

Best Value Review of Police Training

Force: Cumbria Police

Date of Inspection: 11-12 August 2004



A Report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

ISBN 1-84473-396-3
© Crown Copyright 2004
Published 2004

Context and Force performance

Context

Population served by the Force	487,033	
Number of police officers	1,260	
Number of police staff	800	
Number of special constables	84	
Budget for training for the financial year:	Financial Value	Percentage of Overall Force budget
2003/04	not asked	1.0%
2004/05	£2,101,693	2.0%

Performance

A baseline assessment of the Force was undertaken between September and December 2003.

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

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/cumbbaseline0604.pdf

Further details of the Force performance can be found at www.cumbria.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 was concerned that there is no training strategy for the Force. However, there is a draft learning strategy in place that comprehensively links to and integrates with current Force and national strategic plans and HOC 53/2003.</p> <p>The strategy should take account of the emerging National Learning Strategy and be developed in full consultation with the client group, with ownership by both ACPO and the PA.</p>
QUALITY OF COSTED TRAINING PLAN	<p>The 2004/05 plan supports the NCM costing methodology and requirements and also reflects the cost of external training.</p> <p>HM Inspector was concerned to find that the plan does not inform budget setting, is not linked to operational requirements, is not used as an analytical business tool nor has it been widely communicated.</p>
MONITORING COSTED TRAINING PLAN THROUGHOUT THE YEAR	<p>HM Inspector found that there was no process to monitor the training plan or variations to it. However, the Force learning strategy includes revised terms of reference for the Force Learning Panel (FLP) in order to ensure routine monitoring in the future.</p>
TRAINING NOT INCLUDED IN THE COSTED TRAINING PLAN	<p>Most areas of training are included in the plan but the CTP does not capture any of the training delivered by the area training officers.</p> <p>HM Inspector acknowledges that next year's plan will aim to capture all training in Force.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>CLIENT/CONTRACTOR ARRANGEMENTS</p>	<p>Whilst HM Inspector applauds the efforts to create a representative client group, the mechanisms employed by the Force are not working. Significantly, some identified training requirements are by-passing the process.</p> <p>The client/contractor arrangements are unclear and lack strategic impact. Whilst requests for training in the Force are vetted by the FLP, (attended by inspectors or equivalent and chaired by the Force Training Manager), not all training is presented to it. The FLP is by-passed by many departments. This includes health and safety, area training and some specialist training. Only training approved by the FLP is passed to the higher Business Management Board (BMB) for consideration by the DCC.</p> <p>HM Inspector acknowledges that the terms of reference of the panel have been strengthened but uncertainty remains about where the responsibilities for prioritisation lie and whether it can really impact across all training. It is Training Department led and senior management are not considered to be sufficiently engaged in the process to make it work.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRAINING</p>	<p>HM Inspector was very concerned to find fundamental weaknesses in the management of the training function which present a significant risk to the Force in failing to train its staff appropriately to deliver the performance required.</p> <p>The DCC has strategic responsibility for all Force training which is largely delegated to the Director of Human Resources (DHR) who represents training at strategic meetings. The DHR line manages the Force Training Manager; a training professional, who is tasked with running the day to day training function. The DHR does not see his responsibility for training extending beyond the Force training centre. In effect there is no single Head of Training.</p> <p>The Force Training Manager operates in isolation of the strategic management arrangements of the Force. He has no position at strategic meetings in his own right either with the chief officer group or the BCU commanders.</p> <p>Most specialist training and area training operate outside the functional responsibility of the Force Training Manager. Furthermore, the devolved training sites are detached from the professional training function at the centre and operate no alternative QA or evaluation processes. In effect there are four or more separate training centres across the Force.</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 found no action plans in relation to the progress of the recommendations from <i>Managing Learning</i> or <i>Training Matters</i> within the Training Department. However, HM Inspector was encouraged to see all the recommendations in <i>Diversity Matters</i> form part of Cumbria's Race Equality Scheme, (RES), which is overseen by the Equality Steering Group, chaired by the ACC (operations). The RES has not been the subject of formal evaluation by HMIC.</p> <p>The FfC have yet to be integrated into training planning.</p>
<p>CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>A detailed BVR IP was presented to the PA in June 2003. HM Inspector was concerned to find that since then it has not formed part of any implementation programme in the training function, nor has it been communicated to the DHR or Force Training Manager. In effect the IP has not existed as part of the training management approach.</p>
<p>MONITORING THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>The PA Audit and Performance Committee have responsibility for monitoring progress against the BVR recommendations but no monitoring has taken place. ACPO and the PA have failed to follow up the BVR with an IP or established effective monitoring.</p>
<p>QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES</p>	<p>There are no QA processes in Force for the training function.</p>
<p>EVALUATION OF TRAINING</p>	<p>At present the Force does not have a Training Evaluator or an evaluation strategy but HM Inspector acknowledges that a draft evaluation strategy is being developed as part of the new learning strategy. The Head of Training has drafted a new role profile for the training evaluator's role that reflects the draft learning strategy. At the time of the inspection, the Force was in the process of recruiting a training evaluator.</p> <p>Level 1 and 2 evaluation is ad hoc and the improvements that follow the completion of student reaction sheets are hard to define. In addition, the Training Department does not use evaluation to identify performance trends or consider comparative performance across the training function.</p> <p>There is no Level 3 or 4 evaluation.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING	There is some evidence of community involvement across training delivery, particularly for the design and delivery of diversity training. However there is not a coordinated approach to involving the community in the wider aspects of the training function.
COLLABORATION – EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS	HM Inspector was pleased to see there are examples in the BCUs and the Force training centre of collaborative arrangements being in place. However, the value of these arrangements is not fully known as there is no central co-ordination of the collaborative effort across the training function, nor is there a strategic or structured approach to it.
COLLABORATION – OTHER POLICE ORGANISATIONS	There is some exchange of information at regional level around TNA and design and evaluation will follow. There are many examples of shared training with other forces and police organisations across the training function but this is largely trainer driven.
ADOPTION OF NATIONAL GUIDANCE	Whilst the central training staff are familiar with the <i>Models for Learning and Development</i> there is a lack of consistency in their application or knowledge of them across the Force.
MAIN AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FORCE	<p>That training is linked to the Force/area/section objectives.</p> <p>To improve the management structure and training prioritisation arrangements.</p> <p>More flexibility in the use of trainer skills to address local training needs.</p> <p>To review the impact of devolved resource management on the training function.</p> <p>To develop alternative learning solutions.</p> <p>Integration of all training into the learning strategy and training plan.</p>
APPLICATION OF THE 4Cs SINCE THE REVIEW	There is no evidence that Best Value principles have been integrated into current training management.

Area Examined	Findings
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK</p>	<p>HM Inspector was encouraged to find that the Force aims to introduce the ICF no later than April 2005 and apply it to all HR practices.</p>
<p>MONITORING PROCESS AND COMPLETION OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS FOR POLICE OFFICERS AND POLICE STAFF</p>	<p>HM Inspector was concerned to find that there is little confidence or credibility in the PDR system and that in particular many supervisors do not value PDR or have the skills to complete them. HM Inspector acknowledges that the Force Training Manager is seeking approval to help deliver the skills and reinforce the importance of PDR to staff development.</p> <p>The recent lIP assessment noted that the PDR system is widely distrusted and many staff are unclear about its purpose.</p>
<p>BUSINESS PLANNING FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TRAINING</p>	<p>There is no business planning cycle for the management of the training function that integrates with the corporate planning cycle.</p>
<p>PRIORITISATION MODEL FOR TRAINING</p>	<p>The Force Training Manager is developing the concept of a strategic prioritisation model for training that engages both the client and contractor sides.</p>

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

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

Recommendation 2

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

Recommendation 3

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 4

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 5

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a more distinct client/contractor arrangement, ensuring 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 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 7

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 8

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a single improvement plan which captures all locally identified improvement actions as well as those which result from this or previous HMIC Training reports. The improvement plan should also capture any improvement actions which have resulted from other relevant sources having an impact on training

Recommendation 9

HM Inspector recommends that the Force and the Police Authority develop a more robust means of monitoring the improvement plan

Recommendation 10

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 11

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a robust evaluation function for all training, with a tasking and reporting process independent of the Training Department. This should include a clear mechanism for commissioning and actioning evaluation projects and their recommendations

Recommendation 12

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a clear strategy in respect of external collaboration, with external organisations together with protocols for agreements concluded

Recommendation 13

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a clear strategy in respect of collaboration with other police organisations, together with protocols for agreements entered into

Recommendation 14

HM Inspector recommends that the Force ensures that all relevant personnel are conversant with, and are utilising, national guidance in the form of the *Centrex Models for Learning and Development*

Recommendation 15

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a mechanism which ensures that the principles of Best Value are applied to all new training initiatives and that these are capable of audit

Recommendation 16

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a mechanism which allows the monitoring of Personal Development Review completion across the whole organisation

Recommendation 17

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

Recommendation 18

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a prioritisation mechanism for training which is objectively linked to organisational outcomes

Judgements

Judgement 1:

There is the potential for the fundamental failure of the Training Department in its ability to support the operational performance requirements of the Force. It is evident that there are significant difficulties for the Force in terms of a lack of strategy and effective management processes and procedures for the training function. In particular, strategic level prioritisation of training, Quality Assurance and evaluation, community involvement and the integration of the Personal Development Review process are considerable omissions to the current arrangements. It is very clear that there is a commitment within the Training Department to drive performance through training but this currently lacks clear leadership and direction together with support from ACPO and the Police Authority.

There is satisfactory training provision from the training staff across the Force, as evidenced by the Adult Learning Inspectorate inspection, which deserves to be recognised and acknowledged.

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

Judgement 2:

Training management has largely operated in isolation of the strategic management arrangements of the Force and there appears to have been a failure at all levels in the organisation to effectively link training to performance. In particular the improvement plan is out of date and lacks strategic intervention. The Police Authority have not engaged with the training function and consequently failed to discharge their monitoring responsibility.

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

For further information on the judgement criteria refer to Appendix H/Annexe 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 of Standards

- Most students are highly motivated and take an active part in the lessons. They contribute well to discussion and show a good understanding of the work. They are confident, ask relevant questions which are often perceptive and challenging and are able to present points clearly. They take an active part in group work and are able to interpret situations to their own experience and environment. Students generally make good progress in lessons. Where short tests take place to check on understanding students provide accurate answers.

Quality of Teaching and Learning

- All the sessions observed but one were at least satisfactory and some were good or very good. Lessons are generally well structured and organised. Lessons plans are detailed and most have clear outcomes for students. Most have a mixture of activities which kept the students' attention.
- Good scenarios and tasks are used which relate to the local area. Students contribute well and respond clearly to questions which are often followed up by more detailed questions. However in some sessions the questions were not directed at individuals so that all students are kept involved and individual understanding checked. Although all sessions started with a brief introduction to the objectives these were not always clear or sufficiently detailed. Sometimes the main learning points are not reinforced at the end.
- Tutors are well experienced and are able to interest students by relating theory to real situations. However not all tutors have fully completed their training practitioner award. Accommodation is good and generally well suited to courses although not conducive to extensive note taking. In the IT lesson the computer running the power point presentation had to be operated from the back of the room and the tutor was not able to see the students' reactions.

Best Value Review of Police Training

- Training materials and handouts are generally of a good quality and presentations are well designed. The training department maintains a central resource so that tutors share course materials and lesson plans. Students do not have access to resources outside the classroom or have a study area.
- Tutors are very supportive of students in the lessons and good relationships exist between staff and students.
- Students are selected by individual stations or areas to apply for courses. There is no assessment of individuals' abilities or prior learning by the Training Department in advance so that tutors can take such information into account when designing courses. Little pre-course information or exercises are provided to student so that best use can be made of the time.
- There has been little development of alternative approaches to learning such as distance learning or e-learning. Once students return to their jobs there is no further formal contact with the Training Department.
- The number of students on some courses was low even though trainers were expecting higher numbers. Tutors sometimes have little idea as to how many students would attend. There appears to be no sanction applied for those who fail to attend other than having to reapply for a place.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic