

Best Value Review of Police Training

Force: Nottinghamshire Constabulary

Date of Inspection: 25–26 January 2005



A Report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

ISBN 1-84473-524-9
© Crown Copyright 2005
Published 2005

Context and Force performance

Context

Population served by the Force	1,023,160	
Number of police officers	2,507	
Number of police staff	1,374	
Number of special constables	295	
Budget for training for the financial year:	Financial Value	Percentage of Overall Force budget
2003-04	Not asked	2.5%
2004/05	£4.61 million	2.8%

Performance

A baseline assessment of the Force was undertaken March and October 2004.

The findings of HMIC specifically relating to the HR area can be found at:

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/nottsbaseline1004.pdf

Further details of the Force performance can be found at www.nottinghamshire.police.uk

For details of the rationale and methodology for the Best Value Reviews and inspection of police training please visit www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/training.htm

Findings

Area Examined	Findings
TRAINING STRATEGY	<p>HM Inspector found that the Force has not produced a training strategy in accordance with the requirements of the relevant Home Office circular.</p> <p>A variety of documents contain much of the subject matter required by the circular, but HM Inspector found that a review and consolidation of these documents is required to enhance clarity, and re-inforce the link between training and performance.</p>
QUALITY OF COSTED TRAINING PLAN	<p>The Force has produced a CTP, which follows the NCM. The Force has made, and continues to make progress in developing this model alongside the software consultants B Plan, and should be praised for this additional work. HM Inspector considers the production of the CTP to be of note worthy practice.</p>
MONITORING COSTED TRAINING PLAN THROUGHOUT THE YEAR	<p>The training plan is monitored on a regular basis at the monthly Training and Development Management Group meetings (TAMG), which includes central and divisional training managers. Significant alterations to the plan require Training and Development Executive approval. This group is chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) and meets bi monthly. Much of this monitoring relates to delivery and abstraction issues, and is not yet driven by financial information from the NCM.</p> <p>HM Inspector welcomes the development of performance indicators underpinning some of this monitoring activity, and encourages the Force to further develop monitoring arrangements to take into account cost information.</p> <p>HM Inspector is pleased to note that the Force is using NCM data to benchmark course costs with other Forces.</p>
TRAINING NOT INCLUDED IN THE COSTED TRAINING PLAN	<p>The Force has encompassed the majority of pre planned training into the CTP. HM Inspector is encouraged to note the ambition of the Force to incorporate divisional training into the plan in future. HM Inspector strongly encourages the Force to incorporate all other training into this plan as soon as possible, including all aspects of operational support training and other departmental training.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>CLIENT/CONTRACTOR ARRANGEMENTS</p>	<p>HM Inspector found a Force with a clear understanding of the client/contractor relationship, which is outlined in its procedure of Management of Training and Development.</p> <p>At a strategic level the Training and Development Executive act as a customer representative body. At an operational level the Training and Development Panel performs this function, and at tactical level divisional panels operate around these principles.</p> <p>HM Inspector notes that the Head of Training and Development chairs the operational level panel, and encourages the Force to review this arrangement, in order to assure itself that this body retains customer focus as its primary ethos.</p> <p>The Learning Management Unit (LMU) act as client focused body of expertise, responsible for higher level evaluation, TNA's, and auditing and validation of training activity. The deputy Head of Training Department manages this unit.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRAINING</p>	<p>Head of Training and Development has responsibility for training conducted within the Training and Development Department. However HM Inspector is concerned to find no explicit comment in any plans, strategies, or procedures which will ensure that accountability for standards, costs and planning for all training rests with a single source, irrespective of where in the Force or by whom it is provided.</p> <p>The Head of Training and Development reports to the Deputy Chief Constable and is a member on Force strategic planning and performance groups.</p> <p>HM Inspector notes that the senior management arrangements within Training and Development rely wholly upon Police Staff. The Force may like to review this situation in order to satisfy itself that it is able to draw upon an appropriate balance of professional expertise and operational experience.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Learning • Training Matters • Diversity Matters • Foundations for Change 	<p>HM Inspector is pleased to see that the guidance contained within <i>Managing Learning</i> had been extensively used by the Force during the Best Value review, and continues to underpin much of the training and development activity. However HM Inspector is concerned to find little structured or monitored activity by the Force or PA in respect to <i>Training Matters</i> or <i>Diversity Matters</i>.</p> <p>FfC is a driver for regional and Force activity, and the development of a regional evaluation team can be seen as a positive outcome from this work. HM Inspector encourages the Force and PA to review their response and activity now required in relation to these reports.</p>
<p>CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>The Force and PA signed off its Best Value Review of training in 2002 and its associated IP later that year. The current IP has only been in existence for a number of months and arose from the development of the 04/05 annual training plan.</p> <p>HM Inspector notes that recent additions to the IP has extended it's coverage across the training and development business area.</p>
<p>MONITORING THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>HM Inspector notes the intention by the Force to monitor this IP by the Training and Development Executive, and is encouraged to find that a member of the PA sits on the executive panel.</p> <p>However HM Inspector is concerned that no high level monitoring of the actions required from this plan has regularly been undertaken internally, nor has there been any formal PA monitoring undertaken.</p>
<p>QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES</p>	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to find the Force has achieved recognition as an Investor in People for all its functions, and that it has been accredited to ISO 9001, in November 2004.</p> <p>HM Inspector found that the processes underpinning the ISO quality manual still need time to become embedded within the Force, and that a key link in this process, the Divisional Support Officer, has been unavailable to develop these process as planned due to other Force commitments. HM Inspector encourages the Force to review the position of this key post holder as a priority.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>EVALUATION OF TRAINING</p>	<p>The Force carries out extensive Level 1 and 2 evaluation activity, with results being fed back to delivery managers for action where appropriate. The LMU also carries out an auditing function of level one and two activity and have recently introduced Problem Concern Reports as a tool to address any key issues raised.</p> <p>Level three routine evaluation relies upon a form L contained within the Force PDR process as a monitoring tool. Line managers are responsible for this activity. HM Inspector encourages the Force to review this process to ensure it remains fit for purpose.</p> <p>The Training and Development Executive uses matrices to prioritise level three evaluation projects with this work being carried out by an independent professional. This work results in a series of action plans, which are owned by training managers, monitored by the LMU and reported upon at internal monthly management meetings. HM Inspector considers the use of an independent professional to be noteworthy practice.</p> <p>The Force must ensure that, in addition to prioritisation matters, the Training and Development Executive also assumes responsibility for the tasking of actions, and the consequent reports, rather than the Head of Training and Development.</p> <p>In terms of Level 4 evaluation the Force feels it has embarked upon a piece of work linked to customer satisfaction, and the associated Police Performance Assessment Framework performance indicator. This is new and developing activity, which currently come to a halt.</p> <p>HM Inspector notes also the positive development of a regional training and development unit, which will incorporate evaluation activity, and makes a similar point regarding prioritisation and reporting mechanisms to ensure independence of the function.</p>
<p>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that more work needs to be done in relation to involving communities in training, although the Force are developing an action plan to identify activities required to ensure this involvement.</p> <p>HM Inspector encourages the Force to familiarise itself with the immediate actions required to be undertaken in this arena with respect to Home Office circular 4/2005.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
COLLABORATION – EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS	<p>HM Inspector found the Force to have a range of collaborative arrangements with non-police organisations including the previously highlighted evaluation activity with New College Nottingham, and Foundation Degree programmes with Broxtowe College/De Montford University.</p>
COLLABORATION – OTHER POLICE ORGANISATIONS	<p>The Force is well engaged with regional and some non-regional police colleagues in ventures ranging from SIO development and surveillance courses to eLearning and OSPRE preparation. HM Inspector encourages the Force to review the range of collaborative activity undertaken with a view to developing a database of action with associated benefits clearly shown.</p>
ADOPTION OF NATIONAL GUIDANCE	<p>The Force has used national guidance in a number of areas of activity including TNA and design. The LMU is the main source for this knowledge, and the Force is encouraged to disseminate these templates and principles to all service deliverers.</p>
MAIN AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FORCE	<p>The Force highlights three areas for attention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Resources. Demand exceeds capacity and significant training has been cascaded to divisions and departments. ● Reaction. Environmental scanning and the response to its findings need greater consideration. ● Planning. Training planning would benefit from a detachment from the full Force planning cycle to allow it to respond better to customer need.
APPLICATION OF THE 4Cs SINCE THE REVIEW	<p>The Force has detailed procedural actions to follow in the event of new training requests being made. These include a number of documents to assist a sponsor and the LMU consider the training at the TNA stage. HM Inspector encourages the Force to consider the manner by which this procedure could be enhanced to explicitly refer the principles of Best Value, for example in the LMU scoping document.</p>
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK	<p>HM Inspector was encouraged to note that the Force has adopted the National PDR system, and work is ongoing to map all roles against NOS. NOS are also used in design and delivery of training.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
MONITORING PROCESS AND COMPLETION OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS FOR POLICE OFFICERS AND POLICE STAFF	<p>PDR completion rates are monitored locally by Training and Development Co-ordinators, and details are submitted centrally and produced monthly into a performance report. This report is presented to the Training and Development Executive, chaired by the Deputy Chief Constable. The Chief Constable also monitors rates at his monthly performance management meetings. Qualitative monitoring is carried out locally by dip sampling.</p>
BUSINESS PLANNING FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TRAINING	<p>Business planning for training is integrated into the Force planning cycle, and takes cognisance of APA guidance from People Matters. The HOTD has previously expressed his desire to review this process in order to allow a better response to department and divisional needs. HM Inspector encourages the Force to follow this course of action and consider how it could best use the cost information provided by the NCM to help influence budget setting during the business planning process.</p>
PRIORITISATION MODEL FOR TRAINING	<p>HM Inspector is encouraged to find a prioritisation model in use by the Training and Development Executive, which uses a range of considerations to underpin its decision making. This will be benefited by an improved reporting process to highlight the decision making structure.</p> <p>HM Inspector notes the rapid response required of the training function, as a result of the Chief Constables performance focus group, in order to address requirements to improve performance. The Force needs to consider options to respond consistently and effectively to this additional prioritisation process.</p>

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a training strategy that is aligned to the guidance given in relevant Home Office circulars

Recommendation 2

HM Inspector recommends that the Force and Police Authority establish a formal mechanism to monitor the financial elements of the Costed Training Plan on an ongoing basis

Recommendation 3

HM Inspector recommends that the Costed Training Plan is developed to ensure it captures all training in the Force irrespective of where or by whom it is provided

Recommendation 4

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a mechanism to ensure that accountability for standards, costs and planning for all training rests with a single source irrespective of where or by whom it is provided

Recommendation 5

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops structured Implementation Plans in respect of the reports referred to in this report, and that these are regularly monitored through to completion

Recommendation 6

HM Inspector recommends that the Force and Police Authority develop a robust means of monitoring the Improvement Plan

Recommendation 7

HM Inspector recommends that the Force continue to develop its Quality Assurance process to ensure it covers all Force activity in a robust manner

Recommendation 8

HM Inspector recommends that tasking and reporting process in relation to evaluation becomes independent of the Training and Development Department

Recommendation 9

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a strategy for effectively engaging communities in all aspects of training, aligned to guidance contained in relevant Home Office circulars

Recommendation 10

HM Inspector recommends that the Force and Police Authority ensure that the business planning process for training is amended so that it is better able to respond to other Basic Command Unit and Departmental Plans

Judgements

Judgement 1:

Nottinghamshire Police have approached training and development, post a Best Value Review, in a systematic and structured manner, drawing upon structures outline in *Training Matters*, and other appropriate reports. The Training and Development Department have invested in professional managers to take the training agenda forward and also display innovation with respect to regional evaluation and contacted out evaluation processes. The Force has developed a good costed training plan, which has wide coverage of Force training and with a desire shown to capture all training in future. The Force must continue to ensure that all training is subject to the same professional rigour as that currently managed by Training and Development, particularly operational support training and divisional Training.

It is clear to HM Inspector that the Force continues to suffer from a lack of quality resources with respect to the physical training estate, and in particular, classrooms and supporting functions. As holders of Investors in People Status, and accredited to ISO standards the Force has shown itself open to change and improvement, and is progressing well towards developing a comprehensive and embedded quality assurance process. Significant work remains to be done to establish business planning and budget setting which reflect the real cost and demand placed upon the Force by training and development needs, and these are reflected in this report and articulated by the Head of Training and Development. HM Inspector also encourages the Police Authority, and the Force, to ensure that sufficient investment is made in training, and the perception of training, to achieve the desired operational outcomes.

Therefore HM Inspector concludes that the quality of the service is **'fair'**

Judgement 2:

Nottingham Police conducted its Best Value Review of Training prior to the national project consolidated review process. The process was comprehensive and detailed and led to a series of recommendations agreed by the Police Authority. This associated action plan was finalised in 2002. Since that time, until quite recently, there has been no comprehensive plan for training improvement owned by the Force or Police Authority. While an improvement plan does now exist neither the Police Authority nor Training and Development Executive have monitored the plan. There are significant challenges for training and development locally and nationally facing the Force, which will require systematic scanning and subsequent engagement from the Police Authority to enable the Force to respond appropriately.

HM Inspector concludes that the prospects for improvement are **'uncertain'**

For further information on the judgement criteria refer to Appendix H/Annex A in the below document:

BEST VALUE AND PLANNING GUIDANCE FOR POLICE AUTHORITIES AND FORCES (LINK)

Adult Learning Inspectorate

Summary of Findings

The Adult Learning Inspectorate undertook an assessment of several training sessions during the course of the HMIC (P&T) inspection. A summary of their findings is shown below:

Achievement and Standards

- There are high success rates on all programmes, retention is high and few learners fail to meet the requirements of the programmes. Learners achieve high levels of repeatable practical competence especially in activities such as firearms, driving and for many IT skills. Attainment is satisfactory in theory sessions, learners effectively develop relevant skills and during observed sessions learners' demonstrated competence and confidence in the assigned tasks and results in the knowledge checks are consistently high. However many programmes do not have any formal assessment of performance. Managers and tutors do not routinely measure, with sufficient rigour, the performance of learners as a means of ensuring or improving the quality of the provision.

Quality of Education and Training

- None of the observed sessions was graded as unsatisfactory, majority were satisfactory or good with only one session being graded as very good. Teaching styles are predominantly that of instruction and are predominately tutor led with the learners attentive but passive. Learners are not encouraged to actively participate in the learning or take any responsibility for their own learning. Most learners only participate when tutors use directed questioning. Most classrooms have informal layouts which make it difficult for learners to take notes. Most learners attend sessions ill prepared and when tutors make key learning points they do not routinely encourage the learners to note the points. Rapport between learners and tutors is good, however questioning is insufficiently thorough to effectively gauge learner understanding or assess whether the learning objectives of the session have been adequately met. Sessions are planned to meet the needs of the group, there is little differentiation to meet the needs of individuals with few extension activities for those able to work at a faster pace or repeat activities for those that need time to consolidate their skills.

- There are sufficient numbers of well-qualified staff to deliver the programmes most are either experienced police officers and/or trainers. Police officers are usually on tenure from their operational role and have completed training as trainers before taking on the role, and will return to operational duties after a period of 2 to 4 years; this has been extended in some cases. They make good use of their operational experience in the training and are able to illustrate key teaching points with real life examples. There is no career route for highly skilled police officer trainers. Particularly effective use is also made of the operational experience of the students during discussion and group work. Those trainers that are not serving police officers also have high levels of knowledge and experience in their subject, for example PNC training, which they effectively use to enhance their teaching.
- Accommodation is generally good. Rooms however have informal layouts and little provision is made for learners to take notes, flipcharts are often completed by lying on the floor. IT facilities are good with machines and software replicating the real working environment and learners having access to live systems. However there is insufficient space between workstations to allow learners to place their work or notes if they wished to.
- Assessment, either formative or summative, is not routinely used to monitor, plan or assess individual learner progress. Knowledge checks are frequently used at strategic points throughout the training. However learners are not clear on the purpose of these, many believe that they are used to assess the course content rather than their performance. Tutors have little awareness of the needs of the learners before the courses start and sessions are not planned to incorporate differentiated activities. In the observed sessions there was a wide mix of prior learner experience which was not routinely used or allowed for in the lesson planning or delivery. Little evaluation of learner performance is made or routinely recorded in training and planning records that could inform tutor or line managers as to the student needs and suitability for the demands of a particular posting.
- Courses are not designed to meet the needs of the learners, they are designed to meet the business needs of the Force and learners attend as a result of a training plan for student officers, or to meet the needs of specific posts or as part of the mandatory training plan for experienced officers. Training is insufficiently linked to the PDR or the developmental needs of the learners.
- The tutors provide satisfactory support in the taught sessions. They develop good relationships with the learners, make good use of humour and provided appropriate encouragement and motivation during focussed discussions and questions, particularly in breakout group work.

- There is considerable variation in the support that probationary officers get whilst in the divisions. This varies considerable and is dependant on the commitment of the mentors, and their support for training. Some learners receive good support from their colleagues during these attachments whilst others feel isolated and exposed with little support from their mentoring staff. The Force recognises these issues and has instituted a programme of tutor training. There are realistic targets for the number of workplace tutors required and there is an extensive programme of training to meet the demands. Trainee workplace tutors recognise these demands and many report that they have volunteered for this training with a view to improving the experiences of trainees. These initiatives are at an early stage and it is too early to judge their impact. However it is recognised that the quality of training and performance of staff are interlinked and the role of workplace tutors is a key element in the achievement of the improvement targets the Force has established.
- Leaders and managers of training have been proactive in reviewing and changing the training for all police officers and the development of an effective performance review. Training has been developed for appraisers to use the PDR process to effectively monitor and plan the professional development of police officers. However long serving officers express considerable cynicism about training and its impact on career development. There is a culture, within the Force, of under valuing training this is reinforced in the divisions by the low priority placed on the professional review and releasing staff for training. Many officers come to training but seem to be happy to be diverted by repeated phone calls even after the tutors request that mobile phones are switched off. In two observed sessions several officers left the room to receive or make phone calls and as a consequence missed key teaching points. Many operational officers report being driven by quantitative targets rather than qualitative targets. Quality assurance practices do not identify these issues.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic