



College of
Policing


college.police.uk

Psychological risk management

Introduction and guidance

May 2017

BetterProfessionals[™]
for **Better**Policing



© College of Policing Limited (2017)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, modified, amended, stored in any retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior written permission of the College or as expressly permitted by law.

Anyone wishing to copy or re-use all or part of this publication for purposes other than expressly permitted by law will need a licence.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright material you will need permission from the copyright holders concerned. This publication may contain public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0 at www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/

Any other enquiries regarding this publication please contact us at the College on 0800 4963322 or email contactus@college.pnn.police.uk

The College of Policing is committed to providing fair access to learning and development for all its learners and staff. To support this commitment, this document can be provided in alternative formats by contacting the College on 0800 4963322 or email contactus@college.pnn.police.uk

Contents

Introduction	03
Guidance	04
FAQs	05
Risk assessment and management	07
Psychological risk management procedures	13
References	18

Introduction

This paper provides an introduction and guidance to forces considering how to assess and manage areas of policing where there is a higher level of exposure to psychological hazards known to be associated with an increased risk of anxiety, depression, primary and secondary trauma.

The Management of Health and Safety at Work (1999) Regulations provide the framework with a specific reference to the need for risk assessment and management.

‘Every employer shall ensure that his employees are provided with such health surveillance as is appropriate having regard to the risks to their health and safety which are identified by the assessment.’

Risk management falls within the wider risk control and management cycle, in which organisations are required to undertake key five activities:

1. Identify the risks in the workplace – What hazards exist and how could these hazards affect employees’ health and wellbeing?
2. Find out who might be harmed and how this might occur – Who might be exposed? Which groups are particularly vulnerable? How could they become exposed? Which roles or tasks are particularly hazardous?
3. Analyse and evaluate the level of risk – What is the likelihood of an injury occurring? What could be the magnitude of harm caused? How can the risk be measured?
4. Establish ways to reduce the risks – What are the control measures? Are they proportionate? How should they be implemented? Who would be responsible?
5. Record, monitor, review and improve – How is the surveillance programme working? How do we compare with other organisations (including those outside policing)? What can we do to improve?

The approach covers all stages of employment: recruitment, induction, deployment and post-incident support. To be successful, there is also a need for some investment in training and educating officers and staff in how to recognise symptoms of psychological distress and to provide the early interventions essential to the wellbeing of police officers and staff.

The paper cannot cover all eventualities. Roles that involve an exposure to high levels of stress and/or occasional exposure to traumatic events are covered by the Blue Light Wellbeing Framework and the Early Intervention Post-Trauma procedures adopted by forces. The following guidance relates to the risk assessment and management of high-risk roles in policing.

Dr Ian Hesketh
College of Policing

Guidance

This guidance applies to all areas of policing with high levels of psychological hazard. Police forces are committed to promoting the health, safety and wellbeing of their staff and officers by providing suitable working arrangements and environments.

The College of Policing recognises that some officers and staff are exposed to a higher level of distressing experiences, materials and/or information and acknowledge that this exposure can affect mental and emotional health and wellbeing. It is the duty of each force to assess these psychological hazards and put in place reasonable controls to mitigate and manage the psychological risk to employees.

While the core of this guidance comes from health and safety legislation, some of the elements are taken from a military approach adapted for a policing environment.

FAQs

What is psychological risk management and why do we need it?

Some roles carry additional vulnerability. They can interfere with an individual's emotional and mental wellbeing due to the nature of the content faced as part of that person's day-to-day activities. Many individuals have an inbuilt ability to deal with a certain level of psychological stress but this ability varies from person to person and changes over time or circumstance, largely depending on stress and resilience levels. Policy and guidance documents have been introduced to raise general awareness and provide guidance.

Who is responsible for monitoring psychological risk?

We all are. As a line manager or peer, the psychological welfare of those with whom you work is paramount. Psychological risk management has been established to oversee managing psychological risk, particularly to officers and staff who carry out vulnerable roles.

What must I be aware of in a vulnerable role?

Primarily it is about recognising and understanding your own responses to psychological threats and how you manage this. Raise issues of concern with line management if you feel your work involves an increased risk of psychological hazards. Seek advice and, if necessary, counselling through your occupational health (OH) or welfare support services if you become aware of a problem within yourself.

What must I be aware of as a line manager?

Develop an environment that destigmatises mental health and encourages reporting concerns. Make a judgement if roles are at danger of causing psychological risk. Potential exposure to psychological risks must be clearly stated in a post's job specifications and terms of reference. Within the working environment, ensure staff adhere to clear protocols. Limit access to sensitive material. Provide debriefs, impact monitoring and supervision at regular intervals as appropriate.

What help is available?

Officers and staff should familiarise themselves with the concept of psychological risk management. An individual should be able to raise concerns with their line manager, peers, welfare staff or occupational health at any time and expect to be supported. A list of mental health trained staff should be made available to all staff on a range of media, such as newsletters, internal comms and intranets. Regardless of rank or position, it is everyone's responsibility to understand, identify and report psychological risks in the workplace. All personnel should adhere to and promote a culture where psychological effects are not seen as a sign of weakness or incompetence in any circumstance.

Risk assessment and management

1. Identify the risks in the workplace

Many policing activities are known to have a potential for causing psychological harm and therefore can be foreseen. The Health and Safety Executive developed management standards, identifying five potential hazards which should be monitored and controlled in organisations (HSE 2009). These stress-related hazards include:

- lack of control and support
- exposure to conflictual relationships
- poorly defined roles
- organisational change.

These hazards can result in workers suffering psychological injuries, including anxiety and depressive disorders.

In addition to workplace stress, several policing roles are exposed to more extreme hazards as part of their work. These officers and staff are exposed directly or indirectly to death, trauma and distress where the possibility of psychological injury is known and is therefore foreseeable. There is a significant body of evidence to show that workers directly or indirectly exposed to traumatic events during their work have an increased risk of developing post-traumatic stress disorder, major depression, anxiety, alcohol or drug dependency (Breslau 1998). These include:

- body handling
- shootings
- rape and other sexual assaults
- transportation disasters
- physical attacks
- verbal threats
- harassment
- accidents.

The latest version of the American Psychiatric Association guide to psychiatric disorders (APA 2013) provides descriptions of stress-related hazards which can lead to post-traumatic stress disorder, acute stress disorder and adjustment disorder.

During this phase of the cycle, each force should examine all the roles in their organisation to identify any known hazards to the psychological health of employees. Human resources and occupational health should be alert to research and case law relating to work-related psychological injury. This may involve looking at claims for compensation, stress/trauma research and epidemiology.

2. Find out who might be harmed and how this might occur

After the risk assessment, the next stage of the control cycle is to identify which officers and staff are at greatest risk and how they might be harmed. There is growing evidence to show that certain employees are at more risk than others. The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations identify several categories of employees who require attention, including new recruits, new and pregnant women.

Research in to anxiety, depression and traumatic stress has shown a wider range of vulnerability. This includes:

- gender
- personality
- education level
- pre-existing disorders
- early life abuse.

These factors have been shown to increase the impact of an exposure to a hazardous event and need to be considered in recruitment, task design and providing support. Identify which individuals may be at more risk, introduce reasonable adjustments and take account of these vulnerabilities when planning and undertaking a surveillance programme (Breslau 2009, Alexander & Klein 2003, McFarlane 2004).

This phase of the control cycle requires forces look at how a particular employee may become exposed to a hazard. Understanding roles and how these roles are undertaken is important. This would generally require an interview with workers to find out how they engage in hazardous tasks to identify what might be involved in increasing or mitigating the risks. For example, a child protection officer's role is to identify, assess and investigate risks to children. If a child protection officer has a child of a similar age to an abuse victim, this could increase the risk of secondary trauma. This risk may be increased or mitigated by the levels of training, emotional preparation and support provided.

3. Analyse and evaluate the level of risk

The most effective way to systematically analyse and evaluate the impact of the psychological risk in an organisation is through psychological screening. Check the reliability and validity of the questionnaire and make sure that the person administering and interpreting the results is trained and competent in psychometric testing. Several questionnaires and screening tools have been developed and can be used to help analyse and evaluate the level of psychological risk faced by workers. Research has been undertaken in clinical and organisational settings to create measures which assess the levels of symptoms and identify vulnerability and protective factors implicated in the development of psychiatric disorders. Wilson and Keane (2004) provide a good review of the assessment tools and their reliability and validity in assessing trauma symptoms.

An effective surveillance programme should also measure other relevant factors, including personal vulnerability where gender, introversion/extroversion and neuroticism/emotional stability have been shown to be important factors (Tehrani 2016). Several psychometric tools can be used to measure personality. One of the earliest is the three factor EPI (Eysenck & Eysenck 1975) and, more recently, the five factor NEO-PI (Costa & McCrae 1992). Both personality questionnaires measure the important extraversion/ introversion and neuroticism/stability continuums. Personality tests can only be interpreted by a British Psychology Society registered and qualified test user (BPS 2014).

The effective use of coping skills and personal resilience factors can also be helpful in identifying vulnerability to harm. There are several valid and reliable measures that can be used to assess individual resilience, including measures such as COPE (Carver et al 1989), hardiness (Bartone et al 2008) and sense of coherence (Antonovsky 1993). Some of these questionnaires can only be used by a registered psychologist (BPS 2014). Others are more widely available (Brewin 2005). Resilience training sessions can also be an effective means of improving personal resilience (Hesketh et al 2015) and the use of self-administered online awareness instruments can also be used, such as i-resilience (Robertson & Cooper).

Forces may access a provider of electronic psychological screening or employ a suitably qualified psychologist to undertake the screening on their behalf (ACPO 2009). Screening is normally managed by OH. Having undertaken surveillance screening, OH should identify the psychological hotspots where employees are experiencing above the expected levels of clinical symptoms.

An OH adviser should speak to the managers and employees to identify what might have caused the raised prevalence of symptoms, examining organisational factors including recruitment, training, procedures, workload and control or changes in the nature, incidence or magnitude of the psychological hazard.

As the use of psychological surveillance increases, it should become possible to benchmark with organisations facing similar hazards.

4. Establish ways to reduce the risks

- The control cycle involves three levels of risk reduction interventions:
- primary interventions – change working practices or procedures
- secondary interventions – help employees detect and manage their responses to hazards without attempting to eliminate or modify them (training aimed at increasing resilience and coping skills is useful in reducing the impact of psychological hazards)
- tertiary interventions – provide individual support to people who become ill, facilitating a return to work and learning lessons about causation (Jordan et al 2003).

Police forces should concentrate on facilitating primary interventions as these reduce risks at source. Primary interventions require management agreement and support as they typically involve changes in ways of working, equipment or procedures. Benchmarking with other organisations can identify gaps and opportunities for improvements. This is a good way to highlight what might be done to reduce the primary risks.

Secondary interventions can involve the force in developing educational presentations to help the employee recognise how to reduce the risk of psychological harm and identify the early signs of distress. One of the more effective ways of reducing the risk of psychological ill-health is the structured interview with employees, which combines secondary and tertiary interventions. Offer employees identified as experiencing difficulties in the screening a structured interview which will help to identify the most appropriate intervention options. These options may include training to increase resilience or coping, an adjustment to the role, additional management support or redeployment to an alternative role. Employees suffering from clinical symptoms may require a referral for therapy or psychiatric treatment.

5. Record, monitor, review and improve

Organisations need to maintain records of the way that they are handling physical and psychological risks to employees. Not only is this important to the surveillance process but it also helps to demonstrate that the organisation is meeting its legal duties. OH departments should work with management to ensure that data is collected and that opportunities for improvement are taken.

Forces must maintain a risk register which covers any significant psychological risk and a record of the results from the programme of psychological surveillance. OH should provide management with the information on the fitness of employees to undertake their role. Where the employee is currently unfit, the organisation should provide guidance on any adjustments or need for redeployment in an alternative role. It should also provide management information on the operation of the surveillance programme, the numbers of people engaging in the programme, number of roles assessed as needing to be part of the surveillance programme, levels of fitness, areas of concern and opportunities for improvement (Everton 2014).

Psychological risk management procedures

Recruitment

Organisations should assess and regularly review roles which pose a psychological hazard to the wellbeing of officers and staff. They should make applicants aware of the nature of the risks and identify the requirement that applicants may need to undergo predeployment assessments, monitoring and review. Line managers should make sure that high-risk roles are assessed and then reassessed at least every two years, or more often where roles change.

Recruitment materials should clearly indicate those roles which have been identified as involving a higher level of psychological risk. Where there is to be pre-employment screening and/or regular mandatory screening, this should be clearly described.

Any psychological screening tools, including questionnaires, need to be reliable and valid. Psychological interviews or assessments should only be carried out by qualified practitioners.

During appointment

Line managers should conduct regular one-to-ones with officers and staff to proactively monitor the volume and nature of their exposure to psychological hazards. This should also take account of any individual vulnerabilities which may affect resilience. This may include any personal issues such as the birth of a child, a bereavement or illness. Where necessary, the line manager may make an adjustment to the work or, if they need more information or support, refer the individual to OH.

The organisation should hold regular resilience-building sessions where teams can share their approaches to dealing with psychological hazards. Individual or group debriefing of particularly distressing or violent incidents can provide similar benefits. Line managers should promote internal and external support networks that are available to officers and staff, for example, HSE stress management competencies. Where necessary, make referrals to OH for a psychological assessment and additional support.

One-to-one sessions should take place at least four times a year. They should also take place following any absence or where the team member's circumstances change. Resilience can become depleted with time, with the need for consideration being given to introducing job rotation and tenure for particularly demanding roles.

Aftercare

Line management should offer access to advice and review the wellbeing of all staff leaving posts assessed as putting staff at risk of psychological hazards. Where an individual has been found to have become sensitised to a particular kind of traumatic hazard, the organisation should take care to ensure that future deployments do not pose a risk of reactivating a trauma response. Where an officer or staff member leaves a high-risk role and a welfare concern remains, there should be a referral to OH so an assessment of the need for continuing support can be undertaken.

The impact of a traumatic exposure can be long term. Trauma responses can be re-triggered by any reminder of the original traumatic event. This can affect the remainder of the officer's working life and, in a small number of cases, can involve serious psychiatric difficulties which make it impossible for the individual to continue working in policing.

Support and support services

Line manager and peer support is important in preventing the development of psychological trauma responses. Team attitudes that recognise the need to share concerns and to provide peer support will help to build resilience. A positive leader who provides recognition, positive engagement, clear direction and openness for the team will provide an atmosphere where there is an enhanced level of resilience (Cunha, Cunha & Rigo 2009). Individuals should be able to raise concerns and be supported for any psychological issues by their line manager.

There should also be easy access to OH, welfare and peer supporters or ambassadors without fear of being stigmatised. OH's role is to assess fitness for work and to advise line managers on rehabilitation and the need for work-related adjustments. When required, OH practitioners can make appropriate referrals to other health care professionals, including general practitioners, psychologists and psychiatrists.

As part of the risk management process, police forces should monitor and review the screening results and encourage regular discussions, monitoring and reflective practice as control measures.

Roles and responsibilities

As a line manager or peer, the psychological welfare of those with whom you work is paramount. Regardless of rank or position within a force, it is everyone's responsibility to understand, identify and report psychological risks in the workplace. Adhere to and promote a culture where psychological effects are not seen as a sign of weakness or incompetence.

Some roles within forces have the potential to interfere with an individual's emotional and mental wellbeing due to the nature of the content faced as part of their day-to-day activities. Although not exhaustive, these psychological stressors may result from viewing one or many disturbing images and reports, reading accounts of violent actions and dealing with day-to-day exposure to conflicts and crisis.

The roles and responsibilities of individuals involved in psychological risk management should be detailed in a force policy document.

Senior management responsibilities

- Develop and introduce policies and procedures for assessing and managing psychological risk.
- Provide adequate resources to effectively manage psychological risk.
- Role model behaviours and values-based promotional assessments.
- Document support services in place for individuals, peers and line managers who are or may be affected by psychological hazards which can cause psychiatric conditions.

- Foster an organisational culture where officers and staff can approach appropriately trained individuals and line managers in confidence that this will not be seen as a sign of weakness or incompetence.
- Agree and regularly review terms of reference for psychological risk management.

Line management responsibilities

- Identify and assess high-risk roles.
- Manage workloads and demands.
- Support team members.
- Monitor the impact of roles posing a psychological hazard.
- Refer troubled team members for extra support.
- Provide a positive leadership model.

The Federation/union responsibilities

- Identify concerns to management.
- Support resilience building programmes.

Human resources responsibilities

- Ensure pre-employment procedures are carried out.
- Facilitate moves to lower-risk roles when required.
- Support line management.
- Facilitate discussion between line management and OH regarding the nature of roles and the potential exposure to any psychological hazards prior to any recruiting.
- Ensure that the level of psychological hazard is clearly stated in role specifications and requirements.
- Alert applicants to the mandatory screening, assessments and debriefing that are required for the duration of the post.

Occupational health responsibilities

- Support line managers by assessing individuals' suitability for high-risk roles.
- Advise line management on the wellbeing of officers and staff on leaving posts that are assessed as having increased risk of psychological hazards.
- Provide assessments for officers and staff who remain a welfare concern after leaving a high-risk role.
- Provide management information on the impact of the work on teams and sections.
- Provide organisational health checks and strategic healthcare advice.

Welfare/ambassadors responsibilities

- Support the wellbeing of officers and staff in post and on leaving posts.
- Act as a signpost for other services.
- Provide peer support to colleagues.

Employee responsibilities

- Protect your own health and wellbeing and speak to your team leader when you are experiencing difficulties.
- Engage in any wellbeing training or support activities.
- Notice when a colleague is not coping and offer support.

References

- ACAS (2012) Defining an employer's duty of care [internet]. Available from: <http://www.acas.org.uk/index.aspx?articleid=3751> [Accessed 29 August 2014]
- ACPO (2009) ACPO Combating Child Abuse on the Internet (CCAI): Practice advice on the protection of workers engaged in identifying, investigating, tracking and preventing on-line child abuse (internal document).
- Alexander, D., Klein, S. (2003) The epidemiology of PTSD and patient vulnerability factors. *Psychiatry* 2(6) pp 22-26.
- Antonovsky, A. (1993) The structure and properties of the sense of coherence scale. *Social Science Medicine* 36(6) pp 725-733. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- APA (2013) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th edition). Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Bartone, P.T. et al (2008) Psychological hardiness predicts success in US army special forces candidates. *International Journal of Assessment and Selection* 16(1) pp 78-81. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- BPS (2014) Psychological Testing Centre [internet]. Available from <http://www.psychtesting.org.uk/> [Accessed 6 April 2017]
- Breslau, N. (1998) Epidemiology of Trauma and Posttraumatic stress disorder (in Yehuda, R. Ed. *Psychological Trauma*). Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Breslau, N. (2009) The epidemiology of trauma, PTSD, and other posttrauma disorders. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse* 10(3) pp 198-210. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Brewin, C. (2005) Systematic review of screening instruments for adults at risk of PTSD. *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 18(1) pp 53-62. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Carver, C.S., Scheier, M.F., Weintraub, J.K. (1989) Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56 pp 267-283. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Costa, P.T., McCrae, R.R., (1992) Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Assessment* 4 pp 5-13. Abingdon-on-Thames: Taylor and Francis.

- eCuna M.P., eCuna, R.C., Rego, A. (2009) Exploring the role of Leader Subordinate Interactions in the Construction of Organisational Positivity. *Leadership* 5 pp 81-101. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (2011)** Emergency Services: a literature review on occupational safety and health risks. Luxembourg: Publications office of the European Union.
- Everton, S. (2014) Health Surveillance (in Thornbory, G. Ed. *Contemporary Occupational Health Nursing: a guide for practitioners*). London: Routledge.
- Eysenck, H. J., Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975) *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Junior and Adult)*. Kent: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Hesketh, I., Cooper, C., Ivy, J. (2015) Well-being, Austerity and Policing: Is it worth investing in resilience training? *Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles* 88(3) pp 220-230. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- HSE (2009) *How to tackle work-related stress: A guide for employers on making the Management Standards work*. Sudbury: HSE Books.
- Jordan, J. et al (2003) *Beacons of excellence in stress prevention*. Sudbury: HSE Books.
- McFarlane, A. (2004) The contribution of epidemiology to the study of traumatic stress. *Social Psychiatry and Psychometric Epidemiology* 39 pp 874-882. New York: Springer.
- Otto, J.L., Holodniy, M., DeFraitess, R.F. (2014) Public Health Practice is not research. *American Journal of Public Health* 104(4) pp 596-602. Washington DC: American Public Health Association.
- Rick, J. et al (2001) *A critical review of psychosocial hazard measures*. Sudbury: HSE Books.
- Tehrani, N. (2016) Extroversion, Neuroticism and Secondary Trauma in Child Protection Investigators. *Occupational Medicine* 66(5) pp 403-407. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- United Kingdom Parliament (1999)** *Management of Health and Safety at Work* [internet]. Available from: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1999/3242/pdfs/uksi_19993242_en.pdf [Accessed 6 April 2017]
- Wilson, J.P., Keane, T.M (2004) *Assessing Psychological Trauma and PTSD*. New York: Guildford Press.

About the College

We're the professional body for everyone who works for the police service in England and Wales. Our purpose is to provide those working in policing with the skills and knowledge necessary to prevent crime, protect the public and secure public trust.

college.police.uk



Follow us
@CollegeofPolice