



*Leadership and Development  
in the Fire and Rescue Service*

---

Summary of responses to the Consultation Paper



*Leadership and Development  
in the Fire and Rescue Service*

Summary of responses to the Consultation Paper

On 5th May 2006 the responsibilities of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) transferred to the Department for Communities and Local Government.

Department for Communities and Local Government  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London  
SW1E 5DU  
Telephone: 020 7944 4400  
Website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

© Crown copyright, 2007

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.*

*This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.*

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at [www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp), or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ. Fax: 01603 723000 or email: [HMSOlicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:HMSOlicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk)

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email [alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

Communities and Local Government Publications  
PO Box 236  
Wetherby  
West Yorkshire  
LS23 7NB  
Tel: 08701 226 236  
Fax: 08701 226 237  
Textphone: 08701 207 405  
Email: [communities@twoten.com](mailto:communities@twoten.com)  
or online via the Communities and Local Government website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

January 2007

Product Code: 06FRSD04311

# Introduction

The consultation paper 'Leadership and Development in the Fire and Rescue Service' was published in December 2005. This document made proposals concerning the introduction of a transformational leadership model and a framework for leadership learning and development in the Fire and Rescue Service. It also proposed a Strategic Leadership Development Programme and a High Potential Management Development scheme.

The Fire and Rescue Service faces current and future challenges, the scale of which demands clear leadership from within. The nature and scope of the fire improvement agenda requires an active and positive response from the Fire and Rescue Service in order to meet the demand for continuous improvement in standards. Historic traditions of strong, command-based models of service leadership are evolving to meet new challenges posed both by the improvement agenda and the increasing expectations of those who use the service. Increasingly flexible and varied working patterns, more diverse communities, an increased range of risks and statutory responsibilities and a growing emphasis on accountability and governance demand competent leaders with a new and flexible blend of skills and experience to get results. It is now widely recognised that achieving these objectives will require a new focus on leadership development.

Since 1999, a sequence of reports and reviews has consistently identified leadership as a critical issue in the changing environment that confronts the service. These are now reflected in the new direction for the service set out by the Government's improvement agenda.

The proposals outlined in this consultation deal with leadership throughout the Fire and Rescue Service. Recommendations are made for a new approach that embraces the long-standing principles of fair and open selection and develops leaders capable of meeting the new challenges for the Fire and Rescue Service. It is intended to complement IPDS and other aspects of the improvement agenda.

A list of individuals and organisations invited to comment on the consultation proposals can be found at Annex A; comments were however welcomed from groups and individuals outside of this initial list and recipients were invited to bring the consultation to the attention of anyone that may have an interest in the documents' proposals and/or a contribution to make.

# Summary of responses to the Consultation Paper

## Leadership and Development in the Fire and Rescue Service

Reference	Comments	The Department's Response														
<p><b>Section 2:</b> The appropriateness of a <b>transformational</b> as opposed to a <b>transactional</b> model of leadership for the modern FRS</p> <p><b>Question 1:</b> <i>Do you agree that a transformational model of leadership is more appropriate than a transactional model for a modern FRS?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>20.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>47.62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>14.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>4.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nil response</td> <td>12.70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>68.25% agree or strongly agree; 4.76% disagree</b></p> <p>Of those comments offered relating to this question (n=92):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 48.91% expressed a preference for a blended approach of transformational and transactional leadership styles depending on the context;</li> <li>• 16.30% indicated that the document provides insufficient detail on transformational and transactional leadership and that a full definition with clarification of terms is required;</li> <li>• 7.61% suggested that it is important for a transformational approach to be embedded at all levels, and driven from the top;</li> <li>• 6.52% emphasised that adopting a transformational approach is linked to culture change, which takes time.</li> </ul>	Response	%	Strongly agree	20.63	Agree	47.62	Neutral	14.29	Disagree	4.76	Strongly disagree	0.00	Nil response	12.70	<p>That over two-thirds of respondents agree or strongly agree with the view that a transformational model of leadership for the modern FRS is more appropriate than a transactional one is seen as justifying the proposals contained in this section of the consultation document. The pattern of responses can be seen to emphasise the view that staff are best motivated by allowing and encouraging them to take on "<i>more challenging and interesting work...</i>". It is recognised, however, that the 16.3% of respondents who indicated that there was a need for more detail on the transactional and transformational models suggest that the conceptual underpinning of the two models require further clarification – and this will have to be addressed in the future.</p>
Response	%															
Strongly agree	20.63															
Agree	47.62															
Neutral	14.29															
Disagree	4.76															
Strongly disagree	0.00															
Nil response	12.70															

*Continued*

Reference	Comments	The Department's Response																					
<p><b>Section 2:</b> Leadership contexts.</p> <p><b>Question 2a:</b> <i>Do you agree with the three leadership contexts?</i></p> <p><b>Question 2b:</b> <i>Are there any others that need to be included?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Context</th> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Critical Incident Management</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>3.13</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Local Leadership</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>3.13</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Team Leadership</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>3.13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No direct response</td> <td></td> <td>21.88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>For each of the proposed contexts, 75% of respondents agree; 3.13% disagree</b></p> <p>Comments relating to Q2a and Q2b were intermingled and are therefore presented together for clarity.</p> <p>Consideration of the proposed contexts attracted a significant level of comment, particularly in relation to the "Operational" context. Of those comments offered relating to these questions (n=127):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was broad agreement on the proposed contexts.</li> <li>• 15.75% commented that the titles need to be consistent and align with NOS; in a leadership model it is appropriate that each of these contexts incorporates the term "leadership" rather than "management"</li> <li>• 15.75% expressed concern relating to direct entry and operational command with the view that external entrants should not be artificially barred, but a specific development framework was required for such entrants to ensure that safe systems of work were maintained. Due regard needs to be given to overall resilience and capacity, enabling external entrants whilst maintaining operational competence. Consideration should be given as to whether the Strategic level ADC should be accessed by external candidates.</li> <li>• 11.02% preferred the term "critical incident leadership". Critical Incident is considered a specialist leadership area with specific legal, social, financial and political implications;</li> <li>• 12.60% suggested that the term "community leadership" was more appropriate than "local leadership" to emphasise the key role in local community and partnership working (and to reflect the role of members);</li> <li>• 11.02% felt that "corporate", "organisational" or "service" leadership was more meaningful than "team" and more appropriately reflected the corporate responsibility which all employees share. Team leadership is relevant at all levels of the service, including strategic. Respondents recognise that supervisory managers have a key role to play in facilitating change;</li> <li>• 7.87% expressed a desire to see the interface between the three contexts reflected in the document;</li> <li>• 6.30% suggested that other elements of leadership relating to self, ethical and moral leadership should be explicit in the model;</li> <li>• 3.94% indicated that "risk management" was an important element.</li> </ul>	Context	Response	%	Critical Incident Management	Yes	75	No	3.13	Local Leadership	Yes	75	No	3.13	Team Leadership	Yes	75	No	3.13	No direct response		21.88	<p>The pattern and range of responses here indicate clearly that the proposed three leadership contexts (critical incident management, the FRS as a local government service, and the team as the predominant mode of service delivery) have very significant support amongst respondents. Since the three leadership contexts are a critical element within the consultation document, this endorsement by respondents is seen as both encouraging and valuable.</p> <p>However, due attention must be given to the views of those respondents (15.75%) who commented that titles used need to relate to those used in National Occupational Standards terminology.</p>
Context	Response	%																					
Critical Incident Management	Yes	75																					
	No	3.13																					
Local Leadership	Yes	75																					
	No	3.13																					
Team Leadership	Yes	75																					
	No	3.13																					
No direct response		21.88																					

*Continued*

Reference	Comments	The Department's Response														
<p><b>Section 2:</b> The primary focus of the leadership model</p> <p><b>Question 3:</b> <i>Do you agree that the primary focus of the leadership model should be behaviourally based?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>33.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>44.44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>4.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1.59</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nil response</td> <td>15.87</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>77.77% agree or strongly agree; 1.59% disagree</b></p> <p>There was clear agreement with the notion of a behavioural base to the leadership model.</p> <p>Of those comments offered in relation to this question (n=41), 60.98% emphasised the importance of linking this with core values, PQAs and ADCs. Importance was also attached to the need to ensure that these and the role maps are "future proof".</p>	Response	%	Strongly agree	33.33	Agree	44.44	Neutral	4.76	Disagree	1.59	Strongly disagree	0.00	Nil response	15.87	<p>There exists strong support for a behaviourally-based leadership model. This will allow emphasis to be placed on developing FRS leaders capable of exercising behaviours likely to enable change and succeed in the context of a wider agenda for modernising the service, broadening its culture and creating greater flexibility and innovation in service delivery.</p>
Response	%															
Strongly agree	33.33															
Agree	44.44															
Neutral	4.76															
Disagree	1.59															
Strongly disagree	0.00															
Nil response	15.87															
<p><b>Section 4:</b> Strategic Leadership Development in the FRS</p> <p><b>Question 4:</b> <i>Do you support the principles of the Executive Leadership Development Programme outlined above?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>16.39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>55.74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>13.11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>3.28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nil response</td> <td>11.48</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>72.13% agree or strongly agree; 3.28% strongly disagree</b></p> <p>Of the comments offered in relation to this question (n= 78):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 33.33% emphasised the importance of adopting a partnership approach, working with other providers to avoid duplication of effort;</li> <li>• 15.38% raised questions as to how it would be accessed, emphasising the need for an independent objective assessment process and integration with ADCs and IPDS;</li> <li>• 12.82% requested more detail on various aspects of the programme;</li> <li>• 11.54% expressed concern that the Brigade Manager Role Map had still not been agreed/adopted and indicated that this should form the foundation for development programmes at this level.</li> </ul>	Response	%	Strongly agree	16.39	Agree	55.74	Neutral	13.11	Disagree	0.00	Strongly disagree	3.28	Nil response	11.48	<p>The Department welcomes the support for the principles underpinning, and approaches towards Strategic Leadership Development. It recognises the need to promote programmes that both encourage appropriate partnerships and incorporate developmental programmes for individuals that do not require the duplication of effort or previous learning.</p> <p>The Department will work to gain agreement of the Brigade Manager Role Map in order for it to be incorporated into the Executive Leadership Development Programme.</p>
Response	%															
Strongly agree	16.39															
Agree	55.74															
Neutral	13.11															
Disagree	0.00															
Strongly disagree	3.28															
Nil response	11.48															

*Continued*

Reference	Comments	The Department's Response														
<p><b>Section 4:</b> Strategic Leadership Development in the FRS</p> <p><b>Question 5:</b> <i>Do you agree with the proposal to set up a Professional Reference Group for FRS Strategic Leadership Development?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>22.22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>38.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>14.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>6.35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>3.17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nil response</td> <td>15.87</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>60.32% agree or strongly agree; 9.52% disagree or strongly disagree</b></p> <p>Of the comments offered in relation to this question (n=76):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>30.26% expressed support for the composition/representation of the group to extend beyond the FRS to include IOD, ILM, private and voluntary sectors, education and skills, management and leadership, military, community government, HR, training and development managers, elected members. They also questioned why the group should include FSC, SFSC and Communities and Local Government.</li> <li>25% indicated that more detailed information regarding the specific terms of reference of such a group was considered necessary, along with coherence with ADCs, IPDS and the Communities and Local Government/EO Pay and Workforce Strategy.</li> </ul>	Response	%	Strongly agree	22.22	Agree	38.10	Neutral	14.29	Disagree	6.35	Strongly disagree	3.17	Nil response	15.87	<p>The encouraging support for a Professional Reference Group for FRS Strategic Leadership Development is welcome. However, in light of the comments made in relation to this proposal, the Department accepts the need to consider extending representation of the Professional Reference Group. It will also define more precisely its terms of reference and levels of authority.</p>
Response	%															
Strongly agree	22.22															
Agree	38.10															
Neutral	14.29															
Disagree	6.35															
Strongly disagree	3.17															
Nil response	15.87															
<p><b>Section 4:</b> Strategic Leadership Development in the FRS</p> <p><b>Question 6:</b> <i>Do you support the approach outlined for chief officer/chief executive development?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>19.05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>44.44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>14.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>4.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>4.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nil response</td> <td>12.70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>63.49% agree or strongly agree; 9.52% disagree or strongly disagree</b></p> <p>Of the comments offered in relation to this question (n=55):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20% indicated that it was important for it to embrace the ethos of IPDS and link coherently to role maps and NOS;</li> <li>16.36% considered that a partnership/multi-agency approach with other providers and institutions was important and that members should be incorporated;</li> <li>9.09% felt it appropriate for CFO/CEO CPD to be extended to all principal officers.</li> </ul>	Response	%	Strongly agree	19.05	Agree	44.44	Neutral	14.29	Disagree	4.76	Strongly disagree	4.76	Nil response	12.70	<p>The Department will continue to promote the Centre for Leadership at the Fire Service College in developing and managing the Chief Officers' and Chief Executives' Development Programme. The outline programme already responds to many of the issues and ideas raised in the comments made. Particularly significant is the use of partnerships with other providers and multi-agency approaches. The programme will link specifically to role maps and NOS.</p>
Response	%															
Strongly agree	19.05															
Agree	44.44															
Neutral	14.29															
Disagree	4.76															
Strongly disagree	4.76															
Nil response	12.70															

*Continued*

Reference	Comments	The Department's Response										
<p><b>Section 5:</b> High Potential Management Development Scheme</p> <p><b>Question 7:</b> <i>Do you think that the management of the HPMD scheme should be approached:</i> a) regionally or b) nationally?</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Regionally</td> <td>29.41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nationally</td> <td>43.14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Both</td> <td>21.57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neither</td> <td>5.88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>43.14% prefer a national approach; 29.41% a regional approach</b></p> <p>Of those comments offered in relation to this question (n=78):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>35.90% questioned the need for such a scheme. It was suggested that, where IPDS is fully embedded, it is already possible to identify and fast track those with high potential;</li> <li>Notwithstanding this, should the scheme go ahead, there was a preference for a nationally overseen scheme with either regional (17.95%) or local (10.26%) management;</li> <li>There was strong support from CFOA for a HPMD scheme.</li> </ul>	Response	%	Regionally	29.41	Nationally	43.14	Both	21.57	Neither	5.88	<p>The Department recognises that respondents to this question did not provide the same level of polarity as they had with other questions. The Department also accepts that many of the comments made indicated uncertainty and doubt in two main areas: First, that the consultation document contained insufficient detail about the proposed organisational and structural arrangements for delivering the scheme at a regional level; second, that concern was expressed by some as to whether the HPMD Scheme was really needed.</p>
Response	%											
Regionally	29.41											
Nationally	43.14											
Both	21.57											
Neither	5.88											
<p><b>Section 5:</b> High Potential Management Development Scheme</p> <p><b>Question 8a:</b> <i>Do you agree with the concept of Regional Scheme Managers for HPMD?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>38.71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>38.71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No particular option expressed</td> <td>22.58</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Where an opinion was expressed, there was an even split for and against the concept of RSM.</b></p> <p>Of those comments offered in relation to this question (n=28):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21.43% indicated that there was no spare capacity or resource for the RSM role and suggested that, if the scheme were to succeed, a dedicated resource would be needed to make it work.</li> </ul> <p>Other comments were more wide ranging, and included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The suggestion that the RSM role constitutes a new burden;</li> <li>Cognisance needed of requirement for RMBs to undertake training review by March 2007;</li> <li>Consideration needed of the arrangements already in place, e.g. W. Midlands commented that all of their regional work is managed and co-ordinated by an HR project board;</li> <li>Question raised as to how this would work in Wales.</li> </ul>	Response	%	Yes	38.71	No	38.71	No particular option expressed	22.58	<p>The Department recognises that respondents are evenly split as to whether or not they support the idea of Regional Scheme Managers. The comments expressing doubt about the role and function of using RSMs, and the associated cost, have been noted.</p> <p>The Department accepts that the concept of Regional Scheme Managers for HPMD needs further debate and refinement.</p>		
Response	%											
Yes	38.71											
No	38.71											
No particular option expressed	22.58											

*Continued*

Reference	Comments	The Department's Response														
<p><b>Section 5:</b> High Potential Management Development Scheme</p> <p><b>Question 8b:</b> <i>If yes to Q. 8a, how should they be employed?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Nationally</td> <td>31.11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RMB</td> <td>26.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lead Fire Authority</td> <td>13.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Individual Fire Authority</td> <td>4.44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regard to co-ordination through the RMBs, the geographic spread of the region was referred to for both the SERMB and SWRMB and concern was expressed as to whether a regional approach was the best option for such large areas.</li> </ul>	Response	%	Nationally	31.11	RMB	26.67	Lead Fire Authority	13.33	Individual Fire Authority	4.44	<p>The Department will need to ensure that those RMBs that cover large geographic areas have in place sufficiently robust organisational processes so that the concerns that many respondents expressed about operational feasibility and effectiveness over such large areas are addressed.</p>				
Response	%															
Nationally	31.11															
RMB	26.67															
Lead Fire Authority	13.33															
Individual Fire Authority	4.44															
<p><b>Section 5:</b> High Potential Management Development Scheme</p> <p><b>Question 9:</b> <i>Do you agree that there should be no requirement for formal educational or other qualifications for entry to the HPMD scheme?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>12.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>22.22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>17.46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>19.05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>9.52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nil response</td> <td>19.05</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>34.92% agree or strongly agree; 28.57% disagree or strongly disagree</b></p> <p>Of the comments offered in relation to this question (n=53), a range of opinions was offered on entry qualifications, with no clear consensus being reached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>33.96% considered that a robust assessment and selection mechanism was more important than formal qualifications and that it was considered essential that entrants had the relevant key skills to benefit from the intense development that such a scheme would incorporate. Concerns were expressed regarding the contradictions inherent in a 'no qualifications required' approach compared with the government's policy of encouraging greater participation in HE and an increasing qualifications profile;</li> <li>Concerns were also raised about the cost/resource implications of sifting applications and investing in basic education, when savings could be made by raising standards for entry;</li> </ul>	Response	%	Strongly agree	12.7	Agree	22.22	Neutral	17.46	Disagree	19.05	Strongly disagree	9.52	Nil response	19.05	<p>Whilst no consensus was reached regarding the issue of formal educational or other qualifications as a condition for entry to the HPMD scheme, it is clear from the individual comments made that there could be a case for examining whether a dual approach might be appropriate. This would require that external applicants to the HPMD Scheme would require formal educational or other qualifications whilst applicants from within the FRS would not.</p>
Response	%															
Strongly agree	12.7															
Agree	22.22															
Neutral	17.46															
Disagree	19.05															
Strongly disagree	9.52															
Nil response	19.05															
<p><b>Section 5:</b> High Potential Management Development Scheme</p> <p><b>Question 10:</b> <i>Is it reasonable to expect a scheme member to reach middle manager level in 5 years?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>49.21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>14.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nil response</td> <td>36.51</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There was general agreement that it was perfectly possible for middle manager level to be attained within 5 years, depending on resources being available to provide the relevant development opportunities and practical/operational experience (including in a risk-critical environment).</p> <p>It was suggested that 5 years was appropriate as a benchmark, but that a rigid timetable was inconsistent with the ethos of IPDS.</p>	Response	%	Yes	49.21	No	14.29	Nil response	36.51	<p>The Department welcomes this trend of responses since it indicates a willingness to accept that it is quite reasonable for career paths in the FRS to be quicker than has traditionally been the case. Particularly encouraging is the idea of a five-year benchmark rather than a rigid five-year deadline.</p>						
Response	%															
Yes	49.21															
No	14.29															
Nil response	36.51															

*Continued*

Reference	Comments	The Department's Response														
<p><b>Section 5:</b> High Potential Management Development Scheme</p> <p><b>Question 11:</b> <i>Do you agree that HPMD members should work towards an appropriate qualification as part of the scheme?</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>40.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>33.87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>4.84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1.61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>3.23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nil response</td> <td>16.13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>74.19% agree or strongly agree; 4.84% disagree or strongly disagree</b></p> <p>There was broad agreement that participants should work towards an appropriate qualification.</p> <p>Of the comments offered in relation to this question (n=52):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 53.85% emphasised that such qualifications need to be relevant to the role and not mandatory (9%).</li> <li>• 15.38% expressed concern that the pursuit of qualifications may distort a competence-based approach, indicating that competence is the key criteria.</li> </ul>	Response	%	Strongly agree	40.32	Agree	33.87	Neutral	4.84	Disagree	1.61	Strongly disagree	3.23	Nil response	16.13	<p>The Department endorses the general pattern of responses indicating that HPMD Scheme participants should work towards an appropriate qualification. This view reflects national training and educational trends that incorporate life-long learning, work-based learning, embedded learning and so on. Attaining recognised qualifications will enable senior managers in the FRS to maintain equivalence with other leaders in the public sector with regard to their development.</p>
Response	%															
Strongly agree	40.32															
Agree	33.87															
Neutral	4.84															
Disagree	1.61															
Strongly disagree	3.23															
Nil response	16.13															
<p><b>Section 6:</b> Investment in Leadership Development</p> <p><b>Question 12:</b> <i>We would welcome your views on the extent to which the proposals can be accommodated by a redirection of current training and development programmes and through efficiencies, such as greater regional co-ordination.</i></p>	<p>Of the comments offered in relation to this question (n=91), appreciation was expressed for the Government's willingness to discuss the most appropriate way of supporting leadership development. However, concern was expressed relating to the funding of the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 19.78% expressed concern about the resource and cost implications of the modernization agenda for the regions and/or FRSs; there were pressures on FRSs to make efficiencies relating to Gershon. Also the funding of IPDS implementation, firefighter selections tests and ADCs was placing a burden on already stretched resources. Any funding mechanism adopted needed to ensure that employees of smaller FRSs were not disadvantaged;</li> <li>• 13.19% indicated that the proposals needed central funding/set-up investment;</li> <li>• 10.99% felt that insufficient detail had been provided regarding funding;</li> <li>• 9.89% suggested that the proposals would be difficult to fund through further efficiencies;</li> <li>• 4.40% suggested that a Regulatory Impact Assessment was needed;</li> <li>• Respondents suggested that funding previously allocated to EI process (selection for BCC) and funding for previous strategic level programmes should be redirected to new initiatives.</li> </ul> <p>Other comments offered here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14.29% indicated that the ability to adopt a partnership provider approach with regional collaboration would be beneficial;</li> </ul>	<p>The Department notes the significant number of comments expressing concern over different funding issues. It recognises that secure and transparent financial models must accompany the development and implementation of training and development programmes as outlined in the consultation document. Such models will be a part of all development proposals – whether new or enhancements of existing schemes, national or regional, or delivered independently or in collaboration with others.</p>														

*Continued*

Reference	Comments	The Department's Response
<p><b>Question 13:</b> <i>Any additional comments</i></p>	<p><b>122 additional comments were offered. Of these:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22.95% sought clarification of the role of the Centre for Excellence/Centre for Leadership/the Fire Service College;</li> <li>• 18.03% welcomed the opportunity to comment on the proposals and were broadly supportive;</li> <li>• 14.75% expressed concern that there was insufficient consideration of the development of elected members within the proposals;</li> <li>• 5.74% emphasised the importance of linking development occurring as a result of these proposals with the outcomes of the RMB training review concluding in 2007.</li> </ul>	<p>There is Ministerial support for the principle of establishing a Centre of Excellence for the FRS. Communities and Local Government is working with CFOA, LGA and FSC to develop outline proposals for a new organisation that will benefit the FRS by supporting effectiveness and efficiency in delivery, building capacity and strengthening leadership at all levels. This is an opportunity not only to improve the delivery of services and improve products but also a very real opportunity for the FRS to play a central role in influencing the direction of the FRS as a whole. A Centre of Excellence will only be established and succeed if it has the support of the FRS.</p> <p>There will be a formal consultation in February 2007, which will include proposed options for the scope of the CoE, functions, status and governance, location and how it will be funded. The outcomes of the consultation will help to inform the development of detailed proposals for the creation of the Centre of Excellence. Our goal is to announce a decision in principle on whether to proceed following the outcome of the Spending Review in July 2007.</p> <p>The National FRS Learning and Development Strategy for England introduced the concept of a Centre for Leadership and this has now been established under the guidance of a Project Board which includes CFOA and LGA representation. The Centre for Leadership will promote and support both performance improvement and transformation to help the fire and rescue service ensure that it has sufficient leaders at all levels – uniformed and non-uniformed staff – with the right skills and attributes to tackle the challenges ahead.</p>

# Annex A

List of individuals and organisations invited to comment on the consultation document

Adult Learning Inspectorate  
Audit Commission  
Association of Principal Fire Officers  
Black and Ethnic Minority Members (FBU)  
Cabinet Office Chief Fire Officers  
Chief Fire Officers' Association (CFOA)  
Chief Executive, County Councils  
Clerk to the Combined Fire and Rescue Authorities  
Commission for Racial Equality (CRE)  
Convention of Scottish Local Authorities  
Department for Education and Skills (DfES)  
Department of Health, Social Services, Public Safety, Northern Ireland  
Disability Rights Commission  
Edexcel  
Emergency Planning College  
Employers' Organisation for Local Government  
Equal Opportunities Commission  
Fire Brigades Union (FBU)  
Fire Industry Council  
Fire Officers' Association (FOA)  
Fire, Rescue And Safety Vocational Standards Group (FRSVSG)  
Fire Service College (FSC)  
Fire Service Examinations Board  
General Municipal Boilermakers Union (GMB)  
Government Offices (Business Change Managers)  
HM Treasury  
Heads of Human Resources in Fire and Rescue Authorities  
Health & Safety Executive  
Home Office  
HR Practitioners Forum  
Institute of Fire Engineers  
Integrated Personal Development System (IPDS) Project Board (Communities and Local Government)  
IPDS Co-ordinators  
Learning and Skills Council  
Local Government Association (LGA)  
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority  
National Assembly for Wales  
National Association of Fire Officers  
National Joint Council for Local Authorities' Fire Brigades  
Networking Women in the Fire Service  
Northern Ireland Office

Practitioners' Forum  
Qualifications and Curriculum Authority  
Chairs of Regional Management Boards  
Retained Firefighters Union (RFU)  
Scottish Executive Justice Department  
Scottish Fire Service Inspectorate  
Scottish Fire Services College  
Scottish Qualifications Authority  
Sector Skills Development Agency  
UNISON