College of Policing

Effective supervision guidelines

Practice evidence

April 2022

Contents

1.   Background and aims

This report presents the findings from a review of practice evidence on the effective supervision of wellbeing, learning and performance. The review was conducted to inform the development of the College of Policing's **Effective supervision guidelines**, to support the wellbeing, learning and performance of everyone working and volunteering in the police service. For the purpose of the guidelines, a supervisor is defined as anyone who has management responsibility for one or more members of staff.

The guidelines and supporting information draw on the practice evidence presented in this report and a rapid evidence assessment of relevant social research, found in **Effective supervision, related reports and information**.

The practice review was intended to:

- provide a picture of current practice and views in relation to the supervision of wellbeing, learning and performance
- understand the organisational factors that practitioners perceived to support, or act as barriers to, effective supervisory practice
- identify current and potential future challenges to effective supervisory practice

2.   Methodology

We carried out a range of engagement activities with officers, police staff, specials and subject matter experts, including:

- #WeCops Twitter discussion on effective supervision
- workshop on future challenges for supervisors
- call for practice on qualities of a good supervisor and supporting practice
- interviews with policing supervisors in a range of roles, and at different levels of seniority, on their experiences and views on current practice, as well as barriers and enablers to effective practice

We also reviewed reports and detailed findings from engagement and consultation exercises that were previously carried out with policing practitioners by the College and other organisations. These included:

- a survey on the experiences of 1,829 special constables, commissioned by Citizens in Policing and the Institute for Public Safety, Crime and Justice

- workshops carried out with 224 police officers and staff as part of the Home Office Front Line Review

- interviews with 16 chief constables and focus groups with approximately 140 police officers and staff carried out as part of the College's research to inform its Perennial Policing Challenges work

- discussion groups held with 233 women from ethnic minority backgrounds working in policing, chief officers, and force leads for human resources and equality and diversity

Desk research and a small number of interviews were also carried out to understand practice in other sectors, and to review findings from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS).

Further details are included in the appendix.

The practice evidence was gathered systematically and its findings represent the views of multiple individuals. However, it does not represent a review of practice in every force in England and Wales. There is also a risk that the voices of those who felt most strongly about an issue will be over-represented in the findings.

3.   Findings

In this report, the terms 'practitioner' or 'staff' are used to reflect views from a range of officers, police staff and, where available, specials and volunteers. These may or may not have been in supervisory roles. 'Police staff' is used to distinguish non-sworn paid staff (including PCSOs) from sworn officers. 'Supervisor' is used when we know for certain that the view reflected someone in a supervisory role, at any level.

3.1. Supervisor responsibility for wellbeing, learning and performance

We found some differences in practitioners' expectations about the supervisor's role. Most people described it as having two specific areas of focus, which can be summarised as follows:

- operational supervision – the supervision of people doing the practical aspects of their work

- personal supervision – supporting, developing and leading individuals and teams

These two aspects were also reflected in definitions of supervision found in other sectors.

The College's Policing Professional Profiles do not include a general supervisor profile, but these two elements are encompassed in varying forms across the profiles for police officer supervisory, manager and leader roles. For example, two of the 10 key accountabilities of the sergeant profile are:

- 'Supervise a team, managing their wellbeing and welfare, development and ensuring high levels of motivation to enable an effective front line policing service.'

- 'Monitor and manage the performance of the team, devising and implementing effective strategies to identify issues and improve team/individual performance to ensure adherence to professional standards and contribute to the achievement of unit/Force objectives.'

Supervisors we interviewed reflected on the difficulty of finding the right balance between managing operational performance and looking after staff wellbeing.

However, they consistently described this as being due to their own personal preferences and abilities, and considered that both aspects were important to the role of supervisor. In our wider research, we found supervisors at all levels who felt strongly that responsibility for staff wellbeing, learning and development should not fall to supervisors and that they should only be responsible for operational performance, with specialist departments managing the former aspects. We also heard views that senior leaders could only hold supervisors to account for the operational aspects of the role. Some more senior managers felt that while strategic leaders were proactively involved in defining what good operational performance looked like, they were less likely to get involved in defining good people management.

The level and nature of supervisory support was considered to directly influence how much people gave to the job. Good supervision was believed by participants to have a positive impact on staff wellbeing, motivation and performance, with the converse also being considered true. The importance of supervisors supporting the wellbeing of staff was repeatedly mentioned, as was the need for supervisors to be supported to do this by specialist staff and services.

Some practitioners felt that there had been a detrimental change in emphasis of supervisory responsibilities over recent years, so that supervision was increasingly focused on getting more productivity out of staff rather than developing them. This was considered to be as a result not just of resourcing pressures, but also because of what was described as a 'burgeoning bureaucracy', making it harder for supervisors to spend time in the field with their staff, supporting and guiding them in practically doing their work and setting standards by example. This is described in more detail in section 3.8.

Practitioners suggested that the following might help in addressing some of the issues raised:

- a clear definition of the role of the supervisor (as opposed to by job role)

- supervision policies, agreements, objectives and/or contracts at national, local and/or individual level

- processes to challenge and improve poor supervision

3.2. Supervising staff with diverse roles, identities and backgrounds

3.2.1. Supervising staff with different role types

We interviewed staff and officers at a range of levels who had experience of supervising both officers and police staff or specials about any differences they had experienced in supervisory requirements or the expectations of their staff. Other than the fairness issues covered in section 3.2.2, we generally heard that the differences were felt to:

- be contractual – for example, tasks able to perform, payment arrangements, overtime arrangements, disciplinary processes
- have arisen from the working environment – for example, staff having experienced other organisational cultures, specials not working with the same team on each shift, officers not being co-located with supervisor

Supervisors reflected on using the same general skills and behaviours for managing officers, police staff and specials. However, they felt that more could be done by forces at an organisational level to communicate the implications of contractual differences, for example, so that sworn officers understood why police staff and specials might not be able to undertake specific duties or work specific hours. We also heard from some sergeants and inspectors that they did not have access to the duty rotas for specials on their team, and therefore did not know when they would be on shift. They felt that this had a detrimental impact on the ability to plan for both their immediate work and longer-term development.

3.2.2. Supervising staff with different identities and backgrounds

We found that participants with more diverse backgrounds or roles felt that they were treated unfairly or as 'second class'. We found substantial amounts of feedback on this issue from police staff, specials, women and practitioners from ethnic minority backgrounds. We also found some more limited feedback from staff with a disability, those whose sexuality was not heterosexual, those with a religion other than Christian, direct entrants and staff who did not work full-time. The types of unfairness described were generally similar across all groups, although police staff and specials

did not refer to direct discrimination unless it was related to one of the other characteristics.

Examples given included the following factors, which supervisors are most likely to be able to have an impact on:

- contributions being less recognised

- lack of support from line managers or supervisors

- supervisors not taking performance development reviews seriously

- a lack of supervisor understanding of different terms and conditions of work

- being treated with a lack of respect, both personally and for role or expertise

- being made to feel like a burden

- experience and perceptions of discrimination

- backlash or comments from others when speaking out or taking other positive action

The following examples are more likely to require an organisation-wide approach:

- a single organisational culture and a lack of visible commitment to diversity

- fewer opportunities to develop and progress, including a lack of structured development and career pathways

- 'earmarking' of roles or 'jobs for the boys'

- lack of structured support during entry and probation

- less access to specialist equipment, training, debriefing and welfare support, even when involved in the same incidents

- the effects of staff reductions on the nature and volume of work for police staff and PCSOs being less recognised than for police officers

- police staff supervisors feeling that they are shown less respect by individuals and the organisation than equivalently (or even more junior) graded officers

As a result, participants talked of negative impacts on their personal confidence and motivation, feeling less valued and less part of a team, feeling that their careers had been held back, and a general lack of trust in their supervisors and leaders.

Practitioners suggested that the following might help in addressing some of the issues raised in section 3.2:

- increased understanding of the experiences of minority and marginalised groups
- challenging inappropriate behaviours and comments
- visible support from proactive line managers
- diversity and inclusion objectives for supervisors
- representation at senior level, both to provide role models and to champion
- career development structures and pathways
- ensuring promotion processes are fair and transparent
- learning opportunities and materials that are accessible for diverse needs
- development activities designed specifically for police staff, rather than being adapted from existing officer courses
- lateral development opportunities
- time and funding for continuous professional development
- mentoring
- structured supervision
- flexible working policies

3.3. Wellbeing, development and performance conversations

3.3.1. Conversations and the PDR

Descriptions of the supervision of wellbeing, development and performance almost wholly focused on this as a series of conversations that supervisors had with their staff, both individually and as a team, and both formally and informally. While there were many ways of having these conversations, the PDR (called the 'professional development review' by the College) was consistently referenced over and above any other method as a key tool or as a shorthand way of describing these conversations.

We found a wide range of different approaches between and within forces with regard to the PDR, with the perceived focus differing across forces and HMICFRS,

perhaps reflected in the different labels applied to the 'P': professional, performance or personal. Some practitioners perceived the PDR as focusing on talent management and promotion, while others viewed it as focusing on assessment of personal performance in role, particularly on dealing with poor performance. Fewer people felt that it was focused on individual personal and professional development and/or wellbeing.

Staff also mentioned the lack of consistent approaches of individual supervisors across forces. Overall, we found a lack of support for the PDR process in its current form (whatever form that took), with staff variously suggesting it be dropped, replaced, amended, made consistent across forces or tailored to the individual. Used well, PDRs were viewed as an essential and effective tool for line managers to meet regularly with staff to discuss wellbeing, development and performance. More often, staff talked of PDRs 'not being a priority', of rarely having performance discussions, of writing their own PDRs and of the PDR process being a tick-box exercise, rather than a genuine concern for the development and wellbeing of staff.

We heard of a number of forces that were moving away from the use of formal PDR processes to an approach of supervising staff through continuous, ongoing conversations. These conversations could be formal or informal, structured or unstructured and of varying lengths, but with an emphasis on frequent ongoing two-way engagement with staff. We found this changing approach to formal performance review being reflected in the private sector, with a growing view that today's fast-paced workplaces were unsuited to formal performance review processes, with annual or six-monthly objectives quickly becoming dated.

3.3.2. Reflective supervision

We found much information from medical practice and some from social care around the benefits of reflective supervision. We also found some members of staff, with experience of reflective practice in charitable and support service organisations, who expressed surprise and concern that this practice was not more consistently used in policing.

Most commonly used in clinical practice, the purpose of reflective supervision is to provide a safe environment for staff to reflect on and discuss their work, as well as their personal and professional responses.

Typically, a reflective supervision session will support staff to:

- engage in critical self-examination and reflect on their skills, practice and personal responses

- identify practice issues and consider a range of approaches

- develop skills and expand knowledge through discussion, review and positive challenge

- consider future training and development needs

- discuss home life, personal issues and wellbeing, and where these have an impact on practice (or vice versa)

This practice would therefore be expected to support wellbeing, development and performance of individuals and teams. It was specifically felt, by the staff who mentioned it, that this would be helpful in providing a forum for discussing wellbeing on a regular and routine basis.

We found that forms of reflective practice had been used in a number of forces, most often with staff who worked in high-stress environments, such as sexual offences liaison officers. However, reflective practice was not available routinely to all staff and was likely to be withdrawn when resources were stretched.

3.3.3. Difficult conversations

Practitioners reflected on supervisors who they had experienced, or knew, who were perceived to avoid having difficult conversations with staff. While most of the feedback here related to a reluctance to discuss poor performance, people also mentioned reluctance to 'open a can of worms' in relation to wellbeing issues or not feeling able to be realistic about the potential for individual development. There was also some call from supervisors themselves for help here, with suggestions that they felt ill-equipped to handle such conversations.

Practitioners suggested that the following might help in addressing some of the issues raised in section 3.3:

- guidance and training on carrying out PDRs

- less bureaucratic processes for PDR, for example, less emphasis on paperwork

- tailoring of PDRs to an individual's goals and aspirations

- training and support in having difficult conversations

- training in coaching conversations

- supervisors trained in use of reflective practice

- use of insight tools in reviews, for example, 360° feedback

- a national standard for management of performance

- clarity for supervisors about training or lateral development opportunities available for them to offer to their staff

- more informal and personal approaches

3.4.   Selection and development

3.4.1. Prioritising of supervisory skills

Practitioners felt that promotion was most often linked to evidencing specific operational skills, with not enough emphasis on people's ability to manage and lead people. Both aspects were seen to be important, but current processes were perceived to be skewed too far towards operational skills. This was felt to be partly because of an almost tacit assumption that people naturally become 'HR experts' when they move into a supervisory role. Supervisors themselves reflected that they might be able to do their job role well but not be a good people manager, but that both were important. As a result, it was considered by participants that forces might be failing to select the right people to supervise, mentor and lead their staff.

3.4.2. Supervisor development

Practitioners wanted a more structured and timely approach to supervisor development. Supervisor and management development was considered to be more focused on leadership – for example, managing change and providing a vision – than on development of the skills needed by supervisors on a day-to-day basis. Development was also considered to be focused on those already in management positions, rather than future supervisors and leaders. Staff talked about the importance of equipping people for supervision before they were appointed. In particular, a number of people talked of increasing numbers of staff in acting or temporary supervision roles who, it was believed, had received no support to step up to this role.

Staff reported on having found themselves in their first supervisory role without having had any training to prepare them. We heard of sergeants who had held acting and substantive sergeant positions for as long as five years before receiving any supervisor or management training. Practitioners talked about the need to develop staff for supervision and leadership almost as soon as they join the police. Supervisors were said to require a wide range of skills, knowledge and experience, and needed to receive quality training and development to equip them for these roles. Without a planned approach to development, supervisors were seen to follow the model they had seen demonstrated by their own line managers or peers, and examples were given of poor practice being replicated.

It was believed that supervisors needed ongoing support to enable them to develop their skills and competence further. Practitioners felt that there were few opportunities to extract supervisors for development, as well as further challenges in applying any learning in a working environment. It was felt that forces needed to consider the long-term benefits of individuals attending training and developing themselves, rather than having a short-term focus on losing them for a limited period of time. Reportedly, supervisor development often appeared to rely on having individual line managers or a local management team who supported and/or provided effective development, rather than there being an organisational approach to support for development. Staff therefore received different levels and types of development support, with the danger that supervisory practices in forces develop organically, rather than necessarily being what the organisation wants or needs.

There was also some feedback that policing needed to move away from the traditional model of relying on learning coming from training courses and instead encourage more independent learning. Staff talked about an organisational culture that does not value learning and development, resulting in colleagues who were not committed to developing themselves.

Practitioners also felt that that good supervision should be recognised and rewarded, and that there should be a mechanism in place for other supervisors to shadow, and learn from, those who are considered to be excelling at the role.

We found a number of positive approaches to supervisory development across forces, which included formal management and leadership programmes, coaching

and mentoring, online resources, masterclasses, day courses, courses aimed at newly appointed leaders, inputs on wellbeing and chief briefings. Generally, these were more available and comprehensive for officers than for staff or specials.

Practitioners suggested that the following might help in addressing some of the issues raised in section 3.4:

- recruitment processes that assess staff against the Competency and Values Framework (CVF)

- using the CVF as a focus for developing products to support supervisors

- adding units into the National Police Promotion Framework work-based portfolio to evidence peer support, wellbeing and supportive supervision

- accredited supervisor programmes

- structured management training

- group training for newly promoted leaders

- mentoring, coaching and face to face support

- shadowing and job swaps

- development time incorporated into shift rotas

- training, guidance and support in emotional intelligence, resilience, trauma, occupational health, handling conflict and performance management

- training and guidance on business skills, such as project management, continuous improvement and personal effectiveness

- step-by-step and 'how to' guides

- interactive learning programmes and online tools

3.5. Support for supervising wellbeing

Supervisors sought support to look after both their own wellbeing and that of their staff. They reflected on the stress of managing both their own and their staff's wellbeing. They also told us that they felt pressure to be seen to work long or late hours if they have career aspirations, and noted the precedent that this might set for their own staff.

There was some feeling that while supervisors were held to account for the wellbeing of their staff, senior leaders paid lip service to providing wellbeing support. Supervisors felt that the impacts of organisational and operational change (for example, changes to shift patterns or single-crewing decisions) on wellbeing often appeared to be disregarded when senior leaders made decisions, with the result that supervisors had to manage the fallout from those decisions. There was also said to be a patchy provision of welfare, occupational health and counselling services and support.

Practitioners suggested that the following might help in addressing some of these issues:

- improved occupational health support

- light-touch tools (such as questions) that would support supervisors in identifying early signs of stress in staff

- senior leader commitment to considering wellbeing impacts in decision making

3.6.   Discretion and decision making

Supervisors wanted to feel more empowered and supported in making decisions. They talked of a culture within forces of checking and micro-management. People felt that their actions and decisions were constantly under scrutiny, resulting in anxiety and fear of being investigated and punished. It was felt that senior leaders should provide the right environment for supervisors at lower levels, rather than micro-manage them. There was a view that supervisors could be more effective by having permission to get on with their job, make decisions and learn from them. However, they often felt unable to use their common sense to make a decision based on the information available, and felt that they would not be supported if they made a mistake in good faith. Staff talked about their perceptions that this culture discouraged creativity and innovation. Conversely, they felt that it also allowed some supervisors to hide behind policies, procedures or protocols.

Some practitioners told us that the culture in their force was changing, with less transactional leadership, less micro-management and less fear of differing from the norm. However, others told us that while this culture had been reducing in the recent past, it was becoming more prevalent again.

3.7. Finding time for supervision

Lack of time was considered to be a key factor in preventing effective supervision. Capacity challenges for supervisors were considered to be high. Supervisors reported experiencing increases in their personal workload, due to both overall reductions in staff and increased team sizes as a result of reductions in numbers of supervisory staff. Practitioners spoke of an environment where operational requirements and a predominantly process and task-driven environment left little time to focus on staff wellbeing and development (see section 3.8). Supervisors wanted time to be with their staff while they were carrying out their work, so they could check in with them, talk about professional development, and see how they were performing individually and as a team.

Supervisors said that they did not have time to engage in effective performance, development and wellbeing reviews with their staff, including the time needed to prepare and reflect afterwards. We also heard that time set aside for staff conversations and development was perceived to be not respected by the organisation, with operational duties taking precedent, even when not urgent. Support for a move to an 'ongoing conversation' approach to supervising staff was tempered by a concern that supervisors would struggle to find the time or opportunities to hold these regular conversations.

We were not able to find any evidence on what constitutes the ideal number of staff for a supervisor. A range of thought pieces and editorials suggested that this was because optimum spans were dependent on many factors, including:

- the size of an organisation

- the nature of an organisation's culture

- the nature of the job to be done

- the skills and competencies of the individual supervisor

- the skills and competencies of the staff to be supervised

- the type of interaction required between supervisors and staff

Practitioners suggested that the following might help in addressing some of these issues:

- dedicated time for staff wellbeing, development and performance built into shifts

- shift systems that maximise time supervisor and staff are on duty together

- time for one-to-ones protected by control rooms (unless emergency callout)

3.8. Organisational processes and consistency of supervision

We heard that some organisational processes were perceived to act as barriers to meaningful supervision of staff. Supervisors felt that the time they had available for the supervision of staff was increasingly used to 'feed an administrative system'. They described 'a burgeoning bureaucracy and drip-drip of computerised tasks', which was increasing the burden on supervisors with the introduction of systems and processes that reduce interaction. Practitioners spoke of needing to supply the requirements of audits, provide information for IT systems, form-filling and administrative tasks. Supervisors reflected on how these process-driven tasks had the power to demand attention, affecting their ability to support and develop staff. However, some supervisors felt that such tasks could act as an excuse for those who did not truly value supporting staff.

Various changes to organisational structures and operational models were also felt to have had an impact on frontline resources. It was felt that problems were sometimes followed by crisis management, with people being moved around teams, roles and areas with perceived detrimental impacts on individuals and their roles, which supervisors were expected to manage.

Practitioners noted the speed at which individuals moved around a force, from one role to another, with the first line supervisor role often being filled on a temporary or acting basis. They talked about the impacts of constant supervisory changes, including opportunities to build rapport, confidence and trust, and the increased likelihood of missing wellbeing or performance concerns (both in the supervisor and supervisee), or of inconsistently managing these issues. Practitioners also talked about inconsistent styles of supervision and decision making that reduced staff's confidence to make decisions.

3.9. Future challenges and opportunities

3.9.1. New technology

New technology was felt to be leading to a reduction in contact between supervisors and staff, although it was also felt to offer opportunities. (NB: this research was carried out prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.) While technology was clearly seen to bring benefits, practitioners raised concerns about the impacts on the role of supervisor, with many feeling that they were increasingly likely to be 'tied to their computer' (see also sections 3.8 and 3.9.2). There were concerns that this was reducing interaction with staff, with supervisors being too busy performing tasks on a computer to spend time with their staff, supporting and developing them.

On the other hand, some staff mentioned how new technology could reduce the gaps between staff and senior leaders, with Twitter cited as a way for leaders to hear much more about what staff were doing at work and vice versa. Technology was also thought to be able to offer opportunities to improve training through, for example, virtual reality or gamification. However, it was felt that there was much for the police service to learn about good practice in this area.

3.9.2. Agile and remote working

Staff reported being increasingly likely to spend more time working away from their colleagues. (NB: as noted above, this research was carried out prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.) It was felt that advancements in technology and social media would allow increased opportunities for remote, agile and flexible working. These opportunities were felt to bring many possible benefits, with the potential to enable staff to work from a range of locations and, for some, at times of their choosing, allowing them to work in a way that suits them best and fits in with their home life. Increased use of mobile technology, single crewing and staff reductions were also likely to mean that frontline staff are less likely to return to their station.

Increased remote working – whether at home, away from the station, or lone working or single crewing – was seen to be resulting in dispersed teams. It was felt that this might result in an increased sense of disconnect within teams and between staff and their supervisor, with staff likely to experience lack of communication with colleagues, loneliness, fears for safety and reduced opportunities for decompression.

Supervisors also talked about the increased potential to miss the early signs of stress or other problems, with less opportunity to notice changes in people's behaviour or for them to open up. Supervisors felt that they had been given little support in understanding how to manage remote teams.

Increased access to laptops and mobile phones was welcomed. However, many felt that work increasingly encroached on home life as a result, with blurred lines between personal and work communications channels, and staff feeling obliged to be contactable when off duty. Supervisors were seen to have a role in making it clear that staff should not be expected to be logging on out of work and/or working excessive hours. However, there were also some strong views that supervisors could not be constantly checking to see if their staff were working excessive hours, and that there needed to be both an organisational approach and expectations around personal responsibility for managing this.

3.9.3. Changing expectations about work

Practitioners felt that compared with the more established workforce, younger staff had higher expectations for their work-life balance and greater awareness of the impacts of working long hours on their wellbeing. Views expressed in relation to this tended to be polarised and emotive, with some seeing a real need for policing to change to provide an improved work-life balance, while others suggested that these expectations were unrealistic and such attitudes needed to change. Supervisors felt that a lack of organisational response to these changing expectations meant that the onus was being placed on them to balance these expectations on an individual, case-by-case basis, with the potential for conflict and people being treated differently across a single force. While supervisors were considered to have a key role to play in dealing with this, there were also strong feelings that there was a need for a consistent organisational approach, rather than individual decision making by supervisors.

There were also some suggestions that the new educational requirements may lead to a shift in expectations of new recruits, in terms of pay, autonomy and responsibilities.

3.9.4. High turnover and recruitment

Practitioners reported concerns that high turnover was leading forces to promote people too early in their service into first line supervisor positions. There was a view that the intention to recruit 20,000 additional police officers may increase the likelihood of this happening.

Concerns about this risk were threefold:

- supervisors were felt to be more likely to lack the skills and confidence needed to manage and support their staff

- staff were likely to have less confidence in their supervisor

- supervisors were themselves likely to require more supervision from their own manager

It was also felt likely that there would be a lack of experienced staff to mentor and coach the number of new recruits, with the increasing requirement for tutor constables likely to be challenging.

Appendix: Sources of evidence

Source	Types of staff or forces	Number of people	Details (including author or facilitator and year)
Survey	Special constables	1,829	Callender M and others. (2018). **National Survey of Special Constables** [internet]. Citizens in Policing; Institute for Public Safety, Crime and Justice. [Accessed 25 March 2021)
Discussion groups	BAME women from all ranks and roles, chief officers, equality and diversity and HR leads from a range of forces	233	College of Policing and National Police Chiefs' Council. (2019). BAME Women in Policing Workshops 2019 Summary, conducted 13 June 2019 to 11 July 2019.
Workshops	Police officers and staff	224	Betts P and Farmer C. (2019). **Home Office Police Front Line Review: Workshops with police officers and police staff** [internet]. Office for National Statistics. [Accessed 25 March 2021]

Source	Types of staff or forces	Number of people	Details (including author or facilitator and year)
Interviews and focus groups	16 chief constables, officers and police staff at constable, sergeant and inspector level	~150	PwC. (2018). College of Policing thematic analysis, conducted 4 March 2018 to 19 March 2018.
Twitter discussion event	Uncertain but included officers and at least one academic	~50	Guideline Development Team. (2019). #WeCops supervision chat, conducted 2 October 2019.
Twitter discussion event	Not known but included police officers	~50	College of Policing. (2018). #WeCops CPD chat, conducted 18 September 2019.
Discussion event and multi-phase prioritisation exercise	Police officers, staff and volunteers from 20 different forces and related organisations: generalist practitioners and HR, change, organisational development and wellbeing leads	35	Guideline Development Team. (2019). Supervision guidelines future look exercise, conducted 26 March 2019 to 22 July 2019.

Source	Types of staff or forces	Number of people	Details (including author or facilitator and year)
Call for practice	Officers and staff from a range of forces	27	Guideline Development Team. (2019). Supervision guidelines call for practice, 17 September 2019 to 4 October 2019.
Engagement event	Various forces and roles	20	College of Policing. (2019). Leadership learning tool kit working group, conducted 10 December 2019.
Interviews	7 officers and staff at sergeant level; 1 each at constable, chief inspector and superintendent level; 1 independent sexual offences adviser; 1 clinical practice expert; 1 leadership expert	13	Guideline Development Team. (2019). Interviews conducted 12 September 2019 to 28 October 2019.
Observation	One force	N/A	Guideline Development Team. (2019). Leadership Development course, conducted 16 October 2019.

Source	Types of staff or forces	Number of people	Details (including author or facilitator and year)
Summary of research evidence	N/A	N/A	Oscar Kilo. (2019). 'Line manager dos and don'ts'. Slides from event conducted on 12 September 2019.
Blog drawing on research	N/A	N/A	Wilkinson D. (2019). **Tensions faced by leaders: The inherent conflict and tension that exist within manager's and leader's roles** [internet]. The Oxford Review. [Accessed 25 March 2021]
Inspection reports	All forces	N/A	HMICFRS. (2020). **PEEL assessment 2018/19** [internet]. [Accessed 25 March 2021]
Management/leadership resource	N/A	N/A	Alston A and Veenman D. (2019). **The little book for the performance conversationalist** [internet]. The Right Conversation. [Accessed 7 April 2021]

Source	Types of staff or forces	Number of people	Details (including author or facilitator and year)
Guidelines	N/A	N/A	The British Psychological Society. (2017). **Practice guidelines** [internet]. 3rd ed. [Accessed 7 April 2021]
Research paper	N/A	N/A	Nielsen K and others. (2016). **Out of sight, out of mind? Research into the occupational safety and health of distributed workers** [internet]. Institution of Occupational Safety and Health. [Accessed 7 April 2021]
Summary of research	N/A	N/A	Kettle M. (2015). **Achieving effective supervision (Insight 30)** [internet]. Iriss. [Accessed 7 April 2021]

Source	Types of staff or forces	Number of people	Details (including author or facilitator and year)
Research report	N/A	N/A	Godden J. (2012). **BASW/CoSW England research on supervision in social work, with particular reference to supervision practice in multi-disciplinary teams** [internet]. British Association of Social Workers. [Accessed 7 April 2021]
Policy and guidelines	N/A	N/A	British Psychological Society. (2003). **Policy guidelines on supervision in the practice of clinical psychology** [internet]. [Accessed 7 April 2021]

About the College

We're the professional body for the police service in England and Wales.

Working together with everyone in policing, we share the skills and knowledge officers and staff need to prevent crime and keep people safe.

We set the standards in policing to build and preserve public trust and we help those in policing develop the expertise needed to meet the demands of today and prepare for the challenges of the future.

college.police.uk