

Heritage Maturity Model

The ability of a service to identify, preserve, protect and share police heritage for current and future generations.

Introduction

- This maturity model has been developed to aid forces understand the risks of not managing their heritage and the benefits that can be achieved by embracing it.
- It is designed for forces to benchmark themselves against what an efficient, active and successfully managed heritage service provision could look like. By comparison to the optimised delivery level forces can quickly identify where they are performing well and where there remain opportunities in a particular area. This then supports the creation of an action plan that prioritises areas with the most risk, or the most benefits yet to be achieved. It also highlights the different ways forces are utilising their heritage and making it fit for purpose.
- The model is defined into four main areas working in harmony:
 - **Governance** - The ability of a police service to understand its legal and ethical responsibilities and risks related to police heritage.
 - **People & Organisation** - The ability of a police service to recognise the skills and capabilities needed to ensure the protection of police heritage and involve the right stakeholders.
 - **Digital & Technology** - The ability of a police service to utilise technical tools to identify, preserve and share its heritage.
 - **Data & Collections** - The ability of a police service to understand and utilise the historical data and objects it creates and preserve its heritage.

Next steps

- The Heritage Portfolio is requesting that all forces assess their own provision against this model between July and October 2022 and score themselves based on their current set-up, with findings being reported back to assess the national picture regarding police heritage. This will help the portfolio to understand common areas of concern to offer support with going forwards.
- Each column is scored 1-5 from initial to developing, and contain points to consider against each force, which have been designed by subject matter experts from forces around the UK
- Using this model, if the majority of points are met, then that score can be applied. However, interpretation can be used and support will be available from the NPCC Heritage Portfolio to complete this model – contact Corinne Brazier, Heritage Manager at West Midlands Police for more information (Corinne.Brazier@westmidlands.police.uk)
- Examples will be provided of completed maturity models and a workshop scheduled for forces to attend for advice.

Please note it is not fundamental for a force to have a museum in order to achieve a high score on this model – every force can optimise their heritage offering. How you score now is not the most important aspect. The focus should be on the action plan you put in place to improve things.

	A – Governance	B - People & Organisation	C - Digital & Technology	D - Data & Collections
	The ability of a police service to understand its legal and ethical responsibilities and risks relating to police heritage.	The ability of a police service to recognise the skills and capabilities needed to ensure the protection of police heritage and involve the right stakeholders.	The ability of a police service to utilise technical tools to identify, preserve and share its heritage.	The ability of a police service to understand and utilise the historical data and objects it creates and preserve its heritage.
1 INITIAL	<p>No heritage governance group in place</p> <p>No information or business owner for historic data or assets</p> <p>No ethical oversight</p> <p>No existing museum, heritage display or collection</p> <p>Heritage disconnected from Records Management function</p> <p>No systems in place to identify records that will need to be retained beyond operational use</p>	<p>No group or organisation set up to look after the heritage of force</p> <p>Little understanding of the scale of the task, unprepared</p> <p>Force does not link up with volunteers on heritage</p> <p>No willingness to engage in heritage matters</p> <p>Insufficient resources committed to retain records in public interest – e.g. IT, Estates</p>	<p>No technical tools in place (e.g. spreadsheet, scanning, shared drive, collections system)</p> <p>Records and artefacts not indexed, records not scanned</p> <p>No online presence for heritage; social media, website etc</p>	<p>No awareness or action taken to implement new college of policing APP on Archiving in the Public Interest</p> <p>No heritage collection created; nothing being preserved for historic value or public interest; no storage for historic data and artefacts</p> <p>No engagement with heritage in force</p> <p>No disaster recovery plan</p> <p>Data and objects owned by the police service, held in private residences and computers</p>
2 DEVELOPING	<p>Aware of the need for a senior business owner for heritage</p> <p>Plans in force to set up heritage governance group, but not yet in place</p>	<p>Informal force heritage roles; staff with no training or experience</p> <p>No guidance or checklists for staff to follow</p>	<p>Technical tools identified, however not in place, for example databases and scanners</p>	<p>Informal storage</p> <p>No risk assessment of data and objects</p> <p>No engagement in force</p>
3 DEFINED	<p>Entry on Register of Processing Activity (RoPA - where appropriate)</p> <p>Information asset or business owner in place</p> <p>Governance group established</p> <p>Heritage strategy in line with local and NPCC objectives</p> <p>Preservation in the public interest included as part of retention & disposal policy</p> <p>Included on Force Information Asset Register (where applicable)</p>	<p>Single point of contact in force for heritage, data and artefacts</p> <p>Active volunteers from outside organisation</p> <p>Organisational support for heritage group to manage and care for archive and collections</p> <p>Understanding by Freedom of Information and data governance staff of their role regarding information being passed to museum/heritage collection</p>	<p>Limited technical tools to support Data and Artefact management – e.g. spreadsheet containing index of collection</p> <p>Limited online presence</p>	<p>Single point of contact in place to risk assess material as part of an acquisition and disposal process</p> <p>Access to specialist knowledge on preservation and collections care (either in-house staff or external partners)</p> <p>Access to appropriate storage in terms of security, environment, access and space</p> <p>Ensure long term preservation, care and security for collections and information</p>

<p>4 PERFORMING</p>	<p>Entry on Register of Processing Activity – standard practice</p> <p>Data Protection Impact Assessment complete or in progress</p> <p>Working to museum accreditation standards</p> <p>Comply with Museums Association Code of Ethics</p> <p>Active governance group with external support as well as decision making abilities in force</p> <p>Engagement with Information Asset Owner re Force Information Asset Register</p>	<p>Good working relationship with records management staff</p> <p>Working with external partners, such as Museum Development Team, for advice and support</p> <p>Resources committed to retaining records/artefacts in public interest</p> <p>Trained staff (including volunteers if appropriate)</p> <p>Heritage group active with force support</p> <p>Succession planning</p>	<p>A full inventory of the collection ongoing, to museum accreditation standards. Large number of records digitised.</p> <p>Collection accessible to public, colleagues and stakeholders</p>	<p>Work ongoing on implementing APP on Archiving in the Public Interest</p> <p>Engagement with external partners such as local archivists to ensure appropriate storage for collections</p> <p>Scope for an imaginative approach to the use of data and artefacts and ability to dispose of items when required.</p> <p>Disposal and acquisition policies should be in place</p> <p>Collections care regime in place</p> <p>Working to comply with SPECTRUM standards</p>
<p>5 OPTIMISED</p>	<p>Heritage used to engage with communities and commemorate shared histories</p> <p>Heritage part of force's business as usual (e.g. recruitment, communications, engagement events)</p> <p>Working towards accredited museum/collection standards with associated funding support</p> <p>Senior officers understand and promote the importance of police heritage</p> <p>Active governance group with external support as well as decision making abilities in force. Evidence of success.</p> <p>Systems in place to identify, at an early stage, records that need to be retained beyond their operational usage in the public interest.</p>	<p>Appropriately trained and qualified (or with relevant museum experience) staff in post or external museum consultants available to offer support and advice</p> <p>Support from a member of the Chief Officer Group</p> <p>Well connected with external partner organisations</p> <p>Active force heritage group chaired by member of the force, with participants from within and outside the force</p>	<p>Technical tools dedicated for heritage material, scan and store data and artefacts</p> <p>Digital capabilities in place which preserve data and collections</p> <p>Collections management system in place</p> <p>Use of external partners and collaboration where possible/appropriate</p> <p>Use of social media, website etc to promote heritage and engage with public</p>	<p>Fully document & audit force data and artefacts, in line with force Policy</p> <p>Proactive transfer from all departments of data and collections/objects for heritage collection</p> <p>Schedule in place of all records archived in the public interest beyond their operational use.</p> <p>Appraisal, selection and sensitivity review process in place for archived documents.</p> <p>Collection management and processes comply with SPECTRUM standards</p>

Why is this important?

- New Authorised Professional Practise (APP): Archiving in the Public Interest. Police forces do not follow the Public Records Act and share collections with external archives and there have been a number of incidents where they have disposed of records that should have been permanently retained. In response a new APP is being published which will require that forces retain information beyond operational retention periods where there is 'historical significance'
- Personal information: images and data are collected of serving members of police forces, but also members of the public. Collection and use of this data should be governed with policy and procedures and an overall responsible officer. Many of these images are appearing on social media and individuals/groups enthusiastic about police heritage, need support and governance from the relevant police force.
- Data protection legislation: retention and information sharing, as with all other police information should be governed by strategic information governance groups with the relevant oversight for heritage.
- Reputational risk: managing heritage and sharing stories appropriately, both good and bad, can help to improve public confidence and reduce reputational risk

Risk areas

- Governance and support are important in this area; collections and digital assets belong to constabularies and any loss or inappropriate destruction, could lead to criticism and/or financial penalties
- Sharing of assets containing personal information may be subject to data protection legislation and should follow an agreed process and impact assessment
- Selling of collections and sharing information via social media, including images, are two of the biggest areas of risk and should have relevant governance and oversight