

Best Value Review of Police Training

Force: South Wales

Date of Inspection: 2–3 February 2005



A Report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

ISBN 1-84473-525-7
© Crown Copyright 2005
Published 2005

Context and Force performance

Context

Population served by the Force	1,198,986	
Number of police officers	3,339	
Number of police staff	1,576	
Number of special constables	208	
Budget for training for the financial year:	Financial Value	Percentage of Overall Force budget
2003-04	Not asked	1.8%
2004/05	£5.2m	2.4%

Performance

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

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

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/swalbaseline1004.pdf

Further details of the Force performance can be found at: www.southwales.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
<p>TRAINING STRATEGY</p>	<p>There is a training strategy but HM Inspector found it relates only to the Training Department and has not been sanctioned by the strategic Force Training Board. Whilst the plan includes key training issues it is not compliant with HOC 53/03 and so excludes some key development areas.</p> <p>HM Inspector acknowledges that a revised plan is being produced.</p>
<p>QUALITY OF COSTED TRAINING PLAN</p>	<p>HM Inspector was concerned to find that the Force has no costed plan for the training function. Most of the training planned for 2004/05 was identified but the NCM methodology has not been applied to reveal the cost of training.</p> <p>Consequently, the training planning process currently has no influence over the budget setting process. Year on year growth in the training budget has been based on incremental inflationary increases. Furthermore, the 2005/06 costed training plan will be produced too late to inform the 2005/06 corporate planning cycle.</p>
<p>MONITORING COSTED TRAINING PLAN THROUGHOUT THE YEAR</p>	<p>The annual training plan produced by the Training Department is regularly monitored at the Force Training Board [FTB], which also approves any in-year variations. Budget spend against the plan is also monitored. Business cases are the main method for progressing new training programmes but these often operate outside the training planning regime.</p>
<p>TRAINING NOT INCLUDED IN THE COSTED TRAINING PLAN</p>	<p>HM Inspector found that some new training relating to legislative or procedural changes and training generally delivered outside the Training Department, such as dogs, mounted and underwater training is not included in the annual plan. In addition these training areas fall outside the scrutiny of the FTB.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>CLIENT/CONTRACTOR ARRANGEMENTS</p>	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to find that the Force training management structure is clearly set out in the Training Department strategy with terms of reference for each level. The ACC has responsibility for the FTB, which oversees the lower level Local Training Boards. There are four local training boards across the BCUs.</p> <p>HM Inspector was concerned to hear from the majority of staff who were interviewed that they had little confidence in the effectiveness of the strategic FTB. Attendance by senior managers is not consistent and so the ability to make executive and final decisions has been limited. This is compounded by the fact that important areas of operational support training are not subject to FTB scrutiny. HM Inspector was encouraged to see Police Authority attendance at the FTB.</p> <p>HM Inspector was pleased to find the local training boards are enthusiastically supported by BCU commanders and their teams to effectively identify and prioritise local training. Local training plans are produced through this effective challenge process but they are not subject to FTB approval or scrutiny.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRAINING</p> <p>NOTEWORTHY PRACTICE</p>	<p>Responsibility for the training and development function rests with the Director of HR (which is not an ACPO appointment) but who reports to the ACC. The Director of HR is line manager to the Head of Training.</p> <p>The Head of Training is a chief inspector who is in the process of developing the 'Head of Profession' status for all training. However, the consistency of training standards and accountability across the entire training function has yet to be planned and achieved. Some links have been made with the operational support training staff and there are aspirational plans in the short term to integrate them further with the training planning process.</p> <p>HM Inspector acknowledges the proposed new management structure for the training function which will see the appointment of a training professional as Head of Training. This is planned to take effect from 1st April 2005.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRAINING</p> <p>NOTEWORTHY PRACTICE</p> <p>continued</p>	<p>HM Inspector was very impressed by the arrangements made to deliver local training. The Local Training Units (LTUs) are professionally managed by the Head of Training in association with the BCU Commanders, located on the BCUs and managed through the Local Training Boards. Each LTU has an inspector, with the link between training and BCU Commander provided by the Business Manager. HM Inspector found the most advanced LTU was located in Swansea. There was a clear link between training and performance with good leadership among the BCU command team. HM Inspector encourages the Force to achieve the same standard across the other BCUs.</p> <p>HM Inspector was concerned to hear about the difficulties caused by some financial management procedures. There was evidence that community involvement and outside speakers have been discouraged from attending training because of payment problems. HM Inspector encourages the Force to review how this issue could be improved.</p> <p>There are formalised and documented meeting structures across the training function for training managers and trainers which feed into the Training Boards. The Head of Training is included in strategic meetings outside the Training Department and routinely works alongside the DHR.</p> <p>HM Inspector was encouraged to see there has been consistently good support from the Police Authority.</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Learning • Training Matters • Diversity Matters • Foundations for Change 	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to find there has been sound activity which supports the <i>Managing Learning</i>, <i>Diversity Matters</i> and <i>Training Matters</i> recommendations, together with effective Police Authority monitoring.</p> <p>Progress against FfC is monitored in Force and regionally. The Force is leading for the region on e-learning and liP.</p> <p>The Home Office, Race and Diversity Programme guidance is being progressed in Force with the appointment of an ACPO champion to oversee its integration. The DHR also has responsibility for its implementation.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN	<p>The BVR IP 2003 is mostly complete with two outstanding recommendations.</p> <p>HM Inspector was encouraged to find a revised improvement plan that seeks to impact across all Force training and sets out what needs to be done. It has been dormant within the Training Department for some time and is yet to be put before the FTB for approval. There are plans to seek its implementation with the proposed structural changes within training in April 2005. The plan currently lacks detail about timescales, milestones and the monitoring arrangements and is not owned by ACPO.</p>
MONITORING THE IP	<p>The BVR IP is monitored quarterly by the Force Programme Board, which includes the FfC. In relation to the regional recommendations the Police Authority sit on the regional implementation board.</p>
QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES	<p>HM Inspector was concerned to find there is no formal QA framework across the Force. In practice there is very limited QA being applied within centrally provided training. Notable exceptions are the rigour being applied to firearms training and the appointment of a QA officer for officer safety training. It was encouraging to find policies being developed in relation to reducing non-attendance and the commissioning of new training but the Force needs to ensure these are consistently and robustly applied.</p> <p>There are no routine trainer assessments, although line manager observations do occasionally take place and an external assessor is contracted in to help manage the demand. Lesson plans are not subject to annual validation or version control.</p> <p>HM Inspector was pleased to discover that the Force is planning to attain the IIP award and Centrex Approval in the medium term.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>EVALUATION OF TRAINING</p>	<p>HM Inspector was disappointed to find that there is no post dedicated to training evaluation. Instead, the Force has merged the previous evaluation resource into its Strategic HR Planning Unit, which has retained some responsibility for evaluation.</p> <p>Tasking and reporting is independently controlled through the FTB, which also approves the evaluation priorities, but there is no audit trail or longer term monitoring of the recommendations arising from evaluations. HM Inspector was encouraged to learn that valuable management information is being produced from evaluation activity, some of which shows inefficient use of training resources in some areas. However, there are concerns that the subsequent challenge is not being applied within the FTB.</p> <p>All courses are evaluated to Level 1. Level 2 assessments are not proscribed but left to informal arrangements by individual trainers.</p> <p>Some Level 3 evaluation is done through line manager interviews during PDR and there is a system in place to support it, however, this is not monitored to determine its effectiveness.</p> <p>There is no Level 4 activity, although the Force is introducing a process to capture baseline data that will enable evaluation for future training programmes.</p> <p>HM Inspector was pleased to find that the Force is integrating the Home Office evaluation guidance (7/2005) into their future evaluation plans. This will include linking PDR and NOS to evaluation and considering how to develop return on investment and community involvement in their evaluation strategy.</p>
<p>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING</p> <p>NOTEWORTHY PRACTICE</p>	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to find many good examples of community involvement across a broad range of training.</p> <p>Notably, under the Head of Training, the Force has a community involvement coordinator, (a police sergeant), who is developing a database of community contacts that will support a student officer placement programme. There are plans to use these contacts within the wider training process to design and evaluate future training programmes. There is likely to be a financial cost to this activity and the Force is encouraged to identify an ACPO sponsor who can champion it alongside other strategic diversity programmes.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>COLLABORATION – EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS</p>	<p>There are extensive examples of collaboration with external organisations. The Force have been working closely with the Safer Swansea Partnership which includes Swansea City Council, Job Centre, CCTV, BTP, and the Fire service to provide multi agency training days on anti social behaviour for all the partners. Further examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● South Wales Public Sector Working Group to develop multi agency training; ● University of Wales College, Newport and Bridgend College for the delivery of the SIO degree in ‘Managing Major Investigations’ as part of the PIP project. This work is ongoing and is likely to develop into a criminal justice masters degree. <p>Furthermore, there are advanced plans to collaborate with local colleges and universities to accredit child protection training, adult protection training and the tier 3/5 interview trainers and interview advisers.</p>
<p>COLLABORATION – OTHER POLICE ORGANISATIONS</p> <p>NOTEWORTHY PRACTICE</p>	<p>There is strong evidence of effective collaboration taking place across the whole training function. For example, the Force are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Jointly delivering intelligence officers training with Dyfed Powys Police. ● Providing SIO training to Sussex, Thames Valley, Devon and Cornwall, Dyfed, Gwent and the Military Police. In 2005 they will train the Police Ombudsman’s Office of Northern Ireland. ● Welsh region has collaborated in the design, delivery and evaluation of a pilot tutor constable course. <p>HM Inspector was pleased to find a well led collaboration in terms of e-learning. The Force sergeant leading the project has reinvigorated the national e-learning strategy and brought together most of the Forces in England and Wales to share and develop best practice. The Force can demonstrate the efficiency gains achieved to date and outline future efficiency savings for the Force. However, the engagement of the FTB to support this opportunity has not been achieved.</p> <p>The Force needs to set out their future collaboration priorities in the Force training strategy.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>ADOPTION OF NATIONAL GUIDANCE</p>	<p>HM Inspector found the <i>Models for Learning and Development</i> has been effectively integrated into the development of new training programmes and for all stages of the training process across the Force. Furthermore, the processes are also applied by the Force Training Forum and the Training Boards from the very start of the training process.</p>
<p>MAIN AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FORCE</p>	<p>To improve the identification of training needs at individual, departmental and Force level;</p> <p>To develop the extent of accreditation in training programmes; and</p> <p>To provide a blended learning solutions including e-learning to future training programmes.</p>
<p>APPLICATION OF THE 4Cs SINCE THE REVIEW</p>	<p>The Best Value ethos remains in the Force and through the local training boards and training forum in particular there is a good deal of challenge being applied to newly identified training needs. Collaboration and consultation have been developed very well in the Force. The Force now needs to focus on costing the whole training provision to enable comparisons to be made and to fully exploit the NCM outputs.</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK</p>	<p>The Force is implementing the national PDR process in September 2005 and has integrated ICF into priority and threshold payments and the promotion process. Role profiles and objectives are being produced for all police officers and police staff.</p> <p>Some new lesson plans have been aligned to NCF and the NOS but there are no plans to revisit existing training.</p>
<p>MONITORING PROCESS AND COMPLETION OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS FOR POLICE OFFICERS AND POLICE STAFF</p>	<p>PDRs are monitored on Areas by line managers and centrally within HR who dip sample 10 per cent. Force completion rates average 30 per cent for officers and police staff. HM Inspector acknowledges that the Force is moving the completion period for PDRs so that they better inform the training planning cycle.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
BUSINESS PLANNING FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TRAINING	<p>HM Inspector was disappointed to find that the training planning cycle largely exists only within the Training Department. There has been very little connection with or synchronisation between PDR, costs and the corporate planning cycle and the Training Department training plan has been produced too late in the planning year to be influential. HM Inspector acknowledges that the Force has plans to move towards a synchronised process where one stage informs the next at a strategic level, but this needs to be detailed in the Force training strategy.</p>
PRIORITISATION MODEL FOR TRAINING	<p>HM Inspector was encouraged to find a prioritisation process that categorises training into mandatory, core or value added. The key prioritisation level is the FTB, which decides on competing priorities, but not for all training. The Local Training Boards carry out a similar function at BCU and area level but this is not subject to the scrutiny or sanction of the FTB, or always included in the training plan.</p>

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a costed training plan that is aligned to the guidance given in relevant Home Office Circulars

Recommendation 2

HM Inspector recommends that the Force and the Police Authority establish a formal mechanism to monitor the costed training plan on an ongoing basis. This should include the development of performance measures in relation to the delivery of the plan

Recommendation 3

HM Inspector recommends that the Force 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 in the Force or by whom it is provided

Recommendation 5

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a more robust client/contractor arrangement that ensures that the client has a clear role in the commissioning and evaluation of training and the contractor is held accountable for delivery

Recommendation 6

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a comprehensive Quality Assurance process for all training, irrespective of where or by whom it is provided. The Quality Assurance process should be regularly monitored

Recommendation 7

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a robust evaluation function for all training, which includes evaluating the impact of training on Force performance. This should include a clear mechanism for following evaluation recommendations, together with a monitoring regime for the application of evaluation generally by trainers and the implementation of recommendations

Recommendation 8

HM Inspector recommends that the Force ensures that all training programmes are mapped against the Integrated Competency Framework

Recommendation 9

HM Inspector recommends that the Force and the 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:

It is evident that there are significant difficulties for the Force in terms of a lack of cohesive strategy and effective processes and procedures for the training function. In particular, robust strategic level engagement of all training, Quality Assurance and evaluation and the integration of the PDR process are considerable omissions to the current arrangements. HM Inspector was encouraged to find very good innovation in areas such as community involvement and e-learning and it is very clear that there is a commitment within the Training Department and at BCU level to drive performance through training. However, there has been a lack of clear direction and the necessary support from ACPO in some key areas of training outlined in this report. HM Inspector acknowledges that the Chief Constable is implementing a Force-wide leadership programme for all staff that is likely to have a positive impact on the training function.

The Adult Learning Inspectorate found good training being delivered by committed trainers across a range of training programmes, which deserves to be recognised and acknowledged.

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

Judgement 2:

Training management has largely operated in isolation of the strategic management arrangements of the Force. In particular, the BVR improvement plan is dormant, confined to the training department and has lacked strategic intervention.

However, the revised improvement plan presents in detail all that needs to be done with clear milestones and an accountability framework that is owned by ACPO. The governance and scrutiny role of ACPO and the Police Authority are sufficiently challenging to make the objectives more likely to be achieved. The Head of Training and Director HR have a clear commitment to improve the training function and HM Inspector acknowledges that most of the processes that are required to be in place to deliver improved performance and the priority areas have now been defined.

HM Inspector concludes therefore that the prospects for improvement are **'promising'**

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

BEST VALUE AND PLANNING GUIDANCE FOR POLICE AUTHORITIES AND FORCES

Adult Learning Inspectorate

Summary of Findings

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

Achievement and standards

- Students develop good skills in lessons. They are able to answer question confidently and accurately. Their presentation skills are good and they work well as teams when group work takes place. They take an active interest in the lesson and are highly motivated. In an IT lesson they showed a good recall of the previous day's work and knew how the training related to their job role.
- In a lesson on partnership policing students were able to demonstrate that they were able to think around a problem and came up with interesting solutions. In a van driving lesson students were confident in their manoeuvring skills. Students always present a mature approach to learning and respect for trainers and each other, although occasionally more assertive students tended to dominate. Students in a firearms lesson responded well when put under challenging questioning.

Quality of Teaching and Learning

- Much of the training is good. Out of the eight lessons observed five were good or better. None were unsatisfactory. Most lessons are well organised although some lesson plans fail to make clear what learning would be expected of students.
- Different formats for lesson planning were seen although the Force is adopting a standard format. In a lesson in driver training too much time was spent on mathematical calculations on braking distances when the students were there to learn about and practice how to control skidding. Where courses were spread over several days insufficient evaluation of each day's outcomes is recorded and lesson plans for the following day do not take these into account.
- Students are motivated and attentive and quickly start on group work when asked. However where responses by students to trainers' questions are required often too much questioning is undirected and some students are allowed to dominate. Occasionally students do not contribute and their learning is not checked. Few students take notes, relying on handouts which are provided.

- Support in IT lessons is good and trainers keep careful watch over the students' screens. However all students are required to follow the trainers instructions and there are no workbooks which would allow the students to proceed at their own pace. Where possible trainers relate the training to real events and are good at using the students' own experience to bring lessons to life. Summaries seen at the end of lessons were skilfully handled.
- Trainers are well qualified, knowledgeable and experienced. Most have Centrex training qualifications and many are also taking external qualifications including teaching certificates.
- The IT facilities are good and rooms have interactive whiteboards which are used well, although when training had to be moved to another station inappropriate chairs were used. There are too few computers to meet the demands. In one IT room insufficient licences were held to ensure that all computers could be used. Some accommodation is poor, particularly the driver training classroom which is too small to allow any effective teaching to take place. Trainers themselves complained about some accommodation. However the 'Hydra' suite of closed circuit television which allows observation of suspect interview role playing is particularly good.
- There is no standard method of selection of students for courses. Some students undergo assessment before their application is approved. Some are not made aware sufficiently of the skills they need before going on a course although this is being addressed. In some IT courses the wide range of students' skills at the start mean that time is wasted in ensuring that all have the basic skills to start. One instance was related where a student had to be sent back to the workplace because of the inability to cope. Little is provided in pre- course material for students. The information provided to trainers on the students is generally limited to the name, rank and job role.
- When they start courses students are made aware of how they are to be assessed and when this takes place. Some courses require the development of a portfolio based on evidence from the workplace and appropriate mentor and assessor arrangements are established. However monitoring arrangements for new IT support users are not yet established.
- Support for students in lessons is good and relationships are friendly and professional. Two courses, suspect interviewer and assessor training and senior investigative officer (SIO) training which are being developed have been well thought out and designed. Good use is made of closed circuit TV to observe role play and interviews. These courses link into national standards and guidelines. SIO training is a national pilot and involves other Forces.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic