local priorities are, or who the customers are.

For detailed information about applying for or managing a vacancy, please visit the [HR Recruitment - Managing a Vacancy](#) webpage. Subsequent
sections of this guidance may also be helpful, with respect to the advice offered to assessors and candidates.

**Police Promotions**

To apply for promotion and detective selection, officers must wait for the relevant promotion process to open. Promotion and detective selection processes are advertised on the corporate intranet site once they are known. Up to date information is posted on the Police Promotions webpage. Subsequent sections of this guidance may also be helpful, with respect to the advice offered to assessors and candidates.

Please also see the Changing Role webpage for further information regarding selection and promotion.

**Key processes not using the MPF**

National processes will continue to use national criteria rather than the MPF. These include the Initial Police Learning Development Programme (IPLDP), High Potential Development Scheme (HPDS), Senior Police National Assessment Centre (Senior PNAC) and Work Based Assessment (WBA). This is not an exhaustive list; you are advised to seek further clarification from PeoplePages in the first instance.

**Using the MPF in selection and assessment**

The precise way in which the MPF is used will depend on the vacancy or process in which it is used. The most appropriate framework for the role/process must be selected and agreed and be clear to potential candidates. Local recruiters are obliged to test every Driver area, and cover both sub-headings of each Driver. There is no corporate requirement to assess every statement contained within the Drivers, but recruiters should ensure that they assess a reasonable scope of each Driver, and the advertisement for the role may highlight the areas of the framework that are of particular relevance to the role.

As much information as is appropriate should be shared fairly with candidates. When assessing against the framework (for selection or development) clear evidence must be documented to indicate where an individual has or has not met the selection criteria. When assessing the Drivers this is likely to be due to lack of breadth of evidence across a Driver, lack of depth of evidence within a Driver (see explanations of breadth and depth below) and/or insufficient evidence of role-specific skills. For further information, please refer to the ‘What assessors look for’ section.

It is inappropriate to equate rigidly the number of statements that have been evidenced with a score. The appropriate framework and role profile (when available) and/or job description for the target role must be used in conjunction with the candidate’s evidence and the professional judgement of the decision-makers in order to reach an evidence-based evaluation.
Wherever the MPF is used to guide selection/assessment decisions, users should ensure that all decisions are fully compliant with the [Equality Act 2010](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/31).

**Advice to local recruiters**

For detailed information about applying for or managing a vacancy, please visit the [HR Recruitment - Managing a Vacancy](https://www.met.police.uk/hr/) webpage. Subsequent sections of this guidance may also be helpful, with respect to the advice offered to assessors and candidates.

**Advice to assessors**

*Good practice selection using the MPF*

- Be explicit in outlining selection criteria (using a role profile and/or job description). This will assist both assessors and candidates in understanding the context of the role and framing behavioural evidence against the Drivers accordingly. Careful consideration should be given to any additional requirements that are not captured by the generic nature of the Drivers, e.g. professional qualifications, specified skills.

- Allocate sufficient time to test all Driver areas equally. Multiple Drivers may be tested at the same time. You may wish to ‘cross-mark’ evidence, by for example looking for evidence of Operational Effectiveness in the section that relates mainly to Organisational Influence, and so on. However assessors must ensure that candidates are afforded the opportunity to evidence each Driver.

When interviewing, you should additionally:

- Formulate a number of questions for each Driver area, in order to test the breadth of each area (e.g. within Organisational Influence this means testing Leadership as well as Communication). Some sample interview questions are provided below

- Remember you are seeking behavioural evidence from the candidate - broad opening questions should be followed up with probing questions to gain information supporting what the candidate actually did and how they did it.

- Allow candidates to present their best evidence

- Take steps to improve inter-rater reliability (consistency of marking between assessors) such as minimising the number of assessors within a selection process and ensuring assessors receive guidance to improve benchmarking/consistency with respect to how candidate performance is evaluated. This is often improved by assessors participating in a pilot assessment where the same evidence is evaluated by all assessors. Assessors’ views (and their degree of consistency) are then discussed and
learning is captured. Please contact HR Organisational Development if you require further advice.

- Assist assessors/panel members to assess candidates’ behavioural evidence in a fair and objective manner that is free from bias through **Observing, Recording, Classifying and Evaluating** evidence. This will assist in ensuring that assessor attitudes have as little impact as possible on the assessments that are made. Observing and Recording should capture as much verbatim evidence as possible. Classifying is where the recorded evidence is ‘categorised’ against each Driver, and finally the classified evidence should be evaluated a decision reached per Driver area.

A number of common Assessor biases have been identified, which may lead an Assessor to be biased in favour of or against a Candidate. Biases in either direction result in a reduction in the objectivity of the assessment process and consequently may mean that Candidate evaluations are unduly influenced by irrelevant and unfair factors.

**Common Assessor biases:**

1. **Central Tendency:** This is the tendency to go for the ‘easy option’ by only using ratings in the middle of a scale and not scores at the extreme ends of the scale (i.e. 1 and 5) which may require more justification.
2. **The Error of Leniency:** There may be a tendency amongst inexperienced Assessors to demonstrate undue leniency, which is usually prompted by their lack of confidence causing them to err on the side of caution.
3. **Stereotype Effect:** This is the tendency to make positive or negative judgements on the basis of surface characteristics.
4. **Halo/Horns Effect:** This is the tendency to assume that because a Candidate is good in one exercise or one Driver, that he or she will be good in others (Halo). Similarly one cannot assume that if a Candidate is weak in one exercise or Driver area, that they will necessarily be weak in other areas (Horns).
5. **The Mirror-Image Error:** This is the tendency to assume: “I know I’m good, therefore to be good, s/he must be like me”. (Recruiting in one’s own image)
6. **Rushed Decision Making:** This is the tendency to spend insufficient time evaluating Candidates. It is not necessarily the case that each candidate needs equal time, but each candidate does need equal consideration.

In order to avoid these biases, the Assessors must consider these carefully in line with their own attitudes and experiences. Secondly, the use of the Behavioural Assessment Process or ‘ORCE’ model (Observe, Record, Classify, Evaluate) ensures that the assessment of Candidates is as objective as possible, focusing Assessors on job-relevant Drivers at all times.
Figure 4 shows an example rating scale for reference. However you are advised to seek clarification from the relevant department with respect to the precise rating scale that is used for specific processes.

**Figure 4 - Suggested rating scale and definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improvement required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greatly exceeds the standard required.

Exceeds the standard required.

Meets the standard required.

Below the standard required.

Far below the standard required and would be considered a significant development area.

**Sample interview questions**

The following questions are examples of what might be asked of a candidate in an interview or on an application form in order to elicit relevant information per Driver area. These are generic examples only.

**Operational Effectiveness**

- How have your customers benefited from your work?
- How have you shown you can respond to shifting priorities?
- How do you know you have delivered your work to a high quality?
- How have you acted to improve service delivery?
- How do you ensure you understand the range of issues that affect your remit of responsibility? How have you managed these?
- Tell me about a time when you have overcome a problem which would otherwise have prevented you from achieving an objective or outcome.
- How have others benefited from what you’ve learnt about a challenge at work?
Organisational Influence

- How do you work towards ensuring staff or colleagues around you feel motivated?
- How do you ensure professional standards are upheld?
- How have you promoted equality and diversity within your area of influence?
- What are your development areas? How do you know that? How are you managing that?
- Tell me about a time when you have had to manage the expectations of a customer or stakeholder.
- How did you know that you communicated effectively?
- Describe a time when you have supported an unpopular decision. How did you overcome resistance? What were the outcomes?

Resource Management

- (Where relevant) Tell me about a time when you had to make a difficult decision about how to deploy resources. How do you know it was a good decision?
- How have you ensured you or your team are equipped with the right resources to work effectively?
- How have you ensured efficient working in your area?
- (Where relevant) How do you ensure your resources are managed?
- How have you maximised efficiency?

Providing feedback

Feedback should be meaningful to the candidate by being understandable and clear, well justified, useful and delivered sensitively. It must be specific and not just cite terms such as “lack of breadth, lack of depth” without supporting information relating to the candidate’s evidence specifically. The feedback should comment upon this in a way that tells the candidate which area of the Driver they evidenced well and which particular part of the candidate’s evidence the assessor is referring to.

For example, under Operational Effectiveness, ‘the candidate worked in partnership to understand and realise the diverse needs of customers and communities’ could be made stronger by elaborating to ‘the candidate worked in partnership with the charity as well as a number of community representatives to understand why people of a particular age group were experiencing <problem> through holding face to face meetings at the Charity headquarters and in accessible locations as well as by conducting an anonymous survey.’

Please see the Post Selection Activity webpage for further information on this subject.
Advice to candidates

How can selection or development be prepared for using the MPF?

Follow the guidance for that process
Study carefully the guidance notes that are specific to the process to which you are applying, so you can be sure you have done what has been asked of you. For recruitment/selection this will be the job advert itself which will refer to the correct MPF framework, and any available role profile, job description or further information for the advertised role. Ensure your application form shows evidence for each of the three Driver areas and that you have completed it in the format as instructed.

Write clearly
Ensure your evidence is written clearly. Ask a colleague to read over your evidence and provide you with feedback on whether or not it makes sense. You are advised to write as clearly as possible and avoid excessive jargon. Be sure to explain your example so that the detail and its importance can be understood.

Structure your evidence
Ensure with each example that you are providing your assessor with an account of your involvement and achievement, and that is as comprehensive as possible. For example, you are advised to explain the situation, your objectives, your behaviours (what you did) and what happened as a result. It would be extremely difficult to cover every area of each Driver in sufficient detail within a reasonable length of application form, or within a one-hour interview. When using the form for selection, look at which behaviours (within the framework) best support the essential activities, skills and knowledge within the job description and/or role profile for the role or level being selected for. The same will apply when using the MPF in any development exercise.

The number of examples you provide will depend on your role. You may have one, broad, detailed example which covers the scope of a Driver area, or it may be that you have worked on narrower or more specific pieces of work and may better cover the scope of the Driver using two examples. Also consider the space provided and the guidance for that particular process. When structuring each example a useful model to remember is ‘SOAR’. This model is shown in Figure 5. The use of the SOAR model is not essential but is likely to help you describe more clearly your competency relevant evidence. Please note that how you use the SOAR model will depend on your evidence; it may not be appropriate to split your evidence into equal-length quarters.
What assessors look for

The following guidance explains the terms that assessors use to assess candidates’ evidence. Consider how to present your evidence in light of this.

Demonstrate the depth of each Driver by providing specific details and explaining *how*. Assessors will look for ‘**depth**’. Depth is the extent to which the Driver is evidenced. The greater the detail and quality of the specifics (how and why you did what you did), the greater the depth of the evidence. The key advice here is to ensure you are explaining not just what you did, but *how* you did it. Assessors do understand that you are provided with a limited space in which to present your evidence. However, the more detail you are able to convey, the stronger the depth will be. Use the space wisely.
Figure 5 - The ‘SOAR’ model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOAR Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the situation and context of your example, briefly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain your aims, briefly. What were you trying to achieve and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the key area which will provide the most competency-relevant evidence. What did you do and how did you do it? Why? What was your exact role? Who/what else was involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the positive outcomes. Were your objectives achieved? How do you know it was due to your actions? The MPF has greater outcome focus. Therefore, particularly in Operational Effectiveness and Resource Management, the result is very important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessors will look for ‘breadth’ as well as ‘depth’. Breadth is the extent to which the scope of the Driver is evidenced. The greater the range of statements (sentences within each Driver) being evidenced, the greater the breadth of the evidence. Most Drivers consist of two sub-headings - these show the breadth of the Driver and should both be considered when presenting evidence. **Note:** Breadth does not mean the breadth of your role, or the number of activities or responsibilities you hold in your current role.

**Note:** The statements are not to be counted or used as a checklist. Assessors will look for a reasonable combination of depth and breadth of each Driver area.

There is no guaranteed ‘formula’ for success in writing a competency based application form. This is because evidence will always have to be interpreted. There are clear differences between this kind of competency/behavioural assessment and ‘knowledge-based’ assessment (e.g. OSPRE Part 1 examination) where there is a definite right or wrong answer. When assessing behavioural evidence, there is no definitive answer. Instead, the criteria (i.e. the three Drivers) must be used to interpret the effectiveness of the presented evidence. This is the case for all competency based assessment, both within and outside the MPS.
Example evidence

The sample evidence presented below offers broad examples of how achievements can be explained and structured in line with three Drivers, for the purpose of e.g. the PDR or an application form. It is designed purely as a suggestion to help users to understand how work undertaken can relate to the Drivers. As such examples provided here are likely to be greater in length than what would normally be suitable for an application form but this will depend on the form being used for a specific selection/development process. It does not prescribe what is right, wrong, good or poor. These examples came from substantive Police Sergeants.

Important to note: Once the MPF has been used within large-scale selection/promotion processes, HR will be in a position to present within this guidance example pieces of evidence that have been assessed to be ‘good’ more consistently and robustly.
Operational Effectiveness - example evidence

Reducing disorder and increasing passenger confidence on London transport

I established a team to address disorder problems on the route X bendy bus, part financed by TFL. This was the route with the worst disorder problems and TFL set the increase of passenger safety perception as team targets. I established that the major activity of the other police teams was Revenue Protection (RP) operations in partnership with the RP Inspectors, and that they used arrests as a performance indicator (PI).

I gathered information from users and used my experience of previous high visibility operations to understand that any bus with an officer on would show a reduction of disorder, but that few people would see the officer and this would not make a long term difference. I understood that this way of working was ineffective, and counter productive as the arrests were often of persons with no previous police engagement. I spoke to relevant community groups, SNTs and travelers at the bus stops. They all stated clearly that they thought the disorder was because of overcrowding due to the numbers boarding without tickets. I then tasked my team to work differently, to effectively address the problem. The officers were told not to arrest persons for no ticket unless absolutely necessary. I directed them to engage with customers without tickets and assist the RPIs in reporting and fining offenders rather than making an arrest and being a short-lived presence. I then sought feedback from community groups and RPIs to ensure that objectives were now being met.

Large numbers of persons saw these operations, which were run over several hours three times a week. The relevant community groups contacted the SNT to say how effective my team were being, and that a noticeable improvement had occurred. As a result my team was the only one to show month on month reduction in disorder on their route and effectively meet their target of increased passenger safety perception. I have presented my work to senior colleagues and outlined a process by which this work can be rolled out to other routes.
Organisational Influence - example evidence

Integration of small team into the wider team to improve performance and engagement

I took over supervision of a team of 12 officers working as a small subgroup of the wider team who were demotivated and underperforming and reflecting poorly on the MPS. There were poor relations between the groups and I had not previously worked with them so knew that I needed to establish communication with the smaller team and find out how they worked and how to develop them. In order to do this, I listened to concerns, making it clear I was looking to support and develop them, not assign blame and that individual matters would be kept confidential wherever possible. It was clear that they felt undervalued by their sole performance indicator (PI) being number of tickets issued, and by team attitudes to them. I also spoke with the wider team, establishing their concerns over the 12 individuals, explaining that I agreed their performance needed improving, but that officers were not making the most of the value of their contribution.

I organised and participated in mediation sessions to help them understand their respective positions and objectives and gain their trust. I introduced joint briefings to improve communication. A member of staff who was a carer was able to share her experience and a mutually suitable work pattern was established as a result of the discussions. I found that the group did not have a job description, and as such had no clear guidance on what was expected of them in their specific function.

I established that all of the team wanted to engage more with the community they worked in, and I knew that setting a PI of number of tickets did not allow them to do this sufficiently. I then devised a new PI system, measuring a range of activities, emphasising prevention and community engagement. I wrote a job description which was published, which clearly established their role. The new PI system I developed increased team performance by 40% over 3 months, and having explained the system to my manager, this was introduced across all teams. It also identified 3 underperforming individuals, who I developed via a performance meeting and 3 month action plans, which I monitored and so successfully improved their performance. This enabled them to patrol with purpose and identify resolvable issues within their beats. I then involved the team in the implementation of the ideas, working with SNT’s. The whole team was motivated and performing, and reduced crime by 27% in their beat over a 3 month trial of due to their enthusiasm, engagement, and maximising the contribution of all team members.
Resource Management - example evidence

Creation of a new analysis processes to deliver a report for Management Board

Introducing the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR) raised significant organisational concern about increases in MPS recorded crime and the likely (damaging) impact this might have on performance indicators i.e. customer satisfaction and public confidence. I was tasked to use my skills/experience to lead a cross business working group team to deliver a 3 month review of business change impact - with a report including clear statistical findings. I formed a team of 15-20 staff with skills and expertise; from first contact (CCC), crime investigation (TP Emerald), data quality (Data Accuracy Team), Audit and Inspection (MPS Inspectorate) and Performance Monitoring (PIB) who individually and collectively had the capability to carry out and validate the analysis results.

I briefed all the group members around their specific areas of responsibility, and associated timelines and ensured that they had the knowledge, skills and ability to deliver the outcomes required, at each stage of the review. I held regular briefings to share knowledge and expertise ensuring a continuity of communication across the review team (and sub teams). I created a new automated QA product that managed data extracts from CAD/CRIS and DARIS to provide Excel workbooks for analysis. Working with a statistician from PIB I automated the production of statistics from the workbooks. This was new for the MPS and saved substantial time and effort both in terms of sourcing data, completing quality assurance and providing the final analysis. It ensured work was completed on time, to a very high standard, and with minimum resource involvement. The products represent such value for money that they have been reviewed and developed to deliver an automated data extract from the CHS system. This has been quantified as about 70% reduction in time spent.

I monitored progress against the business plan on a daily basis, adjusting resources as required e.g. when a key individual went off sick, or when there were backlogs utilising skilled individuals to maintain resilience. The review completed on time, within the allocated budget and the final report (and statistical analysis) was approved at ACPO and Management Board levels. The quality of my report (and linked review products) was commended by MPS ACPO.

If you have any further questions that are not covered by this guidance please contact the HR Mailbox - MPS Performance Framework and an advisor will get back to you.