	Level 1: Marginal	Level 2: Reactive	Level 3: Process-focused	Level 4: Proactive	Level 5: Integral
Leadership	▪ The force's improvement vision is not formally articulated. ▪ Improvement activity is typically reactive and dictated by external demands (eg, national policy). ▪ There is high turnover in the senior management team. ▪ Leaders drive improvement from the top, tending to impose solutions that have a track record in other contexts. ▪ Evidence is rarely used in decision making and leaders tend to rely solely on experience to make decisions. ▪ Improvement work is largely project-based and silo working goes unchallenged. ▪ A tendency towards risk aversion means opportunities for staff to innovate are limited. ▪ A blame culture exists.	▪ The improvement vision has started to be developed. ▪ Leaders communicate a need for CI to the organisation and provide some information about the approach. ▪ Staff are occasionally asked to submit ideas for change, but are reluctant to express challenging views. ▪ Leaders aim to support change proposals with evidence, but data gathering and analysis is limited. ▪ New workforce practices are applied without analysis of their impact. ▪ Silo working persists, but collaboration is starting to be explored with some awareness of interdependencies between business units. ▪ Leaders stress the importance of developing staff and a fairer workplace, but practice is inconsistent.	▪ The leadership team has articulated a clear ambition for improvement but there is no long-term strategy. ▪ There is a commitment to evidence-based decision making, but it is inhibited by lack of resources, commitment or understanding. ▪ Across the organisation, there is awareness of CI as part of normal business. ▪ There is general cooperation between units/ departments and examples of joint working. ▪ Leaders are generally supportive. They engage with staff but this is mainly limited to direct reports. ▪ Leaders shield staff from blame, often by avoiding exposure to risk. ▪ Leaders are modestly successful in working to improve development opportunities for all staff and create a fairer workplace.	▪ A clear, long-term strategy is evident, visibly supported by senior management – they 'walk the talk', being visible and engaged. ▪ Evidence-based decision making is considered essential, but there is variation in how effectively it is practised. ▪ Coordinated cross-force projects are common and leaders encourage a CI approach to daily work. ▪ Staff regularly see and communicate with leaders. ▪ Staff are encouraged to share views, but inhibitors to honest and open dialogue with more senior management remain. ▪ Individuals' suggestions are routinely acknowledged. ▪ Staff are trusted to experiment and are not blamed for honest mistakes or unintended outcomes.	▪ There is stable leadership with a clear improvement vision. ▪ Leaders are passionate about CI and show commitment by being highly visible, regularly floor-walking and listening to staff. ▪ Suggestions from staff are routinely sought and acted on. ▪ Evidence is routinely used in decision making and leaders challenge weak analysis. ▪ Leaders are prepared to make radical change or defend the status quo if required. ▪ Improvement activity is continuous (as opposed to project-based), silo thinking is not tolerated. Consistent mechanisms exist to highlight interdependencies. ▪ Leaders motivate staff with many/varied development opportunities. ▪ Fair treatment is embedded.
Engagement	▪ Communication about improvement is top-down and ad hoc. ▪ Staff tend to hear about key changes informally before information is available through official channels. ▪ Little information about improvement is communicated to the workforce, partners and the public. ▪ Opinions of the public, staff, critical friends and external partners are rarely sought and tend to have little or no impact on how improvement is managed. ▪ Customer engagement is minimal and only focuses on pre-existing priorities (rather than identifying issues). ▪ Stakeholders may perceive that change is something done to them, rather than with them.	▪ The force is overly reliant on a limited pool of communication methods (eg, force website, newsletters). ▪ Workforce engagement is sporadic and often takes place when change programmes are already under way, potentially leaving staff feeling powerless to suggest changes. ▪ There is modest recognition of the value of involving the public, partners and critical friends in service design and the force is starting to engage stakeholders in CI projects. ▪ Engagement on CI activity tends to be reactive and inconsistent across the CI process, for example partnership work may only focus on issues or consulting on possible solutions.	▪ There is a clear commitment to workforce engagement. ▪ Staff are informed of the rationale of CI and frequently consulted on their views, although they tend not to have responsibility for leading change. ▪ Staff are engaged with throughout the project and their feedback is listened to and acted on in a structured and formal manner. ▪ Stakeholder networks are in place but focus on the most involved partners rather than hard-to-reach groups. ▪ A range of engagement tools and media are used to engage with key stakeholders. ▪ Benefits achieved through CI are occasionally communicated to stakeholders.	▪ Stakeholder engagement is a routine part of CI. ▪ The accessibility, costs and benefits of different engagement approaches are considered for each project. ▪ Consultation with the workforce and external partners, including the public, is evidenced in all business cases. ▪ Staff participate in shaping the work. ▪ The relative merits of different engagement tools and media are considered in planning future strategies. ▪ The force proactively recruits critical friends to provide insight throughout the process. ▪ Stakeholders are actively involved in identifying priorities and developing solutions, fostering a sense that they have a real say.	▪ Engagement with stakeholders is integral to successful change and occurs through each phase of CI. ▪ The force uses multiple channels to communicate with a diverse audience. ▪ A wide network of critical friends is consulted on force plans and projects. ▪ There is a willingness to act on priority areas identified by the public and key partners. ▪ Approaches to engagement are monitored, with feedback sought and used. ▪ A participatory culture prevails. Senior managers adopt a two-way approach to communication, actively encouraging innovative ideas and empowering staff to implement them wherever possible.
Resourcing and sustainability	▪ Improvement practitioners are expected to fit improvement activity around the 'day job'. ▪ Little investment is made in training or resources and turnover is high. ▪ The lack of adequate support by senior management weakens the reputation of the staff and the work, making it difficult to mount robust challenges to accepted practice. ▪ CI work tends to be task-focused, with no alignment to a longer-term CI strategy. ▪ Analytical skills are not recognised as integral to the success of CI, undermining the team's capability to adopt a rigorous approach. ▪ No formal mechanisms for capturing lessons and sharing knowledge exist. Learning is sporadic at best.	▪ A central CI team has been established but has insufficient time, resources and senior support to effectively plan and undertake activities across the force. ▪ CI is targeted at isolated priority areas and the role of the CI team is not widely understood. ▪ The CI team is starting to build its methods and project skills but has limited support, experience or formal training. ▪ There is a tendency to overlook the benefits of engaging with practitioners from business areas when undertaking CI activities. ▪ Limited attempts are made to gain early support from HR, Unison and the Police Federation to develop sustainable solutions.	▪ An established central CI team develops agreed and consistent ways of working but is potentially under-resourced (often using short secondments). ▪ CI is localised to particular teams or areas in force. ▪ CI projects are structured, planned, realistic, and have the general support of senior officers. ▪ Formal communications exist between the team, HR, finance and estates. ▪ Staff understand the role of the CI team and engage with projects. ▪ Knowledge gained in CI projects is often passed on to others. ▪ The CI team reviews its effectiveness and makes required changes to strategy. ▪ Clarity exists about confidentiality and managing sensitive data.	▪ CI teams are multidisciplinary, drawing together those with a strong analytical background and/or experience of change together with police officers with relevant operational experience. ▪ There are strong, formal links to HR, finance and estates. Senior leaders act as champions for CI work and ensure the importance of CI roles is understood across the force. ▪ The team is establishing a positive reputation, which gives it a stronger mandate to challenge accepted practice. ▪ CI approaches are becoming normal practice in some areas. ▪ Knowledge management and sharing of lessons learnt is starting to become more formalised when time allows.	▪ There is a questioning culture throughout the organisation, with all staff seeing CI as their responsibility. ▪ CI skills are embedded in learning and development at every level, with all staff encouraged to apply those skills. ▪ The core team is highly regarded in the force. ▪ CI expertise is seen as positive evidence for staff seeking promotion – the strongest candidates compete to be part of the core team. ▪ The CI team is seen as a centre of excellence, with lessons/knowledge being captured and shared across the force as a matter of course.
Methodology and rigour	▪ There is pressure to rush problem diagnosis and move to developing solutions to be seen to be 'getting on with it'. ▪ There is little or no resource available to collect new data to identify issues. ▪ Analysts are limited to using existing force data, resulting in frequent use of proxy measures. ▪ Evaluation is rarely carried out. ▪ Senior officers have limited interest or understanding of approaches to measuring benefits and how to challenge data.	▪ Little attempt is made to diagnose problems specific to the force – there is a tendency to apply a generic template that has worked for other forces and push to solution design quite rapidly. ▪ Strong claims are made about potential savings. Working assumptions and estimates are not always presented clearly. ▪ There is pressure to assess impact very soon after implementation and limited attention to sustainability of changes. ▪ There are few formal reinvestment strategies.	▪ There is recognition that multiple sources should be used to identify issues specific to the force where this is proportionate to the issue being explored. ▪ The impact of any change is usually assessed, but practicalities mean that follow-up measures are not always consistent with those used at baseline. ▪ Reasonable time periods are allowed before assessment of impact is made – three or six-month reviews are standard. ▪ Assessments tend to focus on cost savings – the impact on service delivery is not always robustly assessed.	▪ Issues specific to the force are identified using multiple sources proportionate to the issue being explored. ▪ Managers understand that changes need time to embed before impact can be assessed – final assessments might take place 12 months later. ▪ Analysing the impact of changes immediately after they are made will lead to questions about sustainability. ▪ Solutions tend to be rolled out only after some analysis of outcomes and benefits. ▪ The impact of CI on non-financial outcomes (eg, victim satisfaction) is routinely assessed.	▪ A proportionate number of data sources (and engagement strategies) are used to identify specific force issues. ▪ Changes are given enough time to embed before impact is tested. ▪ In some cases, comparison sites are used to allow stronger causal links. ▪ Assessment includes costs and potential impact on other areas. ▪ Clear distinctions are made between types of savings. ▪ Reinvestment strategies are explicit and followed up to ensure delivery.