Untangling Police Accountability: A New Public Leadership Challenge?

Dr Stephen Brookes QPM BA(Hons) MCMI
Manchester Business School
+44161 275 0552 stephen.brookes@mbs.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Police governance is facing unprecedented change with the election of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) in November 2012. This paper examines the changing landscape of police accountability and seeks to untangle some of the complexity against the background of current police leadership challenges in the US and the UK. The paper describes the New Public Leadership challenge and specifically focuses on the three separate but inter-related constructs of leadership, management and governance (LMG). It suggests that a new way of thinking can help by adopting what it describes as collective leadership based on intelligent networks, knowledge and skills.
Introduction

Leadership, Management and Governance (LMG) are inextricably linked and yet separate dimensions of public service delivery (Brookes 2010, 2011). This paper considers LMG in the context of police reform in the UK. It makes some observations about shifting tides in comparison to policing systems in the United States (US). Informed by a literature review and research conducted in one of the most challenging police forces in the UK, the paper draws upon the views of police chiefs at a high level police executive forum held in Philadelphia (US) in May 2011 and a key note debate between Sir Peter Fahy (Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police (GMP) and Mr Ralph Godbee Jr (Police Chief City of Detroit Police Department) hosted in Manchester.

‘Policing’ has been described as a public good of value to the public (Brookes and Fahy 2013 forthcoming, Loader and Walker 2001). Creating public value is about ensuring that social goals are delivered in a way that is perceived as legitimate and which is trusted (Moore 1995). These values are shared by a variety of stakeholders ranging from central government as the ‘authorizers of policing’, the public as the ‘recipients of policing’ and police staff themselves as the ‘deliverers of policing’.

Police governance has been relatively stable for almost fifty years and yet its greatest change appears to be heading towards implementation almost unnoticed (Brookes 2012). The Police and Social Responsibility Act – which introduces directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) overseen by Area Police and Crime Panels – will be unprecedented in governance structures. US police chiefs, in considering such changes, express huge surprise that reform is moving more towards the US model when the UK model has been one of envy to most of the US chiefs. It would be interesting to explore the extent to which US police chiefs enjoy credibility with their public value stakeholders and whether the chiefs find such democratic oversight as tiresome rather than detrimental. Of critical importance both in the present and in the future is the question of determining whether there has been any detrimental impact on ‘performance’ in the USA compared to the UK that can be attributable to political control. This is beyond the scope of this paper.

This paper considers the police leadership challenges underpinning the proposed changes, responses already being introduced and the impact that reform is likely to have beyond November 2012 taking account of the purpose of policing set out in 1829. The paper expresses its concern that the courtship with ‘New Public Management’ (NPM) (Brookes 2010, Hough 2010, Leishman et al 2000) as opposed to ‘New Public Leadership’ (NPL) will continue unabated.

21st Century Police Leadership Challenges: More with less?

Identifying the challenges

Those who face challenges to policing are in a good position to consider responses to them. For this reason, the discussions that took place at the Philadelphia forum in 2011 are relevant to the discussion outlined in this paper. Attended by a range of police chiefs from the US and a senior Chief Constable and his leadership team in the UK, the two days were dominated by what one chief of police described as ‘the management of misery’. There were clear similarities on both sides of the Atlantic in relation to pay, conditions and other hygiene factors,
whilst coming under increased scrutiny in relation to policing outcomes.

Declining budgets and the reduction of police establishments was highlighted throughout as a major leadership challenge. In a US context, the COPS\(^1\) office put the budget and the economy at the top of the list of the five issues facing leadership\(^2\). One chief of police gave an anecdotal example from a medium but nevertheless challenging city. Police numbers in his department were reduced by a third and he had been required to demote over 70 officers (total establishment of approximately 300 sworn officers). Other similar examples were provided including police departments where supervisors were being paid less than those who they supervise (thus emphasizing the importance of the ‘front-line’), and New Orleans in developing collective resources to tackle the issues that the City faces (whilst facing a $6m deficit). Trust, confidence and legitimacy were in danger of being undermined and reputations damaged as a consequence of other non-monetary considerations. This includes the incidence of corruption in some police departments and national criticism in relation to the handling of major national disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina in 2005.

Most chiefs viewed ‘Trust’ as the defining feature of policing (for example, it reflects the legacy ‘of the badge’). Trust itself is one of the key elements of public value (Moore 1995) with ‘confidence’ and ‘legitimacy’ respectively representing the cumulative and institutional contexts of ‘trust’ (Brookes and Fahy 2013 \textit{forthcoming}).

Legitimacy of policing in the US was seen to be strong but declining (Tyler 2011). Governance is critical to this; for example, it was argued by another academic member that the public have a stake in what is going on with their police department, have a key role to play in relation to inputs and outputs of policing and to play a part in reversing the alienation that had occurred (Penny 2011). Governance involves more than elected overseers. Stakeholders are many.

References were made to trust and legitimacy defeating behaviours; ‘stop and frisk’ was one such example based on the NYPD ‘zero tolerance’ strategy and influenced very much by the matrices supporting the COMPSTAT processes.

An issue that was clearly referred to at the beginning of the session (Edwards 2011) but which re-emerged at several points during the debate was the need to understand the policing challenges that faced leaders in relation to change and how to respond. Lewis (New Haven) referred to the importance of the processes of policing and Fahy (GMP) in relation to the specialties of police leadership activities. We know, for example, that the police role differs from many other public services by the very nature of the risks, harms and threats that fall to our police services. Health services and local authorities, for example, manage risk but the distinction for policing is by virtue of the authority and coercion that accompanies the role and the types of risks encountered. In relation to policing, there is a significant challenge in that policing is primarily a monopoly; one cannot opt out of public policing and into private policing as one could with education or health.

It was said that there is no real research in relation to police leadership and measures of its effectiveness. Leadership should also be measured – and one way of measuring leadership is to measure the values of leadership\(^3\) through demonstrated behaviours in addition to other measures of effectiveness such as...
public value outcomes (including a reduction in crime), satisfaction, trust, and processes.

Policing has become more complex in the last two decades and measurement of policing activity has mushroomed. During this period, governments have introduced what is now commonly referred to as ‘New Public Management’ (NPM). Originally inspired by the new right philosophy of ‘private sector good; public sector bad’ (Morgan and Allington 2003), NPM includes a focus on objectives and targets. In the UK, a disproportionate focus continues to be given to ‘easy to measure’ targets at the expense of more difficult to measure public value outcomes (such as trust, confidence and legitimacy). To quote Albert Einstein, “count what counts and not what can be counted”. There is a consequential and relentless focus on a culture of compliance with procedures as opposed to the quality of policing services. Under both previous Conservative and Labour administrations, policing plans and objectives were put at the heart of the policing style thus favouring NPM measures rather than public value. Public value comprises the social goals of the public, the extent to which public service institutions have the capacity and capability to deliver these social goals and whether these can be delivered in a way that secures trust and legitimacy. Public value, it is argued, is the outcome of effective public leadership whereas performance matrices are the outputs of management (Brookes 2010, 2011).

Responding to the challenges

A common feature of suggested responses to the leadership challenges is the need for ‘smarter policing’ and better-informed leadership, representing management and leadership respectively. This would support the need for risk assessment including early warning processes or, what this paper describes as ‘intelligent leadership’. The role of governance is to develop a virtuous cycle of continuous improvement ensuring that the police organization, its partners and the individuals within the networks know what is required, how to achieve this and the extent to which success can be evidenced. Together, this forms the model of New Public Leadership (NPL), which is discussed further below.

So, how are police departments and forces responding and how can police leaders build on this? There are four key responses already under way although the journey of responding to the challenges has only just begun.

First, the economic crisis is driving the attention of police chiefs in both the US and the UK; the drastic cuts in police numbers described by one chief were quite common. Although at the time of the forum, the extent of the cuts in the UK were unknown, Fahy was quite prophetic in highlighting that it would be at least twenty per cent. Smarter policing processes and styles are not only desirable they are essential. Significant cuts to and rationalization of policing services have already been made.

Second, the nature of public services in the western world is being transformed by the importance rightly given to providing locally-based, user-centered responses, but alongside the oft-perceived competing objective of tackling serious and organized crime and terrorism. These priorities and the need to ensure an appropriate balance is likely to be supported by new forms of accountability and revised relationships between the community and those serving the public. This means that future police leaders must be focused on ways of enhancing public value and drawing on community intelligence whilst keeping in touch with the wider issues related to serious and organized crime and counter terrorism. This will necessitate them both acknowledging the strengths of those who work not just within policing but what is being increasingly described as the extended policing family or plural policing. It is also about ensuring that they are able to articulate challenges and facilitate change.

Third, the structure of policing that has largely characterized the police service since the early 1970s cannot be expected to remain in place over the course of the next two decades. In keeping with public sector reform elsewhere, police leaders of tomorrow must not only recognize that the future is
uncertain but should be actively encouraged to shape that future. It was interesting that in the later Manchester debate, Godbee (2011) stated that he wished that 43 forces were the problem in the US rather than the 1800+ police departments.

Fourth, against this background, the need for effective leadership within the police service is being increasingly aligned with a need to think differently about leadership. Those identified with the potential to reach the highest levels of the police service are those who will be facing a particularly challenging period of reform over a considerable period of time. Chiefs were unanimous that training and development was a major weakness.

The chiefs discussed the question; ‘how do you create and maintain legitimacy?’ Although closely linked to the crime problem, Tyler (ibid) argued that it is a separate issue and that effectiveness does not equal legitimacy. In other words, reductions in crime does not necessarily result in improved public evaluations of policing. Legitimacy is accomplished by reflecting the views of the public about the police; procedural justice, evaluation of fairness and ethical responsibility. Tyler further argued that community policing could be viewed as a strategy that supports legitimacy. There was a general acceptance that this is not a new idea or, as some argue, it is a case of putting old wine in new bottles (Sampson, 1962). Equally, there was an acceptance that it was often rhetoric and not reality; Tyler said that it is about coproduction, encouraging a willingness to cooperate and introducing procedures that create legitimacy and cooperation or, as argued by Brookes (2006) it is about coactive policing which encompasses both reactive and proactive policing styles. We must however, guard against using the term of community policing as a ‘comfort blanket’ as opposed to applying its principles to frontline policing.

This description of community policing is akin to what has developed in the UK. Police leaders should not be reluctant to involve the community in the creation of public policies and be prepared to seek their views in the development of policing; many do this well. Internal legitimacy is equally important (for example, that officers proactively create and maintain legitimacy and to bring to attention any wrongdoings that emerge). This is what Grint would describe as constructive dissent as opposed to destructive consent (Grint, 2005) in which members of the organization are encouraged to put forward constructive suggestions for improvement rather than the creation of a ‘fear’ climate in which dissent is actively discouraged. We only have to look at Enron to see what happens when an employee sticks his or her head above the parapet to identify wrongdoings, which are known and accommodated by senior leaders! (Tourish, 2005)

Performance management was seen to represent a significant challenge. Referring to the NYPD COMPSTAT process, Tyler argued that alternative matrices were required (i.e. community surveys, trust and confidence measures). This will help in developing a culture within the police department that prioritizes trust and confidence supported by the need to give officers more discretionary capacity (through a framework of values). The overall aim is to create a value-based culture and professionalism. It is this that begins to define a new way of thinking about public leadership as opposed to public management. Both co-exist but the first is about ‘doing the right things’ whereas the second is about ‘doing things right’.

Significant discussion also took place in relation to the role of values and ethics in support of building trust, confidence and legitimacy. Raised by a number of delegates, thoughtful values were considered in relation to the development of smarter policing in balancing competing interests such as crime fighting, offenders rights and in the development of (value based) discretion. Cultural values – in terms of treating each other as one would treat your family – is also important. A ‘line in the sand’ needs to be drawn between values and ethics and, further between these and performance. This is the role of
governance; “ensuring that the right things are done in the right way by and for the right people with the right result” (Brookes 2011).

**Perceptions of the responses**

The paper also draws upon research conducted in Greater Manchester Police. The research explored the perceptions of police officers and support staff (at all levels) and voluntary and community groups in relation to the dichotomy in pursing the New Public Management (NPM) inspired performance regimes compared to a public value strategic approach. The latter focuses on trust and confidence with the satisfaction of the service user at its heart.

The overall view was that there was a much stronger focus on ‘performance’ rather than ‘public value’ (Brookes 2009). In terms of ‘trust’, it was suggested that there was a perceived loss of discretion as a direct result of the emphasis on targets with an accompanying lowering of empowerment in enabling the delivery of policing services in accord with local expectations in favour of a single minded focus on what can be counted. In exploring trust further, the community expressed more trust in individual operational officers than in the institutional elements of policing. A number of public value related questions were included in one of the bi-monthly surveys routinely undertaken as part of GMP’s process of customer surveys. This was specifically included as part of this research project. The public was strongly of the view that police officers and PCSOs would treat the public with respect if you had to contact them for any reason and the majority considered that the police would treat everyone fairly. ‘Visibility’ was clearly important but fewer respondents expressed positive views that the police would be there when they were needed. Further questions were asked in relation to the reputation of the police and levels of confidence at different levels. The public considered that the force had a strong reputation in dealing with more serious issues and honesty but that a stronger reputation was needed in relation to involving and informing the public and taking action on publicly expressed needs. The public had more confidence in the individual officers in the local area more generally but was least confident in policing nationally or at the force level.

Similar views were expressed by chief officers when considering their own ability to deliver policing against a local mandate or strategy when faced with the centrally determined performance management regimes (PMRs).

In exploring trust-enhancing and trust-reducing behaviours, the ‘enhancers’ were seen to be associated with openness, transparency, visibility and responsiveness in the local delivery of policing. For example, “while community representatives understand the real challenges that GMP officers face in relation to more serious and organised crime and counter terrorism their perception is more likely to be shaped through the agency of individual officers in terms of interest shown, feedback provided, accessibility and visibility and the ability to address local issues without constraint” (Brookes 2009:12). Understandably, the behaviours that tended to reduce trust were the opposite, with a strong sense of centralism rather than localism being viewed as a major factor.
A shift from management to leadership, supported by governance?

**A New Public Leadership Framework**

If leadership is about doing the right thing and management is about doing things right (Drucker, 2001) then governance, it is argued, is about ensuring that the right things are done in the right way in the right places with and for the right people. Originating from the Greek verb *kuberná* meaning ‘to steer’ governance can be described as the act of mediating among networks, markets and hierarchies (Stephenson 2008). Brookes (2010) puts forward the virtuous cycle of collective leadership as a form of new public leadership. This is illustrated in figure 1.

As the introduction highlighted the present financial climate is having a significant impact on public services and police reform – through the Policing and Social Responsibility Act – and is already having a critical impact on police resources, practices and governance. An aim of this paper is to suggest that police leadership, management and governance (LMG) are inextricably linked but remain discrete; each will also be important in both understanding and responding to current police reform, particularly in relation to the election of Police and Crime Commissioners. Some initial definitions are offered as a way of unraveling the complexity.

Reform is defined as “the action or process of making changes in an institution, organization, or aspect of social or political life, so as to remove errors, abuses, or other hindrances to proper performance” (OED 2012).

![Figure 1: New Public Leadership as a Collective Leadership Cycle](image_url)
The paper suggests that LMG is the key to effective reform. Definitions from the OED are again helpful:

‘Leadership’ is the position of a group of people leading or influencing others within a given context.

‘Management’ is organization, supervision, or direction; the application of skill or care in the manipulation, use, treatment, or control (of a thing or person), or in the conduct of something.

Grint (2005) makes a distinction between the manager and leader depending on the nature of the problem to be solved – where problems present only a small amount of uncertainty (tame problem) its resolution is associated with management, whereas a problem with a high degree of uncertainty (wicked problem) is resolved through leadership. The desired characteristic of the leader in a ‘tame’ scenario is to provide answers, and a wicked problem to ask questions. The “leader’s role with a wicked problem is to ask the right questions rather than provide the right answers because the answers may not be self-evident and will require a collaborative process to make any kind of progress” (Grint, 2005: 1473). He thus calls upon the earlier work of Rittel and Weber 1973 who first distinguished between ‘wicked’ and ‘tame’ although Grint adds a third problem type, namely critical. This, he argues, equates to command as opposed to leadership and management.

Collaboration is therefore critical and leadership is the property of a community rather than an individual.

The PCC has a leadership role to play as part of the collective, which includes the chief constable, the community and the politicians. However, this represents a major challenge given that the PCCs aim will be to get re-elected and to do all in his or her power to ensure re-election. In a competitive democracy, there is no obligation to do other than this even though collaboration (as opposed to competition) is essential. Given the distinction between leadership and management, the subtle difference of definition in relation to governance is critical.

The European Commission (Commission for (2012) ) define governance as:

“Rules, processes and behaviour that affect the way in which powers are exercised at European level, particularly as regards openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence”

The OED has several definitions that are illustrated below.
Governance is thus more about the methods of decision making, the systems of regulation and the means of accountability. Although PCCs have a role in both leadership and management, this paper suggests that it is more about governance.
All stakeholders share leadership responsibilities. This starts with central government. To what extent has government leadership supported the overall purpose of policing, set out by Sir Richard Mayne in 1829?

"The primary object of an efficient police is the prevention of crime: the next that of detection and punishment of offenders if crime is committed. To these ends all the efforts of police must be directed. The protection of life and property, the preservation of public tranquility, and the absence of crime, will alone prove whether those efforts have been successful and whether the objects for which the police were appointed have been attained."

Although government reforms in more recent years have encouraged the creation of neighbourhood policing teams in all areas of England and Wales the government police reform White Paper (preceding the Policing and Social Responsibility Act) asserted that “the police have become disconnected from the public they serve” (Home Office 2010:2). Experience suggests that the focus still remains very much with the performance matrices rather than social goals.

The police service faces its greatest challenges in seeking to build the confidence of the public whilst facing very severe cuts. In addition to these reforms, the Prime Minister seeks to ‘open up’ police leadership arguing that there “are too few – and arguably too similar – candidates for the top jobs” (BBC 2011). This change of emphasis has already commenced with the appointment of former rail regulator Mr. Tom Winsor as the first non-police Chief Inspector of Constabulary. On taking up appointment, he said:

"The public interest will be my primary focus. The greater the efficiency and effectiveness of police forces, the higher will be the protection of the public and their safety."

Let us hope that Tom Winsor will encourage similar advice to the incoming PCCs, although it is likely that the incumbents will argue that the public has already provided their mandate through the election. With the legitimacy of the electorate behind them PCCs will be formidable adversaries.

The current reform papers are driven by a new form of political accountability through the election of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) as a means of improving the legitimacy between the police and the citizens. An alternative view may be that it is driven by a deep sense of betrayal at a public service that the conservative members of the current government believes failed them in the 1980’s, aligned with New Labour in the 2000’s and then raided their parliamentary offices!

The reform papers call for:

“a strengthened bond between the police and local people” …… “We want the public to be safe and feel safe, have a real say in how their streets are policed and be able to hold the police to account locally, having more opportunity to shape their own lives. We want them to trust the police and know that they will be there for them when they need them and to have confidence that the criminal justice system has ethics”.
(Home Office 2010:20)

---


Assuming that current reform seeks to further support this purpose rather than replacing it

5 The Independent 4th July 2012.
Given the fact that the government spends some £11 billion on policing each year, it would be naïve to suggest that the government should not seek to determine how the public receives a return on its investment in policing and, moreover that the public should have a say in policing. This is particularly pertinent given that policing is the strongest example of a public good in which the consumer cannot be excluded from its influence, whether they pay for it or not, where there are no competitive rivals for its consumption and where policing as a public good cannot be rejected. This is primarily due to the almost exclusive call upon coercive powers, which draws into the debate the question of legitimacy (Brookes and Fahy ibid).

The community is an important stakeholder and similarly plays a role in community leadership. Skolnick (1977) points to community-based policing as resting upon the cultivation of community trust and cooperation and describes this as the distinguishing feature of a new professionalization of policing. Within the current context of reform, the views and needs of local policing should be the driving force rather than government needs and these local views need to count for more but within the caveat of achieving a balance with regional, national and global policing challenges of serious and organized crime. **What role will PCCs play in strengthening the voice of the public and in supporting an appropriate balance between local policing and cross border policing?**

Traditionally, there has been a strong argument that the police service and the police authorities, which form two parts of the tripartite structure of accountability for policing with the Home Secretary, is not effective, although Mawby and Wright (2005:2) argued that these issues had lost some of their controversy in recent years as discussion surrounding accountability shifted to a focus on performance and effectiveness. This is very much in keeping with the notion of NPM. It would appear that the question of accountability has returned to the fore with the impending abolition of police authorities in favour of single democratically elected commissioners.

The current reform papers of the Coalition government to create elected police and crime commissioners has been described as a unique and bold move that will introduce democratic involvement in the leadership of policing for the first time. Gibbs argues that “This distinctive British model will make police chiefs truly accountable for the first time and the public will notice the difference” (Gibbs 2010). The Home Office describes this as a radical new programme of reform that will “strengthen the bond between the police and the public.” The PCCs can play a key role in taking responsibility for assessing trust and confidence as a key indicator of both policing style and leadership (with both self informing the other) and thus fulfill governance as well as a leadership role. In response to this, and linking leadership and governance through management, chief constables could develop a public value approach to policing. This approach is one that is driven by trust and confidence as both quantitative and qualitative outcomes of policing and thus ensuring the legitimacy of policing. Public value policing would thus define and prioritise the preferred policing style, influence the values and behaviours that are important in ensuring trust and provide the impetus for continuous improvement based on leadership at all levels with public value as the outcome of effective and collective leadership.
Unraveling police leadership, management
and governance

What is expected of PCCs?

The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011
replaces Police Authorities with directly elected
Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) for each
police force outside London in England and Wales.6
In addition, Part 1 of the Act also contains provisions
for establishing Police and Crime Panels for each
police area. The government describes this as a
landmark in decentralizing control and returning
power to communities. The 41 police forces vary
significantly in size and complexity, with the largest
(West Midlands) having 8,400 officers and the
smallest (Warwickshire) having just 932 officers7.

In general terms, the definition of a ‘Commissioner’ is
“one appointed or deputed by commission to carry
out some specified work” (OED 2012). Breaking this
down further, ‘commission’ means “Authoritative
charge or direction to act in a prescribed manner;
order, command, instruction (generally, of the
commissioning authority).” The OED explains that
the suffix –er (Commission-er) is “an anglicized form
of French and Anglo-Norman commission(n)aire
(from medieval latin); the sense being ‘one belonging
to or entrusted with a commission’”. The
etymological origin of both commission and
commissioner thus relates to being entrusted. This
gives a sense of stewardship, which is concerned with
values, beliefs and behaviours within relationships
(Smith 2005, Solomon and Solomon 2004, Walshe et

Stewardship theory emphasizes the building of trust
(Champy and Nohria, 2000) and social capital
including trust and associability (Davis et al 1997).
Unlike the agent, the authors argue:

> the steward is a self
actualiser motivated to serve
the collective good whilst
fulfilling both social and
higher needs of growth and
achievement
(Davis et al ibid: 545)

Agency theory – which focuses on the individual –
often, starts from personal self-interest within the
context of governance resulting in self-interested
behaviour. Conversely, stewardship theory rejects
self-interest in favour of the collective good. This
helps us to begin thinking about the role of PCCs
particularly if the commissioning authority is the
electorate. However, the major challenge is that
election is a mechanism that inserts self-interest
(getting re-elected) into governance to serve the
collective good (as judged by the public/electorate).

It is inevitable that the way in which the role is
carried out is likely to evolve through experience and
circumstance. In the BBC Newsnight programme on
19th July 2012, Lord Prescott, candidate for
Humberside, concluded a studio debate with Sir Hugh
Orde (ACPO President) and Ian Johnstone (former
Chief Superintendent and Independent Candidate for
Gwent), by saying “lets see how it works” as the
discussants debated the inevitable tensions that lie
ahead.

---

6 In London, the Mayor of London will act as the PCC for
the Metropolitan police through the new Mayors Office for
Policing and Crime

7 Home Office figures September 2011
Let us explore some of these potential tensions.

Although PCCs are not limited to the number of terms of office they can serve, given the nature of elections, the time focus is likely to be limited. In relation to the purpose of policing, many of the issues tackled are what are described as ‘wicked problems’; these require long term and multi agency responses. The long-term is unlikely to represent an attractive proposition for a commissioner who is elected every four years.

During their period of office the commissioners will be advised and scrutinized by local Police and Crime Panels. Similarly, the full extent of this role is not yet known although it is envisaged that the panels will be able to veto the appointment of a Chief Constable or the approval of the annual budget with a ¾ majority.

The intention is that the PCC operates independently and will not (formally or informally) share responsibility for policing with other local groups or individuals (such as Directly Elected Mayors) (PWC 2011); if this is the case, then why are potential candidates representing the main political parties required to ‘swear allegiance’ to their nominating (and short-listing) party rather than the public by whom they were elected? This is one of the reasons why the Falklands veteran Simon Weston decided to ‘stand-down’ from his candidature as an independent commissioner (Guardian 2012).

However, as part of a job evaluation of the role, PWC – based on desktop research – have identified core skills and requirements. Let us consider these within the constructs of LMG and then consider them within the broader dimensions of values and behaviour:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing the right things</td>
<td>Doing things right</td>
<td>Ensuring that the right things are done in the right way by the right people in the right places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Community Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the context of policing</td>
<td>• Financial processes &amp; procedures</td>
<td>• Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Working with others to achieve outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of knowledge to produce outcomes</td>
<td>• Leadership skills (including Political skills)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Working in partnership with other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting things done through people</td>
<td>• Influencing skills</td>
<td>• Working with employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work effectively with Chief Constable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having an impact on customers, suppliers or others outside the organisation</td>
<td>• Acting as the link between the community and the Chief Constable</td>
<td>• Work effectively with citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensuring that an appropriate balance is maintained between those who have a direct and those who have an indirect impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making sense of complexity</td>
<td>• Setting the strategic direction and objectives of the force</td>
<td>• Decisions as to how to hold the Chief Constable to account and to maintain an efficient and effective police force for the police area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative thinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Find new ways to achieve objectives by building and fostering collaborative local partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking ahead, seeing the big picture and developing and implementing new ideas through innovation.</td>
<td>• Translating the wishes of citizens into action on the part of the Chief Constable to cut crime and antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>• Put in place strategic plans that enable operational improvement within limited resource constraints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we return to our definition of reform, perhaps we should ask “what are the errors, abuses, or other hindrances to proper performance?” and “How will the action or processes of change to policing institutions help in eradicating or improving the problems?” This calls for an approach to intelligent leadership through networks including the development and application of appropriate knowledge and skills.

Intelligent leaders ask the right questions rather than give the solution. This should apply as much to PCCs with the wider public (in terms of needs) as it does for the chief constable (in terms of action).

There is an opportunity to negotiate through this complexity and unravel appropriate roles and accountabilities. The paper argues that this can be undertaken by a process of collective leadership which operates across and at all levels of public sector activity through collegiate (distributed) leadership and collaborate (shared) leadership. Known as 360° Compass Leadership (Brookes 2007), the idea behind it is quite simple and outlines seven key leadership values. These are illustrated in figure 3. The notion of shared and distributed leadership are shown by indicating that leaders lead in all directions (thus emphasizing 360° leadership).

Training and Development

An intelligent led network should also be reflective of a learning organization (Senge 1994) and in today’s complex leadership environment, training, research and development cannot take place in a vacuum. Individual, organizational and networked learning should be directly related to the real world in which policing takes place and both learning and research should follow the principles of ‘original thinking applied’. There is an opportunity to follow an action-learning approach with cascaded training and development that is both research based and aligned to the overall purpose of policing and the vision and aims of forces or departments.
In the UK the economic situation plays a major role in the senior command course within the business domain (demonstrate the essential strategic leadership skills required to manage the risk created by the increasingly fluctuating demands of a dramatic financial environment and the impact this has on the policing provision to communities) but it is not necessarily linked to the training and development at other levels within the organization or the wider police family. There is no doubt learning in both directions is possible but shared learning must be given priority.

CONCLUSION: Rediscovering lost values?

Never before have we been in a position where the individual nature of senior leaders has overshadowed and destroyed collective values. We can look to Enron and the more recent banking crisis that has led the so-called developed world into recession where ‘constructive dissent’ as described by Grint (2005) appears to have been ignored by senior managers in preference to ‘destructive consent’. The public sector has not been immune to this. Under the ambit of ‘new public management’ the last twenty to thirty years has seen an encouragement of private sector management techniques being applied to the public sector, including the police service. There is a strong base of literature that is critical of this approach in skewing leadership towards what can be counted rather than what counts. The interaction between the economic climate and public services, for example, is clear and with significant cuts being made to public services, perhaps it is not just about transformational leadership change but rather revolutionary leadership change based on rediscovering our lost values.

What are these values?

During the police executive discussion in Philadelphia in May 2011, values were writ large: This included the role of values and ethics in support of building trust, confidence and legitimacy; thoughtful values in the development of smarter policing in balancing competing interests and in the development of (value based) discretion and cultural values — in terms of treating each other as one would treat your family. It was also said that a ‘line in the sand’ needs to be drawn between values and ethics and, further between these and performance. It is at this point, this paper suggests, the difference between leadership and management generally (and NPL and NPM respectively) can be drawn. Leadership is about values, management is about ensuring appropriate behaviour and performance and governance concerns the alignment between values, behaviours and performance.

The reform post 2012 is most certainly challenging and the whys and wherefores of its introduction have already been rehearsed. As one chief constable stated recently “The government has spoken. It is our job to make it work”. The ‘our’ is also the ‘we’ and it is a collective responsibility. The introduction of PCCs is a critical milestone in police governance but if the rationale of ‘commissioning’ is to be effective then it is more about stewardship as a form of governance rather than management. Both the PCC and the Chief Constable have a shared role in leadership, but the distinction between the two is critical. Organisational leadership and individual leadership within forces and police departments rest with the chief constable and staffs. Community and political leadership could be given a boost by the involvement of a PCC but only if he or she is prepared to subjugate either individual or political aims in favour of the greater good. This is collective leadership and an approach to leadership that could uphold the original purpose of policing set out by Sir...
Richard Mayne in 1829. It will also help in developing and evaluating the values and behaviours that can bring this about rather than a single-minded focus on performance outcomes. Public value is the overall outcome of excellent public leadership.

The biggest challenge relates to the election mandate. Some may argue, “Why would a PCC focus on the collective good rather than his or her individual or political aims?” It is about the short term and the need to chase electoral popularity. Community safety and policing is about the long term wicked problems as well as the short term tame or critical problems. Only time will tell and perhaps we are left with Lord Prescott’s words lingering in our ears; “let’s see how it works”.
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