

# A national special branch police command management essay

[Business](#), [Management](#)



Command1 is a National Special Branch Police Command made up informally of three Units that deal with issues of national security impacting the UK and wider international world. It lacked structure, systems and shared values. Although informally joined together the Units didn't operate together in a common direction. In October 2006 its management agreed for a review to merge the Units. However, ongoing competition, trust and integrity issues and weak leadership hindered its progress. On delivery a management dilemma caused its leader to abandon the reviews recommendations at the detriment of the entire Command. This will be critically analysed using a number of business models to help evaluate the management challenge and the decisions made by the management.

## **2. Introduction**

### **The Objective**

This assignment will review and critically analyse a management challenge which the author was part of. The challenge will be described in enough detail to allow the reader to understand the journey of dilemmas and decisions the management took. The organisation and challenges will be critically analysed to understand and evaluate the reasons the challenge was managed the way it was.

### **The Business**

This assignment is written about a specialist Special Branch Police Command (Command1) with three Units (Unit1, Unit 2 and Unit3) that deal with issues of national security impacting the UK nationally and wider international world. The business is reducing that threat using intelligence. The Units

within Command1 were formed at different times with different structures, cultures and in different locations. With 100 staff and an operating budget of approximately £12 million, Command1's business involves collecting and developing intelligence. Being intelligence driven and working within a rapidly changing picture of the UK and world political affairs the workload not only changes quickly and unpredictably but also develops rapidly into new subject areas.

## **Methodology**

A data collection phase was largely facilitated by the fact that the author was one of the seven members of the Executive Management Team (EMT) involved in this management challenge. Five of the EMT members were informally interviewed for their reflections. Within this report the seven EMT members are referred to as EMT1 to EMT7. Due to the nature of policing, detailed decision making processes and meeting minutes were recorded at the time and available to the author. All of the data available was critically analysed using a number of business models to help evaluate the challenge and the decisions made by the management.

## **The Challenge**

In October 2006 the governance of the three Units was passed nationally, creating Command1 managed by an Assistant Chief Constable (EMT1). Staff and management relationships across Command1 were historically exceptionally poor. Competition was widespread and not helped by the Unit's different locations. In November 2006 a four month 'light touch' review was carried out with the aim of merging the three Units in to one Unit, with one

name and same terms of conditions for staff. The 100 staff and stakeholders were consulted and in the most part change was supported and expected. A paper was delivered late with 61 recommendations in August 2007.

On delivery EMT1 chose not to implement the recommendations and ignore them. This was mainly to do with a dilemma involving the risk of skilled staff leaving the organisation if their Unit had to move to London. There were also personality issues between the reviewer and management. The management challenge was whether to implement or not to implement the review, the reasons why and the impact to Command1.

### **3. Managing the Challenge**

#### **Historical Background**

To fully understand the management challenge, it's important to briefly analyse and understand a complex historical background. The policing of this subject historically was covered by local force Special Branches. In 1999 the threat increased significantly following a number of major incidents. Unit1 was setup by the UK Government (UKPLC) with governance by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). In 2004 the threat increased again and a National Coordinator EMT1 with a deputy EMT2 was asked to manage the threat for UKPLC. Although EMT1 managed the threat, he didn't manage Unit1 which caused constant power struggles. EMT1 personally found it impossible to deal with Unit1 due to its archaic secretive nature and a personality clash with its head at the time: EMT8, who felt threatened by a takeover (EMT1, 2010 pers comm., 7 July). Rather than deal with the issues, EMT1 chose in 2004 to setup two additional Units; Unit2 to coordinate

operations and Unit3 to liaise with industry, both functions already done by Unit1. Quickly Unit2 and Unit3 started to encroach on Unit1s' business. In 2005 a number of major incidents occurred exposing failings within Command1. In January 2006 EMT8 was removed and EMT3/4/5 were brought in. In October 2006 all three Units came under the direct control of EMT1 informally forming Command1. However the Units acted independently with seven senior managers sitting on the EMT. Shown below:

## **Command1 structure (October 2006) - Figure 1**

**Head of Command1 – EMT1**

**Deputy Head of Command1 – EMT2**

**(Headed review)**

**Unit1**

**Intelligence**

**Central HR and Finance/Resources covering Command1 and 15 other Units**

**Unit2**

**Operations**

**Unit3**

**Liaison**

**Head of Unit2**

**EMT6**

**Deputy of Unit 1 Intelligence – EMT5**

**Deputy of Unit 1 Operations – EMT4**

**Head of Unit 1 – EMT3**

**Head of Unit3**

**EMT7**

**Historical Legacies**

Legacies were behind a number of issues: EMT1 and EMT2 worked together for 25 years. Unit2 and Unit3 were created because EMT1 didn't deal with

issues in Unit1EMT6 used to be the deputy of Unit1 in 2001 to 2004 but was asked to leave. When EMT3/4/5 started in the organisation they felt unsupported by EMT1/2.

## **The Review**

In November 2006 the EMT agreed for a review to align the Units. This 'light touch' review carried out by EMT2 consisted of three phases (EMT1, 2006): Data collection Staff interviews Stakeholder consultation All staff were interviewed in focus groups. Staff commented that they were quizzed about EMT member's abilities (Staff1, 2010 pers comm., 2 Aug) and the style of questioning felt aggressive and intrusive. Only EMT1/3/7 were interviewed. The EMT was not consulted on progress until the review was published in August 2007 with 61 recommendations.

## **Management approach**

The November 2006 EMT meeting was vibrant with all members agreeing that change and a merger was needed. Management instructed staff to embrace the review. However it quickly became apparent that EMT2 was delving deeper than a 'light touch' review. EMT members started to raise questions about the depth of detail as well as the motives of EMT2 (EMT4, 2010 pers comm., 8 July, EMT6, 2010 pers comm., 20 July). EMT2 was two years away from retirement and members felt he was positioning Command1 to help industry for personal gain post retirement. Questioned a number of times EMT2 refused to let anyone know the progress including EMT1. In March 2007 Unit1's EMT members met with EMT1 to challenge the validity of the review and EMT2 motives. This period of uncertainty seemed

to act as an accelerant for further problems and tensions between Units. By April 2007 there was a breakdown in communications from the EMT of Unit1 and the rest of Command1. EMT3 felt threatened and believed that Unit1's worldwide reputation was in jeopardy. EMT3 started questioning EMT1's leadership ability by lobbying other senior police officers for their support. Whilst EMT7 raised concerns from their staff that a merger would result in staff leaving and not moving to London. The review was delivered late in August 2007 with 61 recommendations summarised below (EMT2, 2007):

Merge the Units and move them to one London location  
Create a new brand/name  
Move Unit3 from out of London into this centralised location  
Disband sections of Unit1 and change reduce their remit  
Expand the remit of the Unit2  
EMT1 requested feedback on the recommendations via a traffic light system if they:

- Green – accepted the recommendation
- Amber – Required further consultation
- Red – Couldn't support the recommendation

In September 2007 Unit2 and Unit3 wrote one side reports. Unit1 wrote a thirty-page in-depth report significantly challenging the recommendations and review. The chart below shows the feedback results and level of disagreement from Unit1.

## **Feedback results – Figure 2**

### **4. Critical analysis**

To help understand the management challenge it is important to critically analyse the organisations and approach.



## Organisational Analysis

It's important to understand the business of Command1 (Long, 2006). The business is using intelligence to reduce the threat against national security. This is difficult and sensitive to police as well as being high profile with significant political pressures. Unit1 had a first-rate reputation for dealing with this issue across policing and Government both in the UK and worldwide. Instead of using traditional intelligence and information sources, Unit1's strength was collecting wider datasets of intelligence and analytically synthesizing them into a more holistic view of the subject. Unit2 and Unit3 had an insular approach to the subject as well as poor reputations in policing and across government. These differences are listed below:

### Comparison between Units - Table 1

#### Unit1

#### Unit2

#### Unit3

Well known brand	Good reputation	London location	70 Staff	Motivated staff
Unique established role	2 funding streams (A & B)	Poor brand reputation	London location	15 Staff
High turnover of staff	Hasn't found its niche	1 funding streams (B)	Better terms and conditions	Reasonable brand reputation
100 miles out of London	15 Staff	De-motivated staff	Niche role seen as luxury	1 funding streams (C)

## **Critical Positions**

Being a public sector organisation setup to deal with a problem nationally, Command1 was in a unique role, with no external competition. Using Porter's 5 forces analysis[1] to review market position, with the additional forces of Government and Public views (Gordon, 1997), identifies that Command1's position was pretty stable. The Public and Government do show strong force on the business and have to be managed.

## **Porters Forces – Figure 3**

### **New Entrants –LOW**

Unlikely as customers and UKPLC are happy Majority of business can't legally be done by private sector

### **Industry Rivalry – LOW**

Unique subject Worldwide best practise No competition

### **Suppliers – LOW**

Rely on many sources for information and Intelligence Experienced at managing information flows

### **Substitutes – LOW**

No competition Could theoretically be dissolved to local police forces Private sector could do some part

### **Buyer – MEDIUM**

Customer driven work Customers can be needy Customers soon to criticise if intelligence is wrong Competition for budgets

## **Public Views – MEDIUM**

Strong Public opinions  
Public and media Pressure

## **Government Views – HIGH**

Direct impact on business  
Push and pull from government agendas  
Adopted from Long (2006) and Gordon (1997)

## **Stakeholder Analysis**

Command1 has a wide range of stakeholders. Unit1 has good stakeholder relations across Government and Policing worldwide, Unit2 generally has poor relations, where as Unit3 has good industry relations. The table below analyses the stakeholder's interests.

## **Stakeholder analysis – Table 2**

### **Stakeholder**

### **Type**

### **Interests**

### **Stakeholders (Government)**

External  
Organisation Stability  
Keep reputation  
Fulfil role of policing subject nationally

### **Shareholders (Police)**

External  
Organisation Stability  
Keep reputation  
Fulfil role of policing subject nationally  
Provide a professional service

## **Customers**

External Organisation Stability Keep reputation Quality and quantity of service Meet deadlines

## **Staff**

Internal Organisation stability Good salaries and benefits Good working environment Developing knowhow and experience Continued professional development

## **Industry**

External Organisation Stability Quality service Good relationship Meet deadlines Keep reputation

## **Criminal element**

External Facilitate lawful activity Police lawfully Police ethically Respect Human Rights Adopted from Long (2006)

## **Macro-environmental Factors**

Using an adapted PESTELO analysis, to include geographical issues, the following table reviews the PESTELGO Macro-environmental factors Command 1 has to take into consideration.

## **PESTELGO analysis – Table 3**

### **Political**

UK and World politics drives business Political agendas push and pull business Reports to a ministerial committee Good reputation across

government. Increased media attention and pressure following a number of front page newspaper stories identify Command1 to the public.

## **Economic**

Crime is costly to police Established budget streams and healthy reserve Historically no issues in overspending" Political friends" to protect from budget cuts

## **Social**

Policing area has major social impact on UK Small minority of public oppose policing of this subject External reputation for looking after staff (Unit1) Staff choose to apply for secondments to Units

## **Technological**

Main IT database not fit for purpose Technologically dependent Not technologically advanced on a worldwide stage

## **Environmental**

Environmental policy in place Attempts at ethical policing of subject

## **Legal**

High levels of legal compliance All three Units legally report to different authorities

## **Geographical**

Three Units, three sites Unit3 is 100miles out of London Operate worldwide 70% of staff commute weekly from around the UK

## Organisational

Significant levels of physical risk to some staff Staff view it as a privilege to work nationally

## Conclusions

Politically driven subject area Budgets for this subject area are political protected Poor use of technology Sensitive subject to police Adopted from Long (2006)

## Organisational Culture and Values

Culture gives an organisation its identity, both to its staff and to stakeholders (Miller, 1993) whilst values are the spine of the company and are fundamental to its philosophy and operations (Levy, 2005). Command1 has very traditional policing values seen in western organisations (Thompson, 2006). Command1 and Unit1 have clear mission statements which include Mission, Vision and Values. Command1's mission statement was simple; To reduce the threat from the crime type within the UK. Although there were complex action plans, these were not publicised to the staff. Add the constant competition between Units and it's clear that a systems thinking approach to working together to a common goal was not entirely in place (Paskins, 2006). One of the recommendations was to amalgamate visions, however for this to work and to establish, it would need to be joined up focusing on the aims of all the business across the Units. Policing is often seen as a club or family, as well as a career for life. In the London Units, 70% of staff commuted weekly from around the UK and lived in shared accommodation creating a family culture. Staff work and socialise together,

and form small tight knit groups where in terms of complexity act like agents interacting with one another and having positive affects on each other (Codynamics, 2006). Work-life balance was poor but staff are looked after by the organisation with substantial training and strong internal family values from within. Although more modern than the rest of policing, Command1 still has historical embedded characteristic of western organisations (Thompson, 2006).

### **Organisational values:**

Committed to deliver quality products and quality policing. Trust within staff (not management) Integrity Loyal staff Respect and support to each other Team working but seen in silos Command1 learns from its experience operationally and has developed intrinsic values. Creativity Pride in their work

### **Organisational Culture:**

Macho-guy culture (seen across policing) Process culture in terms of doing the job Learning culture - Unit1 has developed its effectiveness as an organisation by encouraging learning (Chalofsky, 2005). Closed culture - linked to its security Caring culture - looks after staff High productivity helped by the intrinsic reward of working in an interesting job (Thomson, 2006). Command1 acts in a far more quantum[2] way than mainstream policing. A larger degree of flexibility was required from the specialist staff to adapt when issues and challenges arise. All of the eight below Characteristics are present in at least a limited extent.

## **Quantum Characteristics– Table 4**

### **Quantum Characteristics**

#### **Extent**

#### **Command 1's Characteristics**

#### **Holistic and Integrated**

LimitedSevere competition between UnitsHolistic view of subject

#### **Flexible and Indeterminate**

SignificantVery flexible with unforeseen situationsSpecialists empowered

#### **Self-Organising and Emergent**

PresentEmpowerment in experts allows creative thinking and application – this helped staff to approach their work flexibly and imaginatively (Palmer and Price, 2006). Units allowed to do what they want

#### **Diverse**

LimitedHigher percentage of females compared to rest of police (30%)Limited diversity across Command1

#### **Participatory and**

#### **Co-creative**

SignificantWith limited resources everyone matters to get the business done. Staff can creatively multitask to get a job done



## **Risk-taking, playful, forgiving**

LimitedRisk adverse due to risk to life was a serious issue. Issues carefully managed

## **‘ Deeply Green’**

LimitedGreen policies from wider policing family are respected only

## **Vision centred and Value-driven**

PresentSensitive area to police. Staff are aware of the ethics about why we police how we do. Adapted from Zohar (1997)

## **Management Culture and Values**

All members of the EMT were white, middle class university educated males. EMT1/2/4/6/7 were in their last 3 years of their careers. Often senior police officers will try to position themselves so that they are employable into industry after their careers. EMT2’s agenda was questioned by others, specifically his interactions with and focus on industry. Honestly and integrity are most critical to leaders (Russell, 2001) and integrity, which is one of the most important values in policing, was therefore questioned. Policing generally has a hierarchically disciplined structure. Command1 was different. EMT1’s management style was a Laissez Faire approach (Wikipedia, 2010). EMT1 had an open door policy and a first name culture, which although common in business (Sanderson, 2005) is unusual in policing. If staff of any rank didn’t like decisions, they could approach EMT1 for a coffee to discuss issues. This was alien to policing and the management, and in particular EMT3, who had a Directive Autocrat management style (Wikipedia, 2010).

EMT3 commented that they instantly lost respect for EMT1 because of this (EMT3, 2010 pers comm., 29 July). The management didn't think as a whole system, nor did they understand how things influenced one another. Silo working was even encouraged. In Unit2 and Unit3 there was a culture of fire-fighting encouraged by EMT1's natural tendency to counteract and compensate a problem (Stacey, 2003). EMT members clashed over everything while EMT1 and EMT2 did little to stop these confrontations.

## **The Organisational Elements**

### **McKinsey 7s's**

McKinsey's 7s's is an effective tool for unpacking different elements of an organisation and identifying and targeting areas which need attention and focus, effectively unpacking complexity (Long, 2006). McKinsey 7s - Source: Have (2002)

### **Situation at time of review – Table 5**

StrategyCommand1 and Unit1 have strategic strategies (1 and 3 year plans)Strategies not communicated internally or externallyNeither staff nor stakeholders know or understand themStrategic report to drive business published 6-monthly. Which was too micro-oriented to be effective (Turner, 2006). StructureClassic hierarchical structure - although not working effectivelyUnits work in silo's in different locationsUnit structured differentlyDifferent funding streamsBi-weekly tasking and coordination processSystemsVery formalised with complex systems, rules and policiesOverarching bureaucratic management systems above (Symons, 2006)Bi-weekly tasking and coordination processCentralised HR and Finance

outside of UnitNo performance culture in 2006/07Threat and Risk managed wellShared ValuesPoor shared valuesPoor communicationEMT not operating as a teamStyleUn-respected weak leadershipLaissez Faire top management - EMT1Autocratic (Both directive and permissive) style across rest of EMTStrict policiesPoor communication styleSkillsWorld-class subject specialists30% very specializedHigh quality intelligence assetsStaffSkilled experienced staffCreative specialistsUnit1 is a learning organisation with motivated staffLimited diversityLow turnover in Unit1 and Unit3Adopted from Long (2006)Taking the data in table 5 the matrix below (Table 6) looks at the vectors of contention between the seven elements. A traffic light system has been added so show the severity of the issue. Command1 has 8 major issues mainly concerning its lack of strategy, style and competitive structure.

## Vectors of contention before the review – Table 6

### Staff

### Skills

### Style

### Shared Values

### Systems

### Structure

### Strategy

### Strategy

Staff don't understand Skills in place to develop strategy Not being communicated Not being communicated or integrated Systems in place to be utilised Difficult -Units competing

### Structure

Competition and unclear structures Skilled workforce Conflict – don't match Values not structured or led from top Systems conflict with traditional policing structures

### Systems

Structures in place Skilled workforce Leadership style conflict with traditional policing systems Leadership values conflict with traditional policing systems

### Shared Values

Values not led from top, only Unit 1 motivated Fundamental values in place, just unstructured Leadership values conflict with traditional policing values

## **Style**

Competition across Units Leadership skills lacking

## **Skills**

Highly skilled

## **Staff**

Major Issue – Red = 8 Adapted from Key Management Have (2002) Minor Issue – Orange = 8 Limited issue – Green = 5 Using the above data and other analysis included in this report a score from 1 (low) to 10 (high) has been given to each element to show how established the seven elements are in each Unit and Command 1. Adapted from 'Are we a learning organisation' (Bouwer, et al 2002) and shown overleaf. Unit 1 was by far the most established and all Units have good Skills.

## **Seven elements in each Unit pre review - Figure 4**

To conclude the analysis of Command 1 the internal characteristics have been summarised from all the analysis in a SWOT framework (Long, 2006b).

## **SWOT analysis – Table 7**

### **Strengths:**

Worldwide experts Respected Secure budgets Customers satisfied

### **W-Weaknesses:**

Lack of strong leadership Lack of strategy Poor communications Inadequate HR and Finance systems Competitive Units Poor use of technology High operating costs Three sites

## **O-Opportunities:**

Implement review recommendations  
Potential costs cuts from relocation  
Increased motivation  
Improved strategy from review

## **T-Threats:**

Constant operational risks  
Physical risks to staff  
Review not implemented  
Change in political agenda  
Continued leadership issues  
Staff welfare - long hours  
Crime type disappears

## **5. Dilemma**

A management dilemma can be described as an unresolved conflict of values (McKenzie, 2006a). The review recommendations can be categorised into 4 dilemmas:

### **The four dilemmas – Table 8**

#### **Dilemma**

#### **EMT1's views**

**1**

#### **To merge the Units to one central location**

EMT1 confirmed this was his biggest dilemma. Risking losing staff if Unit3 moved to London.

**2**

#### **Rebrand**

EMT1 was open to this although worried about losing the established worldwide brand of Unit1

**3****Reduce remit of Unit1**

EMT1 felt the strength in Command1 was Unit1 and that EMT2 had a hidden agenda in improving relations with industry using the other Units.

**4****Increase remit of Unit2**

Similar to point 3 but in reverse. Unit2 had a poor reputation and hadn't found its niche. It was seen as a luxury in Command1. (EMT1, 2010 pers comm., 7 July). The dilemma that now faced EMT1 was whether to merge the Units. Yet, what concerned EMT1 was the risk of losing Unit3's experienced staff if he moved it to London.

**To merge or not to merge: That is the question**

Table 9 overleaf highlights all the advantaged and disadvantages of the dilemma drawn from the analysis above.

**Advantages and disadvantages – Table 9****Advantages of merging****Disadvantages of merging**

One brand  
One site  
Reduce internal competitions  
Reduce duplication  
Improve staff relationships  
Combine systems  
Reduce costs  
Better service  
Cross fertilization of skills  
Alignment of pay and benefits  
Staff want to merge  
Individual brand identity lost  
Personnel issues with Unit3  
Unit3 staff leave could leave – possible skills gap  
Risk of union being involved

## **Advantages of not merging**

## **Disadvantages of not merging**

Unit3 staff are happy  
Unit1's strong brand stays 'Easier option' - EMT1  
doesn't have to deal with personnel issues  
Waste of review  
Missed opportunities  
Unit1 and Unit2 staff wanted to merge  
Stakeholders expect merge  
EMT1 'loses face'

## **Resolving the dilemmas**

EMT1 looked at the dilemma very simply. Personalities rather than roles got in the way in decision making. EMT1 couldn't within themselves risk upsetting and losing staff from Unit3 although at the detriment of the entire Command.

## **6. Outcomes**

The EMT met in November whilst EMT3 was on leave. The minutes of that meeting show that EMT1 praised the review and thanked everyone for their support (Command1, 2007). EMT1 was worried staff would leave Unit3 if moved to London (EMT1, 2010 pers comm., 7 July). Breakdown in communications continued until February 5th 2008 when EMT3 consulted with a senior officer about a vote of no confidence in EMT1. On the February 14th 2008, EMT3 was removed from position. In the March 2008 EMT meeting EMT1 explained that the review was a great success but no major recommendations were to be implemented. EMT1 spoke about his dilemma. The three Units continued to operate as three competing organisations, whilst EMT1 and EMT2 continued to work together to completely different agendas and direction.



## 7. Conclusions

Command1's lacked structure, systems and shared values. Although informally joined together, the Units didn't operate together in a common direction. People who share a common direction can get where they are going quicker and easier because they are travelling on the trust of one another (Noogenesis, 2006). Competition and duplication hindered its progress, and the management didn't trust each other. Although in October 2006 the EMT agreed a review was needed, EMT2 approach and EMT1 lack of leadership through it made sure it was destined to fail. It could be argued that Command1 was in this situation prior to the review due to weak leadership. Would Unit2 or Unit3 have existed if the original issues between EMT1 and Unit1 had been sorted, arguably not? At the time of the review Unit1 was an established successful organisation with structures, systems and strategies in place. Successful organisations become simpler over time (Miller, 1993), however Command1 was still a young organisation which lacked a structured strategy and suffered from organisational mindsets hindered by historical legacies. This area of policing is complex and high profile with additional political pressures, as well as being incredibly sensitive to police. Police it wrongly or too intensively and the threat actually raises, a type of self-reinforcing feedback (Stacey, 2003). Command1 had the experience of Unit1 to build upon, with creative specialists. It had many quantum characteristics compared to traditional policing. It had rules but was modern thinking to its approach. Too many rules constraints creativity and leads to resentment (Codynamics, 2006). It is the leader's responsibility to set the right tone, to live the values the company espouses and to truly lead by example (Rake,

2005 & Levy, 2005). Communications are vital (Codynamics, 2006) for an organisation and its leader to share its values and vision both internally and externally, both were sadly lacking within Command1. The review was meant to be a 'light touch' review, but EMT2 was not challenged on his in-depth approach. Covey (1992) said "Begin with the end in mind", EMT2 did have an end in mind. However this was arguably an agenda to place him in an organisation servicing industry to benefit his retirement plans. Parts of the review made sense, however the ongoing competition and questioned integrity of EMT2 hindered it. The reviews criticism of Unit1, a successful Unit saw its management circling the wagons in a defensive manner. Whilst Unit2 and Unit3 supported the review for personal gain. EMT1 did not challenge EMT2 regarding the reviews late delivery. With late feedback and EMT1s dilemma a vicious circle had developed with a tit for tat (Dawkins, 1976) amongst the management. Vicious circles are important to recognise (McKenzie, 2006b) but EMT1 didn't recognise it. EMT1 chose not to implement the recommendations. Policing is used to reviews but in this case the solutions (recommendations) were seen as too novel for EMT1. A Familiar task – Novel solution is the best method of transforming a familiar situation in to an unfamiliar one, i. e. improving it (Kaufmann, 2004). Command1 had a perfect opportunity of building on Unit1's worldwide reputation to create a better organisation. The merger made sense. When organisations (in this case Unit's) collaborate horizontally, extra creative value is added resulting in greater innovation and motivation (Friedman, 2005). McKinsey's 7s's analysis showed that Command1 lacked shared values. The review pointed the EMT to espoused values which could have formed a source for

motivation and inspiration (Stride, 2006). A critical thinking approach was not adopted. Instead EMT1 took the easier option, showing a lack of open mindedness. Whilst EMT3/4/5/6/7/8 were hindered by preconceptions and also arguably by emotions, they would have all benefited greatly from a critical thinking approach (Facione, 2006). High levels of emotional intelligence were certainly lacking in some of management. Although EMT2 approach to the review showed elements of critical thinking their agenda arguably hindered them. EMT1 had a tendency to look for easy quick fixes within Command1. They were quite happy to make easy decisions shifting the burden from their mind when it came to complex decision (Paskins, 2006). Similar to not dealing with the legacy issues across Command, it was easier to forget about the review than cause potential upset in Unit3. Judgements are better out in the open (Mckenzie and Long, 2006) but EMT1 made this decision in isolation. But in the end a management dilemma proved too difficult. In EMT1's mind the personal risk of upsetting and losing staff was too much of a dilemma for him (EMT1, 2010 pers comm., 7 July).

## **Concluding analysis**

Command1 could benefit greatly by reviewing the McKinsey 7s's analysis after the review. The original matrix (Table 6) has been updated to look at where Command1 was post review. This analysis would allow Command1 to review its position and use it to develop a comprehensive organisational development change strategy. This would help Command1 form an effective mission and vision statement. A number of major issues are still identified.

## **Vectors of contention after the review – Table 10**

### **Staff**

### **Skills**

### **Style**

### **Shared Values**

### **Systems**

### **Structure**

### **Strategy**

### **Strategy**

Review proposes a new strategy Skills in place to implement strategy Poor leadership to implement style and strategy Review set out strategy and values Systems in place still not utilised Review improved some systems

### **Structure**

Still competition Skilled workforce Still Don't match up - conflict Unit's values not structured or led from top. Further lack of respect Command 1 systems conflict with traditional poling structures

### **Systems**

Structures still in place Skilled workforce EMT1 style conflict with traditional poling systems Leadership values conflict with traditional policing systems

### **Shared Values**

Values not led from top, lost of respect Fundamental values in place, just unstructured Leadership values conflict to implement review

## **Style**

Poor leadership to change style

## **Skills**

Highly skilled

## **Staff**

Major Issue – Red = 8  
Adapted from Key Management Have (2002)  
Minor Issue – Orange = 8  
Limited issue – Green = 5  
Again, visualising the above data the seven elements are shown below. This time scores before the review are shown as well as the authors opinions post review. The green dashed line shows the authors opinion if the original review was implemented, showing the positive outcomes Command1 would have developed across the 7s's.

## **Seven elements in each Unit pre and post the review - Figure 5**

Adopted from Bouwer et al 2002

## **Strategic options**

Finally using the analysis of Command1 the external and internal characteristics have been summarised in a TOWS framework overleaf to highlight some strategies that could be taken (Long, 2006b). The TW strategies are particularly important to Command1 as these defensive strategies will help to minimise weaknesses and avoid threats. Within this box is merging, rebranding and removing the conflict between EMT1 and

EMT2. All win-win strategies and with the other strategies (SO, ST and WO)  
Command1 could move past these years of internal conflicts.

## **TOWS analysis – Table 11**

### **Tows Framework**

#### **Internal**

##### **S-Strengths:**

Worldwide experts Respected Secure budgets Customers satisfied

##### **W-Weaknesses:**

Lack of leadership Lack of strategy Poor communications Inadequate HR and Finance systems Competitive Units Poor use of technology High operating costs Three sites

#### **External**

##### **O-Opportunities:**

Expansion of services and specialists Technological opportunities against crime type Olympics - funding

##### **SO-Strategies**

Secure growth based on reputation Learn from other departments Secure acceptable Olympic funding based on reputation Introduce performance culture for reducing crime

##### **WO-Strategies**

Hire technologists Work on reputation/brand Learn from other departments Improve communications Merge to one site

**T-Threats:**

Constant operational risks  
 Significant Operational failure  
 Physical risks to staff  
 Change in political agenda  
 Shortage of skilled specialists  
 Major new threat arises

**ST-Strategies**

Spread Unit1 learning across Command1  
 Use ministerial committees and political reputation to influence policy  
 Improve reputation by training worldwide partners

**WT-Strategies**

Remove either EMT1 or EMT2 – remove conflict  
 Merge Units  
 Rebrand  
 Develop risk register

**8. Recommendations**

It could be argued that post review Command1 was in a worst state. Although dismissed, the review did highlight issues and could provide a starting framework for change. From the analysis of the management challenge the following is a list of suggested recommendations: Command1 needs to review what is it trying to achieve as an organisation  
 Command1 would benefit by utilising the experiences of Unit1 in a merged organisation. Command1 could adopt a quantum thinking approach before going back to the basics forms of its systems, re-evaluate its attributes and then and only then consider merging (Long, 2006)  
 Command1 and EMT1 should revisit its values and try to focus them to deal with its proposed mission (Argandona, 2003). Command1 should adopt a model to manage its change. Kotter's 8

phases of change would be a good start (Have, 2002) Command1 should champion diversity (Sanderson, 2005). Command1 should make the most of its best assets: its staff. Creativity is the ability to generate innovative ideas and manifest them from through to reality (Goodman, 1995) and an important asset of Command1 is its skilled creative innovative specialists (Kaufmann, 2004). Management can influence different components of creativity including expertise, creative thinking and motivation and all should be encouraged (Amabile, 1998). Command1 should utilise the dynamics from staff living and working together, particularly in terms of "agents" to spread internal communications (Codynamics, 2006). If Command1 didn't merge it would benefit greatly by removing the competition and encouraging cooperation, collaboration and networking (Chalofsky, 2005).

## **9. Personal Reflection**

Firstly I found this assignment difficult due to the confidential nature of the organisation. I was part of the EMT involved and found reflecting back on my role in the challenge difficult but very worthwhile. This journey through the module and assignment has made me think hard about mine and others behaviour, and why individuals acted as they did. This has encouraged me to reflect more about the challenges that I manage. I particularly enjoyed learning and applying sections on cultures and values, something I have taken for granted. As an analyst, I enjoyed the modelling part and look forward to further work in this area. As an organisation we are again on a new journey to merge this time with additional pressures of budget cuts. This assignment has been the basis of organisational development change



strategy for Command1. EMT1 is still in place but this module has provided me with the tools to work through some of the issues with him particularly using this dilemma section. However the biggest lesson I have learnt is that difficult decisions have to be made.

**5956 Words above**