

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <p>Security Classification</p> <p>Documents <u>cannot</u> be accepted or ratified without a security classification in compliance with the Government Security Classification (GSC) Policy (Protective Marking has no relevance to FOI):</p> <p>OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE</p> |                                  |
| Author                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Adrian Rutherford                |
| Coordination Committee                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Workforce Coordination Committee |
| Date created                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | August 2023                      |
| Freedom of Information (FOI)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                  |
| <p>For external Public Authorities in receipt of an FOI, please consult with <a href="mailto:sherry.traquair@npcc.pnn.police.uk">sherry.traquair@npcc.pnn.police.uk</a></p>                                                                                            |                                  |



**TO: ALL CHIEF CONSTABLES**

**Re: Fitness Testing Research Results**

Dear Colleagues,

I write in my capacity as National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) Lead for Fitness.

At Chief Constable Council (CCC) I updated Chiefs on the work we had undertaken to ascertain a new JRFT standard which would be aligned to the aerobic demands of the new Public and Personal Safety Training (PPST). Due to the fact that the new PPST curriculum is now over 2 days and a lot more interventionalist, the findings recommended that a 15% reduction should be applied to the current JRFT level, and the new standard be set at the completion of all shuttles of level 3. This would mean that the new JRFT would last for 2 minutes 28 seconds compared to 3 minutes 35 seconds for the current test.

Chief Constables agreed with the recommendation that we should not accept this revised JRFT standard and that the PPST is now not the appropriate anchor for the JRFT. Chief Constables agreed that we should undertake further work to ascertain a more direct job-related element. The preparation for this work has already begun with options for the identification of funding and scope of the work.

The question then remains what the JRFT standard should be in the interim until the work to find a more direct job-related element is completed. At CCC Chiefs gave a very clear view that we should not reduce the current JRFT level due to the need to ensure appropriate fitness levels for the service.

It is our view that to keep the JRFT level for new recruits (pre-employment) at the current 5:4 standard poses little risk and should continue to be adopted by forces.

In terms of the in-service annual JRFT level remaining at 5:4 there is some risk, especially if sanctions are imposed as a result of failure – whether this be UPP, pay reductions or access to training. The risk relates to the discriminatory impact of the JRFT as seen in higher failure rates for certain groups of our workforce. We have been able to justify previous discriminatory impacts on the basis that the JRFT is a 'proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim'. The legitimate aim being a fit and able workforce and the proportion means being that we have a job-related element connected to the standard that needs to be achieved. As the job-related element – the link to PST – is now broken, it increases the risk.

It will be for Chief Constables locally to determine the level of risk you wish to take regarding this, against the desire to maintain a fit workforce. There are a number of factors that forces could take to mitigate these risks:-



- For a period of time, and until the new standard is agreed, have a position where no sanctions such as UPP are applied due to JRFT failure. The ethos moving to enhanced support to the officer.
- Keeping 5:4 as the standard you wish officers to achieve but accepting those who have completed 3:7 (the outcome of the recent research) but do not achieve 5:4 is a pass in terms of access to PPST, but are given support and advice to work towards the 5:4 standard.
- Only take sanctions against those officers who do not reach the 3:7 standard.

I understand that a further interim period is far from ideal but alongside colleagues from the College of Policing we will work as swiftly as we can to complete this new work and bring certainty to this issue. Work has begun to update the implementation guidance to reflect the interim position, this will be published on the College of Policing's website as soon as possible.

Please do not hesitate to contact me via Closed with any questions you may have.

Yours Sincerely,

Closed

Adrian Rutherford  
NPCC Fitness Lead  
Director People Services for Surrey and Sussex

